

Qualifying Exam

The student should complete this section. Fill electronically, print both pages and bring to Qualifying Exam meeting.

Student's Name: _____ Sponsor: _____

Entering Year: Fall _____ Date of examination: _____

Proposal title:

Committee member: _____ Signature: _____

Committee member: _____ Signature: _____

Thesis Advisor present? Y/N: _____ If yes, Signature: _____

This section should be completed by the Ph.D. Advisory Committee. See page 2 for Instructions for examiners.

Pass

Conditional Pass

Describe the deficiency and how it is to be remedied in the Comments Section below.

- Pending a satisfactory rewrite of the proposal within three months
or by date: _____
- Pending a satisfactory oral re-examination within three months
or by date: _____
- Other (see comments)

Fail Attempt 1

Retest timing to be determined after consultation with the mentor

Fail Attempt 2

Comments:

Student, please submit this completed, signed form to the Program Manager

Instructions for examiners:

Pass: Both the written proposal and oral examination were satisfactory. Additional feedback may be given in the comments box.

Conditional pass: There are specific concerns that preclude an outright "pass", but there is no overarching concern about the ability of the student to address them. Please specify the conditions that must be satisfied to convert a "conditional pass" to a "pass" in the comments box. Assessment may be made via a written report or in a follow-up meeting. The conditions should be satisfactorily addressed no later than December 31 of the year of the qualifying exam. Please inform a co-DGS if the first thesis committee meeting, required to be held by December 31, will be used in lieu of an interim assessment to evaluate whether the conditions have been met.

Fail: the written proposal and/or oral examination were unsatisfactory, and there is an overarching concern about whether the student will be able to remedy the deficiencies and perform at the level expected for a PhD candidate. The student will be given a second chance to pass, and the date for the re-examination should be chosen in consultation with the mentor.

From the Handbook:

The committee will probe the student's general knowledge in the area represented by the project, the area represented by the sponsor's laboratory, and the areas covered in courses the student has taken. Students should be prepared to describe any procedure proposed in the research plan. Although the structure of the oral examination will be that of a defense of the proposal, the emphasis will be as much on general knowledge in these areas as on the merits of the specific research proposed. The examining committee will be made up of two faculty members from the program's training faculty.

The official policy is that the student's research sponsor is excluded from the exam; however, if the other members of the committee agree, the advisor may attend the exam as an observer.

Students whose performance is judged unsatisfactory on this exam will be given one additional opportunity to take the exam. The timing of the re-test will be determined by the committee, in consultation with the mentor; it could be scheduled as soon as one month later, and must be held no later than the end of the Spring semester of the third year. Prior to the retest, the student will be on academic probation. The committee for the second exam shall be composed of the original members plus the sponsor. The student also has the prerogative to request a new committee for the second exam comprised of two new faculty members plus the sponsor, subject to co-DGS approval.