

Student Name:

Form CoT GEC 5

**Rubric for Evaluating PhD Dissertation Research Proposal**

*(This page should be filled out by the student or Committee Chairman/advisor prior to distribution to Committee)*

Chair of Evaluation Committee \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Proposal Review \_\_\_\_\_

Research Proposal Title \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Committee Members and Department

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

After evaluating the dissertation research proposal, **each committee member should fill out the response sheets provided.** For each attribute which a committee member feels is somewhat or very deficient, a short explanation should be provided. A **Comment** sections at the bottom of the rubric is provided for explanations of the reasoning behind the overall evaluation of the examinee’s performance on the research proposal if desired. Completed forms are to be **turned in to the Chair of the Evaluation Committee (or Advisor)**, not the student.

A summary of **written comments** from committee members as well as any edited copies of the research proposal submitted by committee members **WILL** be provided to the student by the chair of the examining committee (or advisor) and; a verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the research proposal by the committee **WILL** be provided to the student by the chair of the examining committee (or advisor) or during a prescheduled meeting of the advisory committee.

All evaluation documents including rubrics and written comments must be completed.

A copy of the completed forms (both rubrics and written comments) must be sent to the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs within 1 week of the completion of the proposal review process.

**Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a Ph.D. graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a Ph.D. graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a Ph.D. graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Dissertation Proposal Defense Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

*(To be completed by each committee member. Please check boxes for all evaluation criteria that you feel are appropriate within each attribute category)*

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Poorly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Poor presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Poor communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts difficult to read	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly organized <input type="checkbox"/> Clear presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Good communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts clear	<input type="checkbox"/> Well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Professional presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent communication skills <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and handouts outstanding
Overall breadth of knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation unacceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals critical weaknesses in depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation does not reflect well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is narrow in scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation acceptable <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals some depth of knowledge in subject matter <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals above average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to draw from knowledge in several disciplines	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation superior <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals exceptional depth of subject knowledge <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals well developed critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reveals the ability to interconnect and extend knowledge from multiple disciplines
Quality of response to questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are poorly presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits lack of knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses do not meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are complete <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are well organized <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits adequate knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses meet level expected of a Ph.D. graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Responses are eloquent <input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are skillfully presented <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent exhibits superior knowledge in subject area <input type="checkbox"/> Responses exceed level expected of a Ph.D. graduate
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations
Comments:			

**Dissertation Proposal Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects poor understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Little potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Good potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent potential for success of research
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

**Dissertation Proposal Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects poor understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Little potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Good potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent potential for success of research
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

**Dissertation Proposal Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects poor understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Little potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Good potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent potential for success of research
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations



**Dissertation Proposal Rubric – Completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Attribute	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Overall quality of science	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments incoherent or flawed <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are poorly defined <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates rudimentary critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects poor understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays limited creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Little potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are coherent and clear <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are clear <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates average critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects understanding of subject matter and associated literature <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates understanding of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Good potential for success of research	<input type="checkbox"/> Arguments are superior <input type="checkbox"/> Objectives are well defined <input type="checkbox"/> Exhibits mature, critical thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Reflects mastery of subject matter and associated literature. <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates mastery of theoretical concepts <input type="checkbox"/> Displays exceptional creativity and insight <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent potential for success of research
Contribution to discipline	<input type="checkbox"/> Limited potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Limited expansion upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Limited theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Limited publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Some potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Builds upon previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Reasonable publication potential	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional potential for discovery <input type="checkbox"/> Greatly extends previous research <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional theoretical or applied significance <input type="checkbox"/> Exceptional publication potential
Responsible Conduct of Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates unacceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is inadequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates acceptable originality <input type="checkbox"/> Considers regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates exceptional originality <input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates regulatory compliance <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation is excellent
Quality of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is weak <input type="checkbox"/> Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is logical	<input type="checkbox"/> Writing is publication quality <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors apparent <input type="checkbox"/> Organization is excellent
Overall Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not meet expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meets Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations

Student Name:

Form CoT GEC 5

**Summary of Individual Committee Member comments for student concerning performance on Dissertation Research Proposal:**

Chair of Examining Committee Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_