

Integrated Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

Name of Discipline

Evaluation of Research Progress by Research Supervising Committee Cover Page To Be Filled Out By Student

* Student provides an electronic version of this form or brings a copy of this form to the meeting for each committee member *
and fills out this cover page prior to committee meeting

Student Name: _____ Date of Meeting: _____

Supervising Professor: _____ Mo/Yr Started Program: _____

Anticipated date of defense: _____

Has official Advancement to Candidacy form been submitted to Dean's office? Yes ___ No ___

Has Dissertation Proposal been submitted and approved by the GSBS Dean? Yes ___ No ___

Title of Proposal:

Has enrollment in two semesters of Dissertation credit been accomplished? Yes ___ No ___

Honors/Awards/Grants received since last committee meeting:

Presentations at national meetings since last committee meeting:

Manuscripts accepted or submitted for publication since last committee meeting:

Evaluation of Research Progress
Submitted by Each Member of the Research Supervising Committee

Name of Committee Member: _____

Instructions to Evaluator: Rate each item with 1, 2, 3, or 4; then provide an Overall Rating.

Students should be rated relative to appropriate expectations for their current level of training.

	No Proficiency Demonstrated Failure (1)	Marginal Proficiency Demonstrated Unsatisfactory (2)	Proficiency Demonstrated Satisfactory (3)	Exceptional Proficiency Demonstrated Honors (4)	RATING (1-4)
Hypothesis and Significance	Failed to demonstrate the significance of the proposed work and a testable hypothesis.	Superficial demonstration of the significance of the proposed work by providing a basic argument that defends the hypothesis.	Satisfactory demonstration of the significance of proposed work by providing a compelling argument that defends hypothesis.	Exceptional demonstration of the significance of proposed work, including effectively providing defense and abstract implications of the hypothesis.	
Experimental Strategies and Methods	Failed to present a realistic strategy and appropriate methods for testing the stated hypothesis.	Undeveloped experimental strategies and questionable methods for testing the stated hypothesis.	Satisfactory experimental strategies and methods for testing stated hypothesis, with basic explanations for why specific methods were chosen , and alternative approaches should proposed strategies fail.	Fully developed experimental strategies and advanced explanations for why specific methods were chosen including detailed explanations of the principles on which methods work, and why alternative methods were not chosen.	
Data Collection, Analysis and Interpretation	Failed to explain how data is collected/analyzed so as to derive valid conclusions regarding the stated hypotheses.	Superficial explanation of data collection/analysis resulting in weak conclusions.	Satisfactory explanation of data collection/analysis, including statistical analysis to demonstrate validity of conclusions.	Exceptional explanation of data collection/analysis, including insights impacting the general field of study , and statistical analysis demonstrating validity of conclusions.	
Verbal Communication	Failed to communicate ideas or explain conclusions.	Marginally effective communication of findings and results, often lacking clarity due to missing details.	Satisfactory communication, with clarity and expected detail, of findings and results.	Highly effective communication, including general implications of results in relation to the field of study.	
Knowledge Directly Related to Student's Research Project	Failed to demonstrate knowledge directly related to research project.	Superficial knowledge directly related to research project.	Satisfactory knowledge directly related to research project.	Exceptional comprehensive knowledge directly related to research project.	

Knowledge of Relevant Literature	Failed to demonstrate knowledge of evidence published by other investigators that supports or refutes hypothesis of the research project.	Superficial knowledge of evidence published by other investigators that supports or refutes hypothesis of the research project.	Satisfactory knowledge of evidence published by other investigators that supports or refutes hypothesis of the research project.	Exceptionally comprehensive knowledge of evidence published by other investigators that supports/refutes hypothesis of the research project.	
Responses to Criticisms From Committee	Failed to address criticisms of research project.	Rarely addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	Frequently addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	Always addressed criticisms of research project successfully.	
Knowledge Indirectly Related to Student's Research Project	Failed to demonstrate general knowledge expected of students at this point in their training.	Superficial general knowledge expected of students at this point in their training.	Satisfactory general knowledge expected of students at this point in their training.	Exceptionally comprehensive knowledge that exceeds typical students at this point in their training.	
Future Studies	Failed to envision "where research would go" after completion of the proposed studies.	Superficial vision of "where research would go" after completion of the proposed studies.	Satisfactory vision of "where research would go" after completion of the proposed studies.	Exceptional vision of how proposed studies should be extended to advance the field.	
Overall Critical Thinking and Independence	Failed to demonstrate any ability to approach scientific questions with rational experimental strategies, or to answer relevant scientific questions independently (<i>i.e.</i> , with constant assistance from Supervising Professor).	Superficial ability to approach scientific questions with rational experimental strategies and to answer relevant scientific questions independently (<i>i.e.</i> , with constant assistance from Supervising Professor).	Satisfactory ability to approach scientific questions with rational experimental strategies and to answer relevant scientific questions independently (<i>i.e.</i> , with frequent assistance from Supervising Professor).	Exceptional ability to approach scientific questions with rational experimental strategies and insights that exceed students at the current stage of training, and to answer relevant scientific questions independently (<i>i.e.</i> , with extremely rare assistance from Supervising Professor).	

The **Overall Rating** reflects the student's total performance. The Overall Rating should be consistent with, but is not a mathematical average of, the individual ratings shown above that may each carry different weight.

OVERALL RATING:	
------------------------	--

COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBER: Indicate below, factors that influenced your ratings. Be particularly detailed if a rating of 1 or 2 is given; provide suggestions for how the student could improve performance. Attach additional pages if needed.

Integrated Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program

Name of Discipline
RESEARCH SUPERVISING COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT
(To be completed by the Research Supervising Committee Chair)

STUDENT: _____

YEARS IN IBMS PROGRAM: _____

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: _____

DATE OF RESEARCH SUPERVISING COMMITTEE MEETING: _____

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Overall Ratings

1. _____ (Committee Chair)	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____
4. _____	_____
5. _____	_____
Optional _____	_____

Attach individual evaluation forms from committee members to this summary.

FINAL GRADE *: Honors (H) - Mean of Overall Ratings = 3.5 - 4.0,
and there is no Overall Rating < 3.0.

Satisfactory (S) - Mean of Overall Ratings = 2.5 - 3.4, and no more
than 1 Overall Rating of < 2.0.

Unsatisfactory (U) - Mean of Overall Ratings < 2.5.

MEAN OF OVERALL RATINGS

FINAL GRADE (H, S, or U)

COMMENTS: Indicate factors resulting in the Final Grade shown above. If the student receives a Final Grade of U, indicate **specific weaknesses** that resulted in that grade and suggestions for resolving weaknesses. Attach additional pages if needed.

This summary report, together with original score sheets from Research Supervising Committee members, should be sent from the chair of the Research Committee (typically the student's faculty mentor/Supervising Professor) to the appropriate Discipline Director for inclusion in student's academic file. In addition, **this summary report should be forwarded to the chair of the Executive Committee on Graduate Studies (eCOGS) of the IBMS Graduate Program.**

GUIDELINES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUBSEQUENT ACTIONS

OVERALL RATINGS provided by members of a student's Research Supervising Committee will contribute, in part, to the grade posted on the student's official transcript for IBMS 6097 in a given semester and can be one of the following:

Satisfactory with Honors (H); Satisfactory (S); Unsatisfactory (U); Incomplete (I)

Satisfactory with Honors:

*A grade of **Honors (H)** may be posted for IBMS 6097 indicating that the student's performance during the research committee meeting demonstrated no major flaws or weaknesses, and was considered exceptional for a student at the current stage of training.*

This grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 6097 if the **Mean Overall Rating for the Research Committee Meeting is 3.5 - 4.0**, and **no Overall Rating given by any committee member is less than 3**.

Satisfactory:

*A grade of **Satisfactory (S)** may be posted for IBMS 6097 indicating that the student's performance during the research committee meeting(s) of a particular semester demonstrated only limited flaws or weaknesses, and was considered adequate for a student at the current stage of training. It is possible that some specific areas for potential improvement were identified as noted in comments. Recommendations for making such improvements may be forwarded to the Discipline Director.*

This grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 6097 if the **Mean Overall Rating for the Research Committee meeting is 2.5- 3.4** and **no more than one committee member gives an Overall Rating of less than 2**.

Unsatisfactory:

*A grade of **Unsatisfactory (U)** may be posted for IBMS 6097 indicating that the student's performance during the research committee meeting(s) during a particular semester demonstrated serious shortcomings in numerous aspects of the student's performance. Furthermore, if a student fails to have a Research Committee Meeting during a particular semester, a grade of Unsatisfactory (U) would be appropriate (also, see Incomplete described below).*

This grade will be submitted to the Registrar for IBMS 6097 if the **Mean Overall Rating is < 2.5**.

If serious shortcomings are identified, and the Research Supervising Committee recommends that a grade of Unsatisfactory (U) be posted for IBMS 6097, the student should be given appropriate advice regarding how to rectify the shortcomings. The student should also be informed that, as stipulated by the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, receiving a U grade in Research/Academic Progress in two consecutive semesters requires that a recommendation must be submitted to the IBMS eCOGS that the student be considered for dismissal from the IBMS Graduate Program. Detailed justification of such an action will be required from the Discipline Director.

Incomplete:

A grade of Incomplete (I) would be appropriate if a student has a justifiable reason for not having a Research Supervising Committee meeting during the expected semester. The "I" grade would be changed to "S" if the student meets discipline requirements for having the delayed meeting; or would be changed to "U" if the student does not meet such requirements.