



Evaluation of Ph.D. Oral Qualifying Exam Results
(For use by Faculty only)

Student name: _____ ID number: _____

Semester entered program: _____

Date, time & location of examination: _____

Please review the guidelines for evaluation on the reverse side of this form, and choose exactly one of the rankings for each criterion.

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Problem statement			
Novelty			
Literature review			
Feasibility			
Proposal text			
Oral presentation - text and graphics			
Oral presentation - voice & grammar			
Replies to questions			

Summary Evaluation

I have read this proposal and recommend:

- pass exam and continue PhD Studies
- pass exam, complete requirements below while continuing PhD studies.
- repeat exam
- leave Ph.D. program

Comments: _____

- Requirements before presenting thesis to committee:
- complete ENGI 600
 - complete UNIV 601
 - complete UNIV 602
 - get CWOVC to review thesis

Signatures: (minimum of three faculty required- Advisor, a MSNE Faculty and a non-MSNE faculty member within the university)

Name printed: _____ Signature: _____ (advisor)

Name printed: _____ Signature: _____ (MSNE faculty)

Name printed: _____ Signature: _____ (non-MSNE faculty)



Evaluation of Ph.D. Oral Qualifying Exam Results (For use by Faculty only)

<i>Problem statement</i>	<p>Excellent: Compelling problem statement that demonstrates the challenge and utility of the work, as well as theoretical or practical applications</p> <p>Satisfactory: Problem is clearly stated; a case is made for utility and some application</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Problem is not clearly stated; little context or justification</p>
<i>Novelty</i>	<p>Excellent: Original research that demonstrates distinct creativity in the problem formulation, analysis, and/or solution techniques</p> <p>Satisfactory: Describes a novel problem appropriate for PhD</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Pedestrian presentation of previously established results</p>
<i>Literature review</i>	<p>Excellent: Identifies all relevant results and techniques from prior work and synthesizes them in a comprehensive discussion</p> <p>Satisfactory: Cites major works and places them in context for present work</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Fails to cite or assimilate prior work</p>
<i>Feasibility</i>	<p>Excellent: Demonstrates knowledge of all necessary background results and techniques, outlines a well-defined scope of work, and presents a realistic timeline</p> <p>Satisfactory: Demonstrates knowledge of most necessary background results and techniques and outlines a research plan</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Lacks sufficient background or has no research plan</p>
<i>Proposal text</i>	<p>Excellent: Well organized text, fluent prose, and few grammatical errors</p> <p>Satisfactory: Acceptable organization & text, limited grammatical errors</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Poor organization, difficult prose, or numerous grammatical errors</p>
<i>Oral presentation</i>	<p>Excellent: Engaging, polished oral presentation with well-crafted visual aids which illustrate key results; includes a substantial conclusion</p> <p>Satisfactory: Professional oral presentation on a par with a solid conference talk; includes a coherent project narrative and conclusion</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Too much or too little detail; unclear about project goals and direction; incoherent slides; candidate reads from slides</p>
<i>Replies to questions</i>	<p>Excellent: Complete answers that demonstrate a deep understanding of the discipline that extends beyond the thesis</p> <p>Satisfactory: Competent answers that illustrate a facility with the issues and techniques immediately relevant to the thesis</p> <p>Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal a limited comprehension of the work and its context</p>