

## Form 1

## Results of Dissertation Committee's Review of the Doctoral Dissertation Proposal

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

Doctor of Psychology in Counseling Psychology Program

Student Name:						
Email Address:						
Phone (best contact number): (						
Working Title of Dissertation:						
APPROVALS:						
Pass with no revisions (except minor editorial recommend	ations, if needed)					
Pass with substantive revisions, re-submit to Chair only fo	r review					
Fail: Resubmit and re-convene Committee for defense						
If changes are required for approval. Please list changes below. An a	additional page may be used if necessary.					
Student must indicate how they have addressed these changes. A attached.	n additional page or pages may be					
Dissertation Chair:	Date:					
Committee Member 1:	Date:					
Committee Member 2:	Date:					
Student:	Date:					

## **Dissertation Proposal Review**

Studen	nt Name:						
Title of	f Dissertation:						
	Rate the dissertation proposal document on a scale of 1 to 5 for each item in the box provided.						
	1	2	3	4	5		
	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT	BELOW STANDARD	MEETS STANDARD	ABOVE STANDARD	EXCEPTIONAL		
Rating	Scale Definitions:						
1: Fails	to demonstrate and/	$^\prime$ or achieve the item	n. Quality of work is	not consistent wi	th doctoral-level work.		
Traditio	onal Grading Scale Eq	juivalents: F, D					
2: Poor work.	demonstration and/	or achievement of t	he item. Lower qua	ality than appropri	ate for doctoral-level		
Traditio	onal Grading Scale Eq	quivalents: C-, C, C+					
3: Succ	essfully demonstrate	s and/or achieves t	he item. Quality is o	onsistent with do	ctoral-level work.		
Traditio	onal Grading Scale Eq	guivalents: B-, B					
5: Exce	sional research. <i>Tradi</i> ptional demonstratic sional research. <i>Tradi</i>	on and/or achievem	ent of the item. Qu		nsistent with		
Dissert	tation Document:						
	APA Style and Forma Grammar Quality of Lit. Review thorough, sufficient	w (clarity, organized	d, relevant,				
	Quality of Methods	section (clarity, org	anized)				
	Quality of Methodo	logy					
	(appropriate, professional quality in design)						
	Competency (student demonstrates understanding of research methodology)						
	Appropriate suppor (bibliography, apper etc.)		ls,				

Number of Scores below 3: \_\_\_\_\_ Average Score for Section: \_\_\_\_

## **Oral Presentation - Proposal:**

Time management (approx. 15 minute covered pertinent material, logical flow				
Professionalism (attire, behavior, intera with committee members)	action			
Engagement (eye contact, voice fluctua	Mastery of study and relevant information Engagement (eye contact, voice fluctuation, etc.) Answers Committee's Questions (appropriately) Overall Quality of the Presentation			
Number of Scores below 3:	Average Score for Section:			
Overall Average Proposal Score:				