Northwest UNIVERSITY

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 recommendations, if needed)
- ☐ Pass with substantive revisions, re-submit to Chair only for review
- ☐ Fail: Resubmit and re-convene Committee for defense

If changes are required for approval. Please list changes below. An additional page may be used if necessary.

Student must indicate how they have addressed these changes. An additional page or pages may be attached.

Dissertation Chair: _____ Date:

Committee Member 1: _____ Date:

Committee Member 2: _____ Date:

Student: _____ Date:

Dissertation Proposal Review

Student Name: _____

Title of 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/or achieve the item. Quality of work is not consistent with doctoral-level work.

Traditional Grading Scale Equivalents: F, D

2: Poor demonstration and/or achievement of the item. Lower quality than appropriate for doctoral-level work.

Traditional Grading Scale Equivalents: C-, C, C+

3: Successfully demonstrates and/or achieves the item. Quality is consistent with doctoral-level work.

Traditional Grading Scale Equivalents: B-, B

4: Above average demonstration and/or achievement of the item. Quality of work is consistent with professional research. *Traditional Grading Scale Equivalents: B+, A-*

5: Exceptional demonstration and/or achievement of the item. Qualify of work is consistent with professional research. *Traditional Grading Scale Equivalents: A*

Dissertation Document:

APA Style and Format
Grammar
Quality of Lit. Review (clarity, organized, relevant, thorough, sufficient)

Quality of Methods section (clarity, organized)

Quality of Methodology
(appropriate, professional quality in design)

Competency (student demonstrates understanding of research methodology)

Appropriate supporting material (bibliography, appendixes, test materials, etc.)

Number of Scores below 3: _____ **Average Score for Section:** _____

Oral Presentation - Proposal:

Time management (approx. 15 minutes,
covered pertinent material, logical flow of information)

Professionalism (attire, behavior, interaction
with committee members)

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: _____