

PhD Epidemiology Proposal Evaluation Form

Student Name and Student Number:	Date of Proposal Defense	
Supervisor(s):	External Reviewer:	
Committee Members:		
Thesis title:		
<p>Following the oral presentation and questions, the committee and external examiner should discuss the sections I – IV of the protocol and indicate with an ‘X’ if the section was acceptable or not acceptable/incomplete. Handling of questions (V) should also be assessed. Feedback should be provided in the text box below.</p>		
EVALUATION (I) Literature review and content knowledge (II) Scholarly impact (III) Quality of proposed research approach (IV) Timelines and appropriateness for PhD (V) Handling of questions	Acceptable -No major concerns; Constructive feedback, considerations and suggestions should be noted in the text box below	Not acceptable or Incomplete -Major concern(s) that must be revised before proceeding with dissertation as detailed in text box below
(I) Literature Review and Content Knowledge		
(II) Scholarly impact: Rationale includes scholarly impact with respect to methods and/or content to the field		
(III) a) Quality of Research Approach: Question and objectives		
(III) b) Quality of Research Approach: Study design and measurement, including rationale		
(III) c) Quality of Research Approach: Proposed analytic approach(es) and justification		
(III) d) Quality of Research Approach: Feasibility (including sample size, data access/collection)		
(III) e) Quality of Research Approach: Ethical considerations covered		
(IV) Timelines and appropriateness for PhD dissertation		
(V) Handling of questions		

Please provide detailed comments on any of the areas above, including constructive feedback. If 'not acceptable or incomplete' was selected then a full written rationale below is required.



PRESENTATION SKILLS (for student feedback only)	Excellent	Very good	Satisfactory	Below average*
Expectation: The student presented and communicated effectively				
Quality of the presentation				
<p>*Please provide detailed comments on any of the areas above that were identified as below average that require improvement:</p>				
FINAL EVALUTION				
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved. The student may proceed with dissertation work and remaining program progression, taking note of all feedback received during the protocol defense and in consultation with the supervisor considering minor amendments to their doctoral research accordingly.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Provisional Approval. The student must create a point-by-point response to the concerns/issues raised and make changes to the proposal within 60 days of the examination. Once the Supervisory committee has approved the revisions, the proposal must be submitted to the Program Director and Administrative Assistant as a final record. An approval will then be recorded.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not approved. Non-approval indicates that the performance was inadequate and/or the protocol has major deficiencies according to the evaluation domains as documented. In event that the student is not approved on the first attempt, the student will be permitted one more attempt. Failure of the second attempt will result in a recommendation for program termination.</p>				

Signatures

Signing below indicates that you agree with the consensus decision reached above.

Reviewer and Supervisory Committee	Signature

Student Signature

I have been given the results above and understand the evaluation.

Student Name: _____

Student Signature: _____

Date: _____

