## NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## First Committee Meeting and Research Proposal

## (to occur within 12 months of entry into the program)

The student will write a research proposal to present at the first committee meeting. The written proposal should be distributed to the committee at least two weeks prior to the committee meeting and should be 2-3 pages in length in the format outlined on the program website. The purpose of the first year meeting is to introduce committee members to the research project plan, assess satisfactory progress in training, and to evaluate that the coursework completed or planned is aligned with research and future goals.

Signatures indicate the Research Committee accepts the written research proposal as an indication that the research goals and approaches, as well as planned coursework, are appropriate for successful achievement of the M.S. degree. Feedback should be provided through the rubrics (pages 2-4).

**Research Advisor** :

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(name) (department) (signature)

**Committee Members (at least two in addition to the Research Advisor are required):**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(name) (department) (signature)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(name) (department) (signature)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

(name) (department) (signature)

**Feedback/Commentary regarding completed or planned Coursework.**

The completed/planned coursework is appropriate (i.e. meets program requirements and is appropriate for research and future plans). Additional comments:

**After the student presentation and question period, the research committee will discuss student progress and should provide:**

1. **an overall assessment of the thesis proposal (page 2)**

**(based on the shaded criteria plus analysis and discussion)**

**(2) feedback for the thesis proposal (page 3)**

**(3) feedback for the oral presentation (page 4)**

**(4) their signature indicating acceptance of the Research Proposal (page 1)**

**(5) feedback for coursework completed or planned (page 1)**

In determining the overall assessment and the written feedback, committee members should use the relevant rubrics as a guide but may include additional relevant feedback. The overall assessment for the dissertation proposal (Pass with Distinction, Pass, or Fail) should be marked on the form. The candidate will be informed of the outcome of the proposal defense at its conclusion (after the committee has deliberated). If the overall assessment is “Fail”, the written comments should include if there are options for the student to continue in the program (e.g. re-write and/or re-present the research proposal, or other steps as appropriate). A copy of the completed forms should be sent to the Program Coordinator within 48 hours of the Committee’s determination of the outcome.

**Thesis Proposal Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Exceeds Expectations | Meets Expectations | Does Not Meet Expectations | |
| Background Knowledge & Significance | * Fully explains background and information gap for project * Articulates compelling study rationale * Clarifies study significance in an exceptional manner | * Provides background for project * Adequately articulates study rationale * Clarifies study significance | * Fails to adequately provide background * Fails to articulate study rationale well * Does not articulate study significance | |
| Study Design & Research | * Targets the identified gap(s) in the literature and explains them very well * States hypothesis clearly * Applies empirical knowledge to shape questions and explains them very well * Articulates methods in detail and explains them very well | * Targets the identified gap(s) in the literature * States hypothesis * Applies empirical knowledge to shape questions | * Fails to target the identified gap(s) in the literature * Fails to state hypothesis * Fails to apply theoretical frameworks to shape questions | |
| Literature Review | * Exhibits superior knowledge of key concepts in subject area * Exhibits excellent depth of knowledge in subject area * Arguments are exceptionally coherent, clear, and organized to identify a gap in the literature | * Exhibits adequate knowledge of key concepts in subject area * Exhibits depth of knowledge in subject area * Arguments are coherent, clear, and organized to identify a gap in the literature | * Exhibits poor knowledge of key concepts in subject area * Exhibits poor depth of knowledge in subject area * Some arguments are not coherent, clear, or well organized to identify a gap in the literature | |
| **OVERALL ASSESSMENT** | **Pass with Distinction** | **Pass** | **Fail** |

**QUALITY OF WRITING (Check where appropriate; provide specific feedback below)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| * Writing is excellent | * Writing is adequate | * Writing is weak |
| * No grammatical or spelling errors apparent | * Some grammatical and spelling errors apparent | * Numerous grammatical and spelling errors apparent |
| * Organization is excellent | * Organization is adequate | * Organization is poor |
| * Documentation\* is excellent   **\***works cited/discussion of relevant research | * Documentation\* is adequate   **\***works cited/discussion of relevant research | * Documentation\* is poor   **\***works cited/discussion of relevant research |

**Feedback/Commentary regarding Thesis Proposal** (using Thesis Proposal rubrics [p. 2] as well as those in “Quality of Writing” feedback checklist above, and any additional relevant feedback not covered in the rubrics or checklist) *Use as much space as necessary*.

**QUALITY OF ORAL PRESENTATION (Check where appropriate; provide specific feedback below)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Criteria* | *Exceeds expectations* | *Meets*  *expectations* | *Does not meet expectations* |
| Overall Quality of Presentation |  |  |  |
| Appropriateness of Presentation Tools |  |  |  |
| Engagement with Audience |  |  |  |
| Quality of Response to Questions |  |  |  |

**Feedback/Commentary regarding Oral Presentation** (using rubrics in “Quality of Oral Presentation” feedback checklist [above] plus any additional relevant feedback). *Use as much space as necessary*.