UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
Bioengineering Graduate Program

Written Ph.D. Candidacy Examination

PLEASE PRINT:

Student: _____   ND ID#: _____

Advisor: _____   Date: _____

Co-Advisor (if applicable): _____

Committee Member: _____   Dept.: _____

Committee Member: _____   Dept.: _____

Committee Member: _____   Dept.: _____

All committee members must indicate scores in the passing range for the written proposal before scheduling the oral examination. See the following page for scoring criteria.

Note that this score is only for the written examination. The student must also take and pass the oral examination before advancement to candidacy.

FACULTY SIGNATURES   Pass   Fail

	Ex	VG	G	F	P
_____ *Committee Member*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____ *Committee Member*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
_____ *Committee Member*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

YES   NO
Coursework Completed?: ☐   ☐   *(At least nine courses should be completed)*

_____   _____
Advisor Approval   Date

Scoring Criteria for the written candidacy examination:

Excellent (EX)

The proposal is exceptional in all respects. Specifically:
- The proposal demonstrates an independent research plan, sufficient in scope for a doctoral degree.
- The research direction is supported by a clear explanation of its significance.
- Sound critical thinking is applied in relationship to the existing state of knowledge and the proposed research.
- The hypotheses or objectives are supported by the literature or preliminary results, and the specific aims address these hypotheses or objectives.
- Appropriate experimental, analytical, and computational methods are defined to complete each aim.
- The writing and style are clear and concise.

Very Good (VG)

The proposal is of high quality. It meets the expectations of an excellent proposal, but may have slight deficiencies in some areas. The research can likely be completed, and the hypotheses and aims will be suitable as a basis for peer-reviewed publications. *The candidate should be provided with an explanation of the deficiencies in writing or in person, for example during the oral examination.*

Good (G)

The proposal is deficient in several areas, but it is likely that the research can be completed. Methodological errors are present that are easily correctable, the hypotheses/objectives may need refinement to be suitable as the basis for publication, or the overall scope is modest. *The candidate should be provided with an explanation of the deficiencies in writing or in person during the oral examination.*

Fair (F)

The proposal has significant flaws that the committee member believes can be repaired by thorough editing. For example, the hypotheses are not specific, the connection between the hypotheses, aims and research questions are ambiguous, or it is not clear that the methods can address the research questions. *The candidate should be provided with an explanation of the deficiencies in writing or in person. The oral examination will not proceed until the candidate sufficiently modifies the proposal to achieve a score of GOOD or higher.*

Poor (P)

The proposal lacks direction, the problem is not compelling, or the work is not considered to be of sufficient scope for a doctoral dissertation. It is unlikely that the proposal can be modified to meet the expectations of the committee member, and the committee member will not consider a revision of the proposal.