## PhD Qualifying Examination and Mentoring-Committee Rubric – for all Committee Members

The chair will collect completed rubrics from all committee members in order to submit combined feedback in the final Qualtrics rubric.

The final Qualtrics rubric will be filled out by the chair at the conclusion of Qualifying Exam Discussion.

Student Name:	Cor	Committee Member:					
	<u>Cor</u>	nmittee	<u> Chair:</u>				
Common Breadth of Biomedical Engineering k	(nowledge ( <i>re</i>	view stu	<u>ident self-eva</u>	<u>luation on Co</u>	ver Sheet):		
	Appropriate Needs Discussion		s	Comments (if needed)			
			ion				
Call higher. Dischensister. Anatomy and/an							
Cell biology, Biochemistry, Anatomy, and/or Physiology							
Programming							
Signal Processing							
Numerical Computation							
•							
Experimental Design and Statistics							
Data Science (including aspects of Open-Science)							
Engineering Design							
Biomedical Engineering Ethics and Professionalism							
		1	I				
<b>QUAL ONLY</b> - Expectations for Qualifying Exar	n:						
			Fa.a.da	Masta		Fails to Meet	
			Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Improvements Needed	Minimal	
			2	ZAPOGGGGGG		Expectations	
WRITTEN EXAM							
Critical analysis and synthesis of literature							
Gap or needs identification							
Development of a significant and specific research que	estion with a testa	able					
hypothesis to address the gap/need		.1				_	
Appropriate and realistic experimental design to test t		tne					
form of a <i>Research Strategy</i> - not to level of thesis Spe Consideration of caveats, potential problems, and alte		05					
Ethical Considerations in the Conduct of Research	mative approach	es				<del> </del>	
Appropriate Timeline proposed							
Written Technical and Scientific Communication							
Whiteir reclinical and scientific communication						1	
ORAL EXAM							
Oral Technical and Scientific Communication							
RESEARCH PROGRESS			T	1	T	T	
Technical depth in fundamental principles in student's	research area					-	
Critical analysis and interpretation of data						-	
Appropriate level of independence							
Do you have concerns about plagiarism in the	Written Docu	ment?					
No concerns; Minor concerns	(needs more g	guidanc	e); M	ultiple concei	rns (meeting ne	eded)	
CHAIR ONLY (Chair will need to report this on	the student's	assessm	<u>nent):</u>				
Date of Screening:							
Similarity Index (in %):							

## **ORAL EXAM DISCUSSION**

Has IDP been provided and discussed with committee (Y/N):

## Comments/Suggestions (if any): Career Path Options discussed: \_\_\_\_ Academic; \_\_\_\_ Industry; Clinical; Global Health; Other Was POS Discussed (Y/N): Comments/Suggestions (e.g., additional useful courses): **Strengths of Student:** Areas for Improvement/Growth: Technical: **Professional Development:** Any Additional Suggestions for Training Plan/Networking: Qualifying Exam Outcome Recommendation: **Pass** Provisional Pass (issues in no more than one area): Written document revision required (within 3 weeks) Oral Exam needs to be repeated (within 2 months, based on same document) No Pass (both components must be repeated by the next spring or fall semester) Fail (did not pass 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt) **Next Committee Meeting Recommendation** \_\_\_\_\_ Within 12 months (required for all students) \_\_\_\_\_ Within 6 months (if needed/helpful) \_\_\_\_ Other Confidential Comments to the Chair regarding the Qualifying Exam: Committee Member Signature: Date: