**Committee Meeting Report**

Completed form should be discussed with the student and then given to the DGS. The rubric scores below should be based on skill level expected for a trainee by the end of their training. Mentors are strongly encouraged to keep a copy so they can track student progress.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student:** | | **Meeting date:** | |
| **Year joining BCH program:** | **Is this a qualifying exam?** | | **Anticipated final year:** |
| In the rubric below please consider the following when assigning scores:  **1st year in BCH** – students are typically novices in research and will receive scores in the range 2.0-2.5 (lower than 2.0 if considered deficient). The high end of the range should be for outstanding students.  **2nd (qualifying) year** – students should have progressed sufficiently for scores to be in the range 2.5-3.0. To pass a qualifying exam, there should be no more than one area of deficiency (score lower than 2). If a deficiency is noted, an improvement plan should be provided.  **3rd year on** – students should steadily improve in all aspects and scores should reflect that. If a deficiency is noted, an improvement plan should be provided.  **Dissertation defense** – students are expected to show good to excellent mastery in all areas at the time of their defense. While excellence should be a goal, students do not have to score perfect 4.0s to progress to their dissertation defense. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Learning outcomes** | **4 - Excellent** | **3 - Good** | **2 - Needs Improvement** | **1 - Deficient** | **Score** |
| **Ability to master and critically analyze literature related to the project.** | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of knowledge in the project area, and the ability to consistently discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications. | Demonstrates a good understanding of knowledge in the project area and displays many examples of the ability to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications. | Demonstrates some understanding of knowledge in project area, and some ability to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications. | Demonstrates minimal understanding of knowledge in the project area and is unable in many cases to discern the meaning and relative validity of data in scientific research publications. |  |
| **Ability to formulate relevant, testable hypotheses, devise clear experiments for addressing hypotheses, and analyze and interpret data appropriately.** | Demonstrates thorough understanding of the scientific method, clear ability to generate hypotheses, understand and design complex experimental protocols, and analyze data with a clear and proper interpretation. | Demonstrates good understanding of scientific method, generating hypotheses, designing experiments appropriate for testing hypotheses, presenting data in an appropriate context. | Demonstrates some understanding of scientific method, needs assistance with complex experimental design and analyzing data, can present and interpret data with some help from PI. | Demonstrates little understanding of scientific method, limited ability to conceive experimental designs to address hypotheses, needs significant faculty input for data analysis and interpretation. |  |
| **Ability to orally communicate data and interpretation effectively with scientific peers, answer questions, and communicate ideas.** | Articulates intimate understanding of project, is able to orally communicate and defend new ideas, thinks effectively on his/her feet, is consistently able to integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines and experience to answer questions or solve problems. | Has appropriate understanding of project, able to articulate ideas but lacks creativity, can think through basic problems when questioned, and in many cases can integrate knowledge appropriately to answer questions or solve problems. | Has a basic understanding of project but lacks depth, answers basic questions but has difficulty thinking on his/her feet, and is sometimes able to integrate knowledge to answer questions or solve problems. | Lacks understanding of project and is not able to communicate rationale for interpretation of data or direction of the project and is unable to draw from different areas or experiences to answer questions or solve problems. |  |
| **Ability to communicate effectively through scientific writing.** | Demonstrates thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose of the proposal; uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to convey contribution to the scientific discipline; pays detailed attention to and successful execution of grant-writing conventions including organization, content presentation, formatting, and style; uses relevant and credible references appropriately, uses skilled language that conveys meaning with clarity and fluency, and is nearly error free. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose of proposal; many examples of appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to convey the contribution to the scientific discipline; consistently uses grant- writing conventions including organization, content, presentation, and style; consistently uses appropriate references to support ideas; uses clear language that generally conveys meaning to readers, with few errors. | Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, and purpose of the proposal; has some examples of appropriate, relevant, and compelling content; follows expectations appropriate to grant writing for basic organization, content, and presentation; attempts to use credible and/or relevant references to support ideas; uses language that generally conveys meaning with clarity, though with errors | Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose of the proposal; uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in parts of the work; attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation; attempts to use sources to support ideas; uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |  |

In the following please indicate the student’s progress relative to where they are expected to be **at their current stage** in their training.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Committee Member** | **The student’s progress relative to where they should be at this stage is:** | | | |
| **Proficient** | **Improving** | **Needing improvement** | **Inadequate** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Summary of Committee Meeting. The Dissertation Advisor should summarize progress in the past year, comparing accomplishments with the goals set at the previous committee meeting. List research goals for the coming year. An improvement plan should be supplied for any categories that are deemed deficient or inadequate.

**Please have the student email a copy of their CV to the DGS.**