

Comprehensive Examination

Overview

The University of Iowa requires PhD students to “satisfactorily complete a comprehensive examination, consisting of written or oral parts or both at the discretion of the major department....It is intended to evaluate a candidate’s mastery of the subject at or near the end of the candidate's formal preparation and prior to the completion of the dissertation.” (*Manual of Rules and Regulations of the Graduate College*, Section XII. K). In the College of Nursing, the comprehensive exam evaluates the student’s mastery of the literature and methodological approaches to science in their chosen interest area in order to make original contributions to knowledge. Satisfactory completion of the comprehensive exam advances the student to PhD candidacy.

To evaluate the student’s mastery of the literature and the methods appropriate to advance knowledge, the comprehensive exam has three components: [1] An integrative scholarship paper; [2] A doctoral research prospectus and; [3] An oral examination, which addresses the content of the Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP). Each component occurs at distinct times in the program of study. A brief description and timeline follow with additional detail provided in later sections.

- **The Integrative Scholarship Paper (ISP)** addresses a particular content area of interest to the student. “Integrative scholarship involves the aggregation of data and evidence in a way that allows the research community to comprehend and value connections and perspectives that unite isolated facts and research studies. Integrative scholarship summarizes data, enlightens and informs the reader broadly, and sets the stage for subsequent research” (McGaghie, 2015 p. 294). The approach students will use to write the ISP will, in general, follow a combination of “scoping” and “critical-realist” as described by McGaghie (2015). The ISP is an iterative process between the student, Chair, and committee that concludes when the ISP committee judges the ISP to meet the criteria for completing the ISP and moving on to the Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP).
- **The Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP)** addresses a particular research problem and purpose informed by the ISP. The DRP includes a specific aims page and a one-two page significance section (based on the ISP) similar to an NIH grant. The remainder of the DRP focuses on the approach/design, including the conceptual model that guides the study, setting/site, sample size, phenomenon of interest or measurement of study variables, and data analysis as appropriate. This content is to be consistent with the problem, overall study goals, purpose, specific aims and choice of a specific design. The student must provide alternative approaches for each component in the approach/design and provide rationale for selecting one strategy over another including level of innovativeness. The DRP is defended by the student during the Oral Exam and concludes when the DRP committee judges the DRP to meet criteria for passing at the conclusion of the Oral Exam.

Comprehensive Exam Components	Timeline*
<p>Integrative Scholarship Paper (ISP) Evaluated by a 3-member faculty committee.</p>	<p>The ISP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will begin Fall semester of year one • must successfully complete the ISP by the end of the spring semester year two • is completed when the ISP committee agrees that the student has passed the ISP
<p>Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP) Evaluated by a 5-member faculty committee that also serves on the oral exam.</p>	<p>The DRP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will start the semester immediately following successful completion of the ISP • must be completed by the end of semester following the ISP • is completed when the DRP committee agrees the student has passed the DRP (occurs concurrently with the Oral Exam)
<p>Oral Examination Evaluated by a 5-member faculty committee that also served on the DRP.</p> <p>Must already have Degree Plan, Oral Examination Committee Member roster on file, and approved by Graduate College.</p>	<p>The Oral Exam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will occur two weeks after the submission of the DRP to the committee • is completed when the committee agrees the student has passed both the DRP and the Oral Exam • once a student has successfully completed all Comprehensive Exam components, s/he will advance to candidacy and begin planning the dissertation proposal

*The timeline is based on academic year (Fall and Spring semesters). The summer semester is not included, although students should be writing during summer months.

Comprehensive Examination Committee

Students should work with their advisers to identify individuals who may fit well on the Comprehensive Exam Committee. The ISP committee must consist of at least three members, including the chair. The committee should reflect the student's focal and cognate areas.

The DRP and Oral Exam committee must consist of at least five faculty members and will include the 3 ISP members plus 2 other faculty, preferably one of which will be from outside the College of Nursing. At least two of the faculty members must be from the CON. For some students, the DRP/Oral Exam committee will be the same as the Dissertation committee; for others there may be a slight change between the Oral Exam and the Dissertation committee in order to include at least one person outside the College of Nursing. In all instances, the student should get a written (email acceptable) confirmation from any potential committee member that s/he is willing to serve.

Criteria for PhD Advisor/Chair/Comprehensive Examination Committee

1. College of Nursing (CON) PhD Adviser(s)/Comprehensive Exam Chair(s)
 - a. CON faculty appointment (Tenure/Tenure track)
 - b. Justifiable relationship between the advisor and student
 - For example, an active program of research and peer-reviewed publications within last five years in the student's area of scholarship is desired
 - c. Co-advising experience for at least one PhD nursing student with a senior faculty member (at a minimum)

2. CON PhD Comprehensive Exam Committee Member:
 - a. Iowa faculty tenure-track appointment or consent from Graduate College.
 - b. PhD or equivalent degree such as DNS, etc.
 - c. Method and/or content expertise in the student's area of scholarship

3. Committee Members Outside the University of Iowa
 It is possible to add an expert from outside the UI to a student's comprehensive exam and dissertation proposal committees if the new member offers specific expertise in a narrow range or specific research focus, which is not provided by other members of the committee or other UI faculty. The Graduate College must approve these requests.

Comprehensive Examination Committee

Graduate Faculty Member	ISP Reviewers	DRP Reviewers	Oral Exam
Faculty #1 (CON – Chair)	X	X	X
Faculty #2 (member)	X	X	X
Faculty #3 (member)	X	X	X
Faculty #4 (member)		X	X
Faculty #5 (Non-CON member preferred)		X	X

Integrative Scholarship Paper (ISP)

The ISP is the first component of the Comprehensive Examination for the PhD. Students begin the ISP during the first semester of year one and must pass the ISP by the end of Spring semester, year two.

The goal of the ISP exam is to ensure that the student completes a thorough integrative scholarly product that provides the foundation for the DRP. Therefore, multiple iterations of the ISP are passed between the student and committee until successful completion (see below). Each student will complete the 7 steps as noted in the first column of the table below. The second and third columns illustrate how each step is operationalized by approach (scoping vs. critical-realist) used to integrate and synthesize the literature: Most students will start with scoping and may or may not move on to critical-realist.

Research synthesis step	Scoping	Critical-realist
1. Formulate the problem	Broad research question structured loosely	Define the scope of the review; identify the question, clarify the purpose, find and articulate program theories
2. Search the literature	Nonlinear, comprehensive, interactive search	Define search terms and sampling strategy using theoretically based framework
3. Gather information from studies	Inclusion and exclusion criteria are developed post hoc	Collect the most compelling studies that satisfy search terms and strategy; search needs not be exhaustive
4. Evaluate the quality of the studies	Study quality and weight of evidence are not initial priorities	Judge the relevance and rigor of available research studies in terms of the theoretical framework
5. Analyze and integrate the outcomes of the studies	Create a literature map or chart having multiple layers	Compare and contrast findings from different studies qualitatively; seek confirmatory and contradictory findings
6. Interpret the evidence	Qualitative evidence synthesis; quantitative data included rarely	Refine program theories (i.e., interventions) from the evidence, especially analyses of data in included studies
7. Present the results	No reporting conventions; written report shaped by volume of relevant evidence	Write a convincing narrative about integrative findings, especially implications and applications of theory refinement, attend to RAMSES publication standards

Adapted from: McGaghie, W. C. (2015). Varieties of integrative scholarship: Why rules of evidence, criteria, and standards matter. *Academic Medicine*, 90(3), 294-302.

ISP: Guidelines for Completion

1. The student works with all members of the ISP committee to determine the focus and breadth of the paper.
2. The student schedules a planning session (telephone or video conference format allowable) with the chair and committee to develop a content outline. Note: this should be done during the first semester of the PhD so that work on the ISP happens simultaneously with the core courses.
3. Once the topical outline of the ISP has been determined, the student works primarily with the chair to share drafts back and forth. The chair will provide substantive feedback on the paper but does not contribute detailed edits (i.e. does not revise the text but rather provides feedback about both the content, organization, and quality of the writing). The chair expects that significant changes and improvements will occur with each revision.
4. Once the chair has determined the ISP is a "satisfactory draft," the paper is then shared with the rest of committee for comment and feedback.

5. With each iteration of the ISP, the student will revise the paper as needed to address the comments and feedback of the committee. The student will revise the ISP using a word processing program and highlight the changes either by using the track changes mode in MS Word or by using bold or colored text. The student will also prepare a document describing how they have responded to the reviewers' suggestions.
6. The revised paper is shared with the committee, who then determines if/when it has achieved the standards of a final ISP paper (see criteria for grading below). Again, no specific limits are set for the number of drafts but each draft is expected to be a significant improvement from the previous. The committee may meet with or without the student as needed to facilitate successful completion of the ISP.
7. A designation of "complete" by at least two of the three committee members is required to move to the DRP. **The student should successfully complete the ISP by the end of the spring semester year two.** The student may petition the PhD Admissions and Progression committee for an extension detailing the extenuating circumstances that warrant an extension. See Evaluation and Completion in the next section.
8. There is a no formal ISP defense.
9. The chair will communicate in writing the date of the final completion of the ISP to the student, Graduate Programs Office and the Director of the PhD Program.

ISP: Evaluation and Communication

The ISP committee members will individually review and evaluate the ISP. The ISP will be rated as complete or needs revision. When revisions are required the faculty will provide written comments and feedback to guide the student in his or her revisions. Committee members will submit their written evaluation to the chair within two weeks of receiving the paper. This process will recur until at least two of the three committee members designate the ISP to be complete (refer to ISP Evaluation Form).

Criteria for Grading the ISP

Depending on the topic and state of the science, the length of the paper is approximately 20-40 pages, excluding figures and tables and references. Grading criteria include:

1. The purpose(s) of the ISP is clearly stated.
2. The scope of the literature review is clearly circumscribed and fits well with the purpose(s).
3. The search strategy (including inclusion criteria and strategies for identifying literature related to the topic) for identifying the literature is clearly specified.
4. Appropriate literature is identified for the review.
5. Findings are presented in a clear and organized manner.
6. The analysis of the literature and critique of results is appropriate.
7. The synthesis of the literature is coherent and appropriate.
8. The state of science in the area is clearly expressed in terms of gaps in knowledge;
9. Appropriate implications for theory, research and practice are logically derived from the review of the literature and adequately discussed.
10. The paper is clearly articulated and logically constructed.
11. A standard style format, such as APA, is consistently and accurately used for citing references in text and in the bibliography.

Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP)

The DRP is the second component of the Comprehensive Examination for the PhD (see page 1 for description). Students are eligible to submit this examination after satisfactorily completing the ISP. The DRP must be completed by the end of semester following the ISP (reminder: summer semesters are not included in the timeline although students should use the summer months to write). The primary goal of the DRP is to evaluate the student's mastery of coursework and research methodology. The intent is that the DRP can be further refined and revised and subsequently developed into the Dissertation Proposal following the Oral Exam.

DRP: Guidelines for Completion

1. The student selects 2 additional members to serve on the DRP/Oral Exam committee (see page 3).
2. The student writes a 1- to 2-page paper summarizing the topic and problem to be addressed in the DRP in consultation with the chair and sends it to the DRP committee, along with a copy of the ISP. A proposed timeline for completion is also submitted to the committee.
3. Each member of the DRP committee will send questions/comments about the summary to the chair within two weeks of receipt. All members must approve the DRP plan and timeline.
4. Graduate College Paperwork
 - The Graduate Programs Office will fill out and submit the Request for the Comprehensive Examination which must be forwarded to the Graduate College at least two weeks in advance of the examination and must include the date and time.
 - The Request for the Comprehensive Examination will be accompanied by a Doctoral Plan of Study Summary Sheet, which is prepared by the Graduate Programs Office in consultation with the student's advisor.
 - The Doctoral Plan of Study Summary Sheet requires the Graduate Programs Office staff to perform a transcript review indicating successful completion of essential coursework in the student's focal area and indicating coursework remaining to be completed to be eligible to graduate.
 - The Doctoral Plan of Study Summary is signed by the student's advisor, the Director of the PhD Program and submitted to the Graduate College for approval/signature by the Graduate College Dean, along with the Request for Comprehensive Exam.
 - Department and student copies of the Doctoral Plan of Study Summary Sheet are returned to the Graduate Programs Office. After this point, the Graduate Programs Office must be notified of any changes to the Doctoral Plan of Study so that the appropriate document can be submitted to the Graduate College.
5. Once the problem/purpose has been determined, the student completes the paper independently. During this period of time, the student should not consult with faculty, students, or outside individuals. It is expected that the work is solely that of the student.
6. The student schedules a submission date and a date for the Oral exam. It is the student's obligation to make arrangements for a meeting time for the oral portion of the examination, and notify the members of the committee and the Graduate Programs Office of the date and time. The Graduate Programs Office will reserve a room.
7. The student submits the DRP two weeks prior to the Oral Exam (must occur one semester after the ISP).

DRP: Evaluation and Communication

The DRP committee will individually review and evaluate the written DRP. Each committee member will rate the DRP as Satisfactory, Reservation, or Unsatisfactory. Committee members will submit their written evaluation of the DRP to the chair at the Oral exam (refer to the DRP Grading Form).

Criteria for Grading the DRP

Depending on the topic, the length of the paper is approximately 20-40 pages, excluding figures and tables and references. Grading criteria are as follows:

1. Relevant literature is included and synthesized appropriately on the specific aims page.
2. The research problem and purpose of the study are well articulated.
3. The aims (and when appropriate hypotheses) are clearly delineated and in the case of a quantitative study, measurable.
4. The significance section includes an appropriate evaluation of the level of knowledge or state of the science related to the proposed research question or topic.
5. The conceptual framework or theoretical orientation is appropriate with respect to the aims of the project and type of design.
6. The selected research design fits the research problem, purpose, and proposed aims.
7. The rationale for the selection of the research design is clearly described. Strengths and limitations of the design are clearly and appropriately identified; a discussion of alternative designs is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
8. The selected data collection method(s) will permit the researcher to address the aims. The rationale for the selection of data collection methods and the strengths and limitations of particular data collection methods are clearly and appropriately presented. A discussion of alternative data collection methods is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
9. The analytic plan is specific and appropriate. A discussion of alternative analysis methods is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
10. Ethical issues are adequately and appropriately addressed.
11. The prospectus is clearly written and logically developed.
12. A standard style format, such as APA, is consistently and accurately used for citing references in text and in the bibliography.

Oral Examination

The Oral Exam is the third component of the Comprehensive Examination for the PhD (see page 1 for description). It focuses on the quality and content of the DRP. It also provides an opportunity for the student to defend and address any deficiencies in their written DRP. It allows the committee to delve further into the student's breadth and knowledge of alternative approaches and methods to address the specified research problem. At the conclusion of the Oral Exam, a final evaluation of both the DRP and Oral Exam will be rendered. Students complete the Oral Exam 2 weeks after submitting the DRP to the DRP/Oral Exam committee. The primary goal of the Oral Exam is to evaluate the student's ability to defend and extend ideas/methods proposed in the DRP a two-hour oral session. The intent is that at the conclusion of the Oral Exam, the committee can offer recommendations for the dissertation proposal.

Oral Examination: Guidelines for Completion

1. The student schedules the Oral Exam with the committee.
2. The Oral Exam is conducted as a closed examination, attended by only the student and all members of the Oral Exam committee.
3. At the beginning of the Oral Exam, the committee discusses their individual evaluations of the DRP without the student present and develop a plan for posing questions/issues for the student to respond in regard to the DRP during the Oral Exam.
4. The student responds to committee questions surrounding the DRP.
5. At the conclusion of the oral questions, without the student present, the committee discusses strengths and weaknesses of the defense including whether or not the student has passed the DRP and the Oral Exam components.
6. When successfully completed, Comprehensive Exam Grading Form and Comprehensive Examination Report will be filed as described below with the Graduate College indicating that the Comprehensive Exam has been completed and the student will be considered a doctoral candidate.

Oral Examination: Evaluation and Communication

The committee will discuss strengths and weaknesses of the defense including whether or not the student has passed the DRP and the Oral Exam components. Based on this discussion, the Comprehensive exam will be rated Satisfactory, Reservation, or Unsatisfactory (see Comprehensive Exam Grading Form; this form is to be completed by the Chair on behalf of the committee).

Two forms are needed to communicate the final evaluation outcome:

- a. The Comprehensive Exam Grading Form. This form will be reviewed by the Director of the PhD Program; members of the PhD Admissions and Progression committee may also review this form for the purposes of program evaluation or in the case of a student disputing the outcome of the exam.
- b. Report of Doctoral Comprehensive Exam form with committee members signatures. This form will also be signed by the Director of the PhD Program (aka DEO) and sent to the Graduate College by the Nursing PhD Program Administrator.

Upon completion of the oral exam, the Chairperson turns both forms into the College of Nursing PhD Program Administrator (110 CNB).

References

McGaghie, W. C. (2015). Varieties of integrative scholarship: Why rules of evidence, criteria, and standards matter. *Academic Medicine*, 90(3), 294-302.

The University of Iowa College of Nursing
Nursing PhD Comprehensive Examination
ISP Evaluation Form

Student: _____

Date: _____

Use this form to evaluate the Integrative Scholarship Paper (ISP).

Directions:

The Chairperson is responsible for distributing this form to each of the committee members involved in evaluating each time the ISP is evaluated.

NOTE: THE COMMENTS ON THESE PAGES WILL BE GIVEN TO THE STUDENT AS THEY APPEAR ON THE PAGE.

Grade (Circle One):

Complete

Revise

Criteria for Grading the ISP

Depending on the topic and state of the science, the length of the paper is approximately 20-40 pages, excluding figures, tables, and references. Grading criteria include:

1. The purpose(s) of the ISP is clearly stated.
2. The scope of the literature review is clearly circumscribed and fits well with the purpose(s).
3. The search strategy (including inclusion criteria and strategies for identifying literature related to the topic) for identifying the literature is clearly specified.
4. Appropriate literature is identified for the review.
5. Findings are presented in a clear and organized manner.
6. The analysis of the literature and critique of results is appropriate.
7. The synthesis of the literature is coherent and appropriate.
8. The state of science in the area is clearly expressed in terms of gaps in knowledge;
9. Appropriate implications for theory, research, and practice are logically derived from the review of the literature and adequately discussed.
10. The paper is clearly articulated and logically constructed.
11. A standard style format, such as APA, is consistently and accurately used for citing references in text and in the bibliography.

Provide written comments and feedback below to guide the student in his or her revisions. Alternatively, provide comments and feedback using the "track changes" and "comment" features to provide feedback directly in the ISP. Return your feedback to the committee chair, who will share the feedback with the student.

The University of Iowa College of Nursing
Nursing PhD Comprehensive Examination
DRP (Written) Grading Form

Student: _____

Date: _____

Use this form to grade the written DRP.

Directions:

1. The Chairperson is responsible for distributing the Nursing PhD Doctoral Research Prospectus (DRP) Written Grading Sheet to each of the committee members when the student turns in his or her DRP.
2. Prior to the oral exam, each committee member is to fill out this form and turn it in to the Chairperson at the oral exam.
3. Upon completion of the oral exam, the Chairperson collects and turns all forms into the College of Nursing PhD Program Administrator (Mary Kosobucki, 110 CNB).
4. These forms will be reviewed by the Director of the PhD Program and members of the PhD Admissions and Progression Committee as needed for the purposes of program evaluation or in the case of a student disputing the outcome of the exam.

Grade (Circle One) – See descriptions on the next page:

Satisfactory

Reservation

Unsatisfactory

Criteria for Grading the DRP

Depending on the topic, the length of the paper is approximately 20-40 pages, excluding figures, tables, and references. Grading criteria are as follows:

1. Relevant literature is included and synthesized appropriately on the specific aims page.
2. The research problem and purpose of the study are well articulated.
3. The aims (and, when appropriate, hypotheses) are clearly delineated and in the case of quantitative study, measurable.
4. The significance section includes an appropriate evaluation of the level of knowledge or state of the science related to the proposed research question or topic.
5. The conceptual framework or theoretical orientation is appropriate with respect to the aims of the project and type of design.
6. The selected research design fits the research problem, purpose, and proposed aims.
7. The rationale for the selection of the research design is clearly described. Strengths and limitations of the design are clearly and appropriately identified; a discussion of alternative designs is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
8. The selected data collection method(s) will permit the researcher to address the aims. The rationale for the selection of data collection methods and the strengths and limitations of particular data collection methods are clearly and appropriately presented. A discussion of alternative data collection methods is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
9. The analytic plan is specific and appropriate. A discussion of alternative analysis methods is included and is comprehensive and appropriate.
10. Ethical issues are adequately and appropriately addressed.
11. The prospectus is clearly written and logically developed.
12. A standard style format, such as APA, is consistently and accurately used for citing references in text and in the bibliography.

Satisfactory: The student is graded as “satisfactory” (passing) in all written parts of the DRP.

Reservation: The student inadequately addresses one or more of the 12 criteria.

Unsatisfactory: The student completely omits or fails one or more of the 12 criteria in the written DRP.

Specify the rationale for your evaluation and specify deficiencies to be addressed by the student in a subsequent revision or during the oral exam.

Overall Performance Options and Implications (Choose One):

Pass: The student is graded as passing the DRP and oral exam. The student has passed the exam and is not required to take any further comprehensive examination; he or she is advanced to candidacy.

No Pass: The student fails to meet the guidelines for completion of the DRP and/or oral exam. The student receiving an Unsatisfactory (failing) grade may retake the examination the next semester. The committee will decide whether all parts or just the failed parts should be reexamined. The time and manner of the second examination will be determined by the committee and will be stated in writing and given to the student. The student who fails the examination twice or who declines to take it a second time after failing once, or who fails to take it within four months after completing any necessary preparatory coursework or other requirements, shall be dismissed from the program. The Chairperson must notify the Director of the PhD Program of this outcome.

The University of Iowa College of Nursing
Nursing PhD Comprehensive Examination
Comprehensive Exam Grading Form

Student: _____

Date: _____

Use this form to grade the oral exam and document overall performance results.

Directions:

1. The Chairperson will complete this page based on the comments of the committee after the oral exam.
2. Upon completion of the oral exam, the Chairperson turns this form into the College of Nursing PhD Program Administrator (Mary Kosobucki, 110 CNB).
3. This form will be reviewed by the Director of the PhD Program and members of the PhD Admissions and Progression Committee as needed for the purposes of program evaluation or in the case of a student disputing the outcome of the exam.

NOTE: THE COMMENTS ON THESE PAGES WILL BE GIVEN TO THE STUDENT AS THEY APPEAR ON THE PAGE.

DRP and Oral Examination

Grade (Circle One):

Satisfactory

Reservation

Unsatisfactory

Provide rationale for the grade below (see criteria for grading the written DRP).

Criteria for Grading the Oral Comprehensive Exam

The committee will discuss strengths and weaknesses of the defense, including whether or not the student has passed the DRP and the Oral Exam components. Based on this discussion, the Comprehensive Exam will be rated as follows:

Satisfactory: The student is graded as “satisfactory” (passing) in all written and oral parts of the DRP. The student has adequately addressed each of the 12 criteria and is not required to take any further comprehensive examination; he or she is advanced to candidacy.

Reservation: The student inadequately addresses one or more of the 12 criteria in the written DRP and does not provide adequate explanation to resolve the inadequacy(ies) during the oral defense.

A letter will be sent to the student and to the Graduate College specifying reservations to be met and the deadline for removal. The student must adequately address the criteria **within three months** after the oral exam in order to be advanced to candidacy. The Chair of the committee will notify the Director of the PhD Program in writing as to whether or not the student has satisfactorily removed the reservations. If the student does not remove the reservations within the specified time, the grade will be changed to Unsatisfactory (fail). Note: a reservation may not be used if this is a second exam for the student. A copy of all correspondence will be sent to the Graduate College.

Unsatisfactory: The student completely omits or fails one or more of the 12 criteria from the written DRP and does not provide an adequate explanation to resolve the omission(s) or failure(s) during the oral defense. The student receiving an “unsatisfactory grade” has failed the comprehensive exam and must complete revisions to the DRP by adequately addressing the missing or failed criteria. The student must also retake the oral exam. The earliest the student can retake the oral exam is 4 months after receiving the initial grade of Unsatisfactory. The student may also be required to make up deficiencies through additional course work and/or readings or assigned research papers. The student who twice fails the examination or who declines to make the necessary revisions after failing once, or who fails to make revisions within **four months** after completing any necessary preparatory coursework or other requirements, shall be dismissed from the program. The Chair must notify the Director of the PhD Program of this outcome.

In the event of a Reservation or Unsatisfactory grade, provide rationale for the grade by specifying the deficiencies to be addressed by the student in a subsequent revision and, if required, any other additional course work and/or readings or assigned research papers. Indicate the date that these activities are to be completed.