

CTE Qualifying Review Summary Sheet

Student Name: _____ Advisor Name: _____

Second Reviewer Name: _____ Third Reviewer Name: _____

The committee has reviewed this student’s portfolio, including a copy of the student’s transcript, the Graduate Study Program, and the Qualifying Paper. Below are the findings of the Second-Year Review Committee and our signatures.

Doctoral Qualifying Paper:

The qualifying paper (QP) should be a work of original research. The QP study addresses a research question by collecting and analyzing original data, primary materials, or by analyzing an existing data set. In structure, format, and length, the QP should be modeled on articles in a scholarly journal that the student, in consultation with the adviser, has identified as appropriate for the research undertaken. Indeed, the student should be able to identify at least one published article that has served as a guide for the present paper. The QP should adhere to publication guidelines of the identified journal; thus length and format of papers may vary. Except in exceptional circumstances that the student can justify, the QP should not exceed 60 double-spaced pages. (See "GUIDELINES FOR CTE QUALIFYING PAPER" for more detailed information about the content and expectations for the QP.)

The committee judges the qualifying paper to be (check one):

- A satisfactory or better completion of the requirement.
- Acceptable with completion of revisions, as agreed upon by the committee and provided to the student in writing, to the satisfaction of the advisor.
- Requiring revision and resubmission for review by the committee. The resubmission must be submitted by _____ (due date). Student should submit a cover memo specifically indicating how the revisions addressed concerns indicated during the review. *The Office of Academic Services will be notified that the student is required to re-submit if s/he wishes to be considered for advancement to candidacy.*
- Failure to demonstrate the capacity necessary to proceed to the dissertation, for reasons agreed to by the committee and attached to this form.

Required changes, additions, or corrections to the student’s Graduate Study Program:

[] **The Committee has reviewed the student’s program with the student and sees no reason (e.g., incompletes) for the student not to advance to candidacy.**

Evaluation:

By our signatures below, the Committee judges that the student is capable of completing a doctoral dissertation that meets the scholarly standards of this university and recommends that this student be advanced to candidacy.

Committee & Student Signatures

Program Advisor: _____ Date: _____
 Reviewer 1: _____ Date: _____
 Reviewer 2: _____ Date: _____
 Student: _____ Date: _____