

Table 1

Research and Scholarship Assessment Guidelines – Recent Performance (in Last Year)

Year	Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
<i>First-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a research project and submitted the work for publication to a refereed journal. Completed an original and important research project. Presentation of results accepted at a national conference this summer and the student is preparing a manuscript for publication.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a major research project and presented results at Royce. Acquired sophisticated techniques required for the student's research, designed an important and original research project, and made substantial progress in collecting the data.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiated a research project and collected substantial portion of the data.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently initiated a research project but has not made substantial progress on the project.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only occasionally worked in the lab and has not designed or initiated a research project.
<i>Senior Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a new experiment, gave a presentation at an international conference and has one new first-authored publication in refereed journal Made substantial progress on two new research projects. Has new second-authored publication and submitted abstract for talk at international conference. Gave presentation at Royce.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed research project, presented work at Royce and a national conference, and submitted paper for publication.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed publishable research project and is preparing manuscript for publication. Gave talk at Royce.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very near completion of research project but has not presented or written a paper in past year other than to meet program requirements.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked on research project but has not completed any experiments or presented any of the work in past year.

Table 2

Research and Scholarship Assessment Guidelines – Cumulative Performance

Year	Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
<i>First-year Students</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Normally not applicable for first-year students, but publications and presentations from the undergraduate program can be noted and would be considered excellent.]
<i>Second-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one first-authored paper in refereed journal, submitted another for publication and presented at national conference.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at international conference and has paper accepted for publication.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed publishable research project and has paper almost ready for submission to journal. Presented at national conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at Royce but has not submitted paper or presented at major conference.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has not completed any research projects and has no publications or presentations.
<i>Third-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has two major publications and one submitted paper. Presented at both national and international conferences. • Has first-authored publication in a first-tiered journal and presented at several national and international conferences.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one first-authored publication and presented at a national and international conference.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one paper accepted for publication and presented at a national conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at a national conference but no publications.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented only at local conferences.
<i>Fourth-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three first- and one second-authored publication. Presented at national and international conferences and won award for best student presentation at major national conference. • Has first-author publication in first-tiered journal and two additional publications. Gave two presentations at international conferences.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has two publications as well as submitted paper and several conference presentations.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one journal publication and one submitted paper. Presented at a national and an international conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gave several national and international conference presentations and has one second-authored publication.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at national conferences but has no published or submitted papers.

Table 3

Academic Performance Guidelines

Assessment	Minimum GPA
Excellent	3.7
Good	3.5
Satisfactory	3.0
Weak	2.7
Inadequate	–

Table 4

Cumulative Progress, Entering with a Bachelor's

Prior to September 2010

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 FYRP Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 FYRP prospectus submitted	W	I	I	I	I	I	I
3 FYRP initiated (data collected)	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
4 FYRP preliminary draft	G	W	I	I	I	I	I
5 FYRP completed	E	W	I	I	I	I	I
6 SYRP/Masters topic accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	W	I	I	I	I	I
7 SYRP/Masters initiated (data collected)	-	S	W	I	I	I	I
8 SYRP/Masters preliminary draft	-	G	W	I	I	I	I
9 SYRP/Masters oral exam completed successfully	-	E	S	W	I	I	I
10 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	-	E	G	S	W	I	I
11 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
12 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
13 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	-	E	G	S	W	I
14 Dissertation initiated (data collected)	-	-	-	G	G	S	W
15 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	-	-	E	G	S	W
16 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation						

Table 4B

Cumulative Progress, Entering with a Bachelor's in September 2010 or Later

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 FYRP Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 FYRP prospectus submitted	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
3 FYRP initiated	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
4 FYRP data collected	G	I	I	I	I	I	I
5 FYRP completed (presentation or paper)	E	I	I	I	I	I	I
6 SYRP/Master's topic accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	I	I	I	I	I	I
7 SYRP/Master's initiated	-	W	I	I	I	I	I
8 SYRP/Master's data collected	-	S	W	I	I	I	I
9 SYRP/Master's preliminary draft	-	G	W	I	I	I	I
10 SYRP/Master's oral exam completed successfully	-	E	S	I	I	I	I
11 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	-	E	G	S	W	I	I
12 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
13 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
14 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	-	E	G	S	W	I
15 Dissertation initiated	-	-	-	G	S	W	I
16 Dissertation data collected	-	-	-	G	S	W	I
17 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	-	-	E	G	S	W
18 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation						

Projected Duration of Program from Entry to PhD Completion

E = Excellent = on track for 4 years (2-year SYRP/Master's and 2-year PhD)

G = Good = on track for 5 years (2-year SYRP/Master's and 3-year PhD)

S = Satisfactory = on track for 6 years

W = Weak = on track for 7 years

I = Inadequate = more than 7 years

Vertical lines indicate end of funding after two years (at SYRP/Master's level) and after another three years (at PhD level)

Table 5

Cumulative Progress, Entering with Master's **Prior to September 2010**

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 ^m Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 ^m Background preparation substantially complete	S	W	I	I	I	I
10 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	G	S	W	I	I	I
11 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	E	G	W	I	I	I
12 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	E	G	W	I	I	I
13 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	E	E	S	W	I	I
14 Dissertation initiated (data collected)	-	E	G	S	W	I
15 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	E	E	G	S	W
16 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation					

Table 5B

Cumulative Progress, Entering with Master's from Another Program

in September 2010 or Later

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 ^M Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 ^M Background preparation substantially complete	G	W	I	I	I	I
11 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	E	G	S	W	I	I
12 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	E	E	S	W	I	I
13 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	E	E	S	W	I	I
14 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Committee	E	E	G	S	W	I
15 Dissertation initiated	-	E	G	S	W	I
16 Dissertation data collected	-	E	G	S	W	I
17 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	E	E	G	S	W
18 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation					

Note. ^M = milestone is specific to students entering with Master's from another program.

Projected Duration of Program from Entry to PhD Completion

E = Excellent = on track for 3 years
 G = Good = on track for 4 years
 S = Satisfactory = on track for 5 years
 W = Weak = on track for 6 years
 I = Inadequate = more than 6 years

Vertical line indicates end of funding after four years.

Table 6

Recent Progress in Program, Entering with Bachelor's or Master's

Number of New Milestones	
Reached Since Previous Evaluation	Rating
4+	Excellent
3	Good
2	Satisfactory
1	Weak
0	Inadequate

Note. These guidelines should be interpreted heuristically and the rating based on an informed assessment of the student's performance in moving through the program at a consistent rate.

Table 7

Teaching Assessment Guidelines

Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Involved in teaching activities (as a lecturer or teaching assistant) and was recognized by a Departmental or University Award.
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Senior Student</i>: successfully delivered a lecture course, an activity which could provide important experience prior to seeking an academic position.• <i>Junior Student</i>: served as teaching assistant and commended by course instructor for being particularly helpful.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Teaching assistant
Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Because teaching activities are optional, a rating in this category would be used only in isolated circumstances. For example, if a senior student has been advised to deliver a lecture course as preparation for an academic career but has not done so or is involved in too many teaching activities to the detriment of other activities, a supervisory committee might use this rating.
Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This rating would not be appropriate unless the student's teaching activities involved professional misconduct or other seriously unprofessional behaviour.

Table 8

Service Assessment Guidelines

Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in substantial service activities and merit of service was formally recognized (e.g., by external award).
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in substantial service activities. While the notion of “substantial” is subjective, an assessment in this category might correspond to service activity involving more than an hour/week for an extended period of time.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in service activities. Typically, this assessment would correspond to service activity involving an hour/week or less (e.g., being a student representative on a Departmental committee that met monthly or biweekly).
Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Because service activities are optional, an assessment in this category would ordinarily not be used. If a student has been overextending him or herself on service activities, has been cautioned about this by a supervisory committee, and has not acted on this information, then this assessment might be appropriate.
Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">This rating would not be appropriate.