Admission to Ph.D. Candidacy Form
Georgia State University, Biology Department
Ph.D. Qualifying Examination Report

This form must be submitted to the Biology Department following the completion of Ph.D. candidacy requirements.

Student Section
I hereby apply for admission to candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Biology. I attest that am fully informed of all the requirements for graduation.

Student Name: ___________________________  Panther ID: ___________________________

Start Term: ___________________________  Expected Graduation Term: __________

Concentration: ___________________________  Student Email: ___________________________

Student’s Signature: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________  

Examination Committee Section
The student’s Doctoral Research Proposal Evaluations are attached to this form.

If yes, please check here ___________  If no, please indicate the date by which the student must complete their Doctoral Research Proposal ___________

The Committee’s evaluation of the student’s performance resulted in the following grade:

_____  Unconditional Pass (Student passed with superior examination performance.)

_____  Qualified Pass (Student did pass; however, student must complete coursework specified below before completion of PhD degree.)

_____  Decision Pending (Student must meet the conditions stated below in the time period allotted. If student does not meet the condition, the student will receive a fail on the exam).

_____  Fail (Student is required to retake the examination.) Indicate Grade: _______

Additional Comments: ____________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Examination Committee Signatures:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________
### Biol 9991 and 9992, Doctoral

#### Research Proposal Evaluation

Student Name: ___________________________  Faculty Advisor: ______________________

Evaluator: ___________________________  Committee Chair: ______________________

**Instructions:** Please rate the student’s performance using the criteria listed below. Each committee member should rate the student independently.

Ratings will then be discussed by committee members. The rating endorsed by the majority for each skill will comprise the rating that the student receives for the exam and the course grade, which will be reported on the committee chair’s evaluation.

Follow the following scale for rating. 1 = excellent; 2 = satisfactory; 3 = unsatisfactory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided background information justifying the central thesis of the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated an understanding of relevant scientific literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generated an appropriate aim and testable hypotheses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated an understanding of the scientific method in the design of proposed experiments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed appropriate analytical methods and/or statistical tests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the written document</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfactory: all ratings = 1 or 2
Conditional Pass = one or two ratings = 3
Unsatisfactory = three or more ratings = 3
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