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| **Criteria** | **Excellent (1-3)** | **Satisfactory (4-6)** | Poor (7-9) | **Score** | **Comments** |
| *Quality of the written proposal* | Addressed a significant research question, and provided a feasible and innovative, logical research approach.  Research plan is well written.  Will lead to a high-quality dissertation. | A few moderate flaws in significance, innovation, research approach, or writing.  Will lead to a qualifying dissertation without changing the direction of the research question or approach substantially. | Multiple moderate or severe flaws in significance, innovation, research approach, or writing.  Will not lead to a qualifying dissertation without substantial changes in the direction of the research question or approach. |  |  |
| *Quality of the oral presentation* | Clear and engaging presentation on the relevant literature and background, significance of the research question, innovation of the proposal, and justification of the research approach. | Minor to moderate shortcomings in oral presentation skills.  Could describe the literature, significance, innovation, and approach after limited guidance by the review committee. | Severe shortcomings in oral presentation skills.  Failed to describe the relevant literature, convey the significance, innovation, or justify the research approach even with guidance by the review committee. |  |  |
| *Defense of the proposal* | Able to answer all/most of the questions, and provide strong rebuttals to criticisms or skepticism from the committee regarding the significance, innovation, and approach.  | Able to answer more than half of the questions.  Was not able to provide convincing arguments to a few major criticisms regarding the significance, innovation, and approach. | Unable to answer a majority of the questions from the committee.  Was not able to provide convincing arguments to several major criticisms regarding the significance, innovation, and approach. |  |  |
| *General knowledge of core knowledge and specialized field of biomedical engineering* | Comprehensive/solid grasp of key concepts and fundamental knowledge in biomedical engineering.  In-depth, specialized field knowledge on topics relevant to completion of the proposed research. | Fair to good understanding of most topics in biomedical engineering and on specialized field topics relevant to completion of the proposed research.  Shows weakness in a major area/topic that may be remedied by an additional course or less work. | Knowledge is very weak.  Performance does not reflect that the student should have passed the Qualifying Review. |  |  |

(adapted from U.Penn Biology doctoral program)