

Rehabilitation Science Program

Doctoral comprehensive examination process

Revised February 2018

Summary description, aims and timing

The Comprehensive Examination in Rehabilitation Science is composed of two parts:

Part A: An examination with written and oral components that tests knowledge in:

- i) Rehabilitation Science,
- ii) Research methods used in Rehabilitation Science, and
- iii) The area of the student's research focus.

Part B: Evaluation of the dissertation proposal both in written form and in an open oral defense, normally but not necessarily conducted as part of the Rehabilitation Science Seminar Series.

The comprehensive examination is a means of ensuring that all graduates of our doctoral program:

1. master the breadth and depth of knowledge related to rehabilitation science;
2. are able to formulate and defend arguments based on critical appraisal of the research evidence within the rehabilitation science literature;
3. are able to integrate and situate knowledge generated in the rehabilitation science field more broadly, such as within the health sciences community and society in general;
4. are able to competently discuss how different techniques of inquiry are used to create knowledge in the field of rehabilitation science;
5. apply their knowledge to critically appraise basic, clinical and applied research relevant to their research area.
6. make informed judgments on the application of appropriate research methodologies to their research area;
7. demonstrate a sound understanding of the scope, perspectives, concepts, current issues and research methods relevant to their area of study.

Students will demonstrate that they are well prepared to pursue original research in Rehabilitation Science at the doctoral level.

Both parts of the comprehensive examination are normally completed by all doctoral students¹ within the first five academic terms of their program. Normally, a student completes Part A in the third or fourth term, and Part B in the fourth or fifth term. Permission to delay the examination, or to reverse the sequence of components must be sought, in writing, from the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) prior to the end of the student's third term of enrolment in the doctoral program. If the student requests either an extension or a sequence reversal, the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) will make a decision if the matter is straightforward, or refer the matter to the RHBS Program Progress and Awards Committee for decision.

Part A is always completed in closed session. Part B is normally completed in open session; all faculty and other graduate students are invited to attend. When feasible, a student's Part B is scheduled into the RHBS Program Seminar Series.

¹ Doctoral comprehensive examinations may also be referred to as doctoral candidacy examinations: i.e., they are used to determine if a doctoral student may become a doctoral candidate. Those who enter the RHBS program are therefore referred to as doctoral students until they complete both Part A and Part B of the doctoral comprehensive examination.

Details about Part A

Comprehensive examining committee (CEC)

The Comprehensive Examining Committee (CEC) includes three examiners and a Chair. The Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) [AD(RPPP)], or delegate, will serve as Chair. The examiners will be selected by the student and advisor in consultation with the AD(RPPP).

Eligibility for examiners:

- normally but not necessarily faculty members in the RHBS program
 - if not in the RHBS program, hold a faculty appointment elsewhere
- have earned a PhD themselves, or have equivalent research experience
- arm's length from the student (i.e. not having had direct collaboration in the past on grants, projects, etc.)

Under no circumstances may the supervisor or co-supervisors serve as examiners.

It is the responsibility of the supervisor and student to contact prospective members of the CEC to determine their willingness to sit as a member of the committee and their availability to attend the oral examination based on the proposed draft examination schedule. The Chair of the CEC must approve the composition of the committee² and the examination schedule before it is considered official; the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant will provide the CEC members with these guidelines and confirm specific timelines for each student, including confirming a specific date and time for the oral examination.

Examination structure, including sequence of contacts between examiners and student

Written component

Each CEC member will have a specific area or focus, which will direct his/her questions. The areas to be examined include:

- Rehabilitation Science
- Research Methods
- The Area of the Student's Proposed Specialization

Once the CEC has been struck, the student schedules a meeting or similar contact with each examiner individually in order to provide them with information about their academic and professional background and about their proposed area of dissertation research, and to obtain guidance to help the student prepare for the examination. This meeting may take place the week before the examination period begins or in the first week of the examination period. Each committee member will direct the student to core resources (book chapters, articles, journals, and/or search terms) that address the specific knowledge base upon which their question will be based.³ If this meeting occurs in the first week of the examination period, guidance should be provided to the student within two working days of the meeting. At this initial meeting, the examiner will also provide guidance about the scope to be covered and the nature of the questions that the student should expect to receive.

Normally the examiner in the **Rehabilitation Science area** will select and discuss with the student one of the following topics, or a variation thereof:

1. Describe prevalent rehabilitation approaches relative to your population of interest, and factors that challenge successful intervention.

² It is expected that all eligible RHBS faculty contribute equitably to the comprehensive examination processes, in accordance with their appointment status and experience. The Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) will facilitate record-keeping and information-sharing to achieve this expectation.

³ The core resources for the Rehabilitation Science area will be the core resources for the RHBS 804/904 course in its most recent iteration (excluding any resources that are topical for that year only). The core resources for the Research Methodologies area will be the core resources for the RHBS 833/933 course in its most recent iteration (excluding any resources that are topical for that year only).

2. Provide an interpretation of your research focus (population, major interventions, health care funding, or other key considerations) in terms of the ICF.
3. Discuss the clinical practice or policy environment associated with your research and suggest strategies for effecting policy change based on principles of knowledge translation and exchange.

Normally the examiner in the **Research Methodologies area** will select and discuss with the student one topic from the following options, or a variation thereof:

1. Discuss major methodological strategies that are prevalent in your area of research, and critique each in terms of their impact on knowledge creation in that area.
2. Outline the most significant challenges to measurement and/or data collection associated with your research area and discuss potential strategies for dealing with these.
3. Discuss ethical concerns associated with research conducted with your population of interest.

Normally the examiner in the **area of research specialization** will select and discuss with the student one topic from the following options related to the area of research specialization, or a variation thereof:

1. Identify two or three major theoretical models that relate to your area of research focus and explore how each would differentially shape interpretation of the problem and approaches to scientific study.
2. Conduct a critical review of the literature on a central concept in your area of research and present a summary of the major findings.
3. Choose an area of concern or controversy related to your area of research. Outline the major arguments surrounding this issue, and identify arguments in favour of one position.

Within four (4) weeks of the start of the examination period, committee members will each submit two or three questions in their area of examination to the Chair of the CEC. As soon as the examiners have formulated their proposed questions, they should refrain from any contact with the student about the content of the examination, unless the student requires clarification of the intent of a question (see below).

The Chair of the CEC will select the three questions, one for each area, ensuring that the questions are clear and that there is no appreciable overlap in each area of the examination. If the Chair has any concerns about the questions, he/she will discuss the question(s) with the relevant examiner(s) and they will collaboratively make changes to the question(s) if needed to address the concerns.

Within five (5) weeks of beginning the examination process, the student will arrange to pick up their questions from the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant. If the student requires clarification of the intent of a question, he/she should approach the respective examiner or Chair within one week of receiving the question. The student will have a total of three (3) weeks to prepare a separate written submission for each response. A copy of each response should be submitted electronically to the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant on or before the student's deadline.

Format of each of the three submissions

- maximum 15 pages (approximately 4,000 words), exclusive of title page and references
- title page should include student's name, examiner's name, area of the examination, and the question the student was answering
- double-spaced margins of 2.5 cm (1"), 12-point font, pages numbered
- any standard reference style of the student's choice
- although brief appendices are allowed they should be used sparingly. The examiner should be able to judge the quality of the work without referring to any appendices.

Post-submission processes

Upon receipt of the student's submissions, the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant will provide electronic copies to all members of the CEC. All examiners will have access to all three submissions but each one is only expected to examine and evaluate their own area. Within one week of receipt, the examiner members of the CEC will be asked to confirm to the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant and Chair of the CEC that the student's submission in their area is adequate to support proceeding to the oral

examination.⁴ In follow up, the examiner members of the CEC will be asked to send a brief written report to the Chair of the CEC no less than 48 hours before the scheduled oral examination. The report should comment on the overall quality of the written submission. In the absence of any compelling reason to postpone or cancel the oral examination, the examination will proceed as scheduled.

Oral component

The oral examination will take place 1 to 2 weeks after the written submission. The oral examination will normally last between 1.5 and 2 hours but may last longer if the examiners feel they need more time to determine the outcome. Examiners must be prepared to stay – in person, or via technology, as applicable – for at least 2 hours. The student's supervisor may be present at the oral examination, but does not participate in posing questions to the student and is not a voting member of the committee.

At the start of the examination, the Chair will ask the student to leave the examination room. The Chair will then ask each member of the CEC to comment on the quality of the written submission provided for each question. The student will return to the examination room and the Chair will invite each examiner, in sequence, to ask questions of the student about their topic, for about 20-30 minutes for each examiner. Examiners may ask anything about the student's written submission: e.g., seeking clarification, more depth, alternative approaches, insight and critical analysis of the information, application of relevant current literature to the topic area. Following all three examiners' questioning, the Chair will ask the student to leave the room so that the CEC may deliberate in closed session.

Determination of possible outcomes

The CEC considers both the written submissions and performance in oral examination in order to determine the outcome.

Possible outcomes

PASS: satisfactory written submissions in all three areas, and satisfactory performance in the oral examination

INCOMPLETE: weakness in one or more written submissions, and/or in one or more areas of oral examination, deemed by the CEC to be weaknesses that can be corrected by remedial work.

FAIL: unacceptable level of performance on the combined written/oral examination component, sufficiently poor that the CEC deems that remediation is not possible

If the outcome is **PASS**, Part A of the student's comprehensive examination is considered successfully completed, and the student may begin work toward Part B. *Optional:* examiners may provide comments to the student for consideration in improving the quality of the written work, if applicable for future incorporation into their dissertation and/or for publication(s).

If the outcome is **INCOMPLETE**, the student progresses into a remediation period, described below.

If the outcome is **FAIL**, the RHBS Program will recommend to the School of Graduate Studies that the student be asked to withdraw from the program.

Remediation period

If the outcome is **INCOMPLETE**, remedial work will be determined by the CEC and may include one, two, or in rare occasions, all three areas of inquiry depending on the outcome of the examination.

The Chair and at least two examiners of the CEC must continue to constitute the CEC, regardless of how many areas of inquiry are deemed to need remedial work.

In each area deemed to need remedial work:

Remedial work will include additional writing related to part or all of the original submission.

⁴ The only academic reason to cancel or delay the oral examination would be if a member of the CEC detects that a submission by the student was inappropriate to proceed to oral examination: e.g., a complete misunderstanding of the question to be answered, or an allegation of a major breach of academic integrity.

It may also include an additional reading period if appropriate. Adaptations to the student's reading list, or question to be answered, are not permitted unless they are minor and do not shift the initial expectations of the student's learning in the area.

Normally, there will be no repeat oral examination. However, a CEC may stipulate the requirement of a repeat oral examination if the student's performance at the initial oral examination was deemed to be the key feature of the overall weak performance.

The timeline for the student to submit the required writing will normally be a maximum of 4 weeks. Specific timelines are to be negotiated within one week of the decision that re-submissions are required.

The student's revised submission(s) will be assessed by the relevant examiner(s). The examiner may come to one of two possible recommendations:

PASS: satisfactory performance on the new written submission

FAIL: unsatisfactory performance on the new written submission

If the examiner(s) recommend **PASS** for the required submission(s), Part A of the student's comprehensive examination is considered successfully completed, and the student may begin work toward Part B.

If one or more examiners indicates a possible recommendation of **FAIL**, the CEC will convene a meeting to verify the recommendation(s). The CEC's conclusion may be **PASS** or **FAIL**. If the conclusion is **FAIL** the RHBS Program will recommend to the School of Graduate Studies that the student be asked to withdraw from the program.

Details about Part B

Advisory committee to guide the development of the doctoral dissertation proposal

The student's supervisor (or co-supervisors) in consultation with the student, will establish a dissertation advisory committee including at least two members (at least one of whom will be a faculty member from Queen's). Advisory Committee members can be selected from outside of the University, provided that they have been deemed eligible to supervise PhD students at their primary institution.

This advisory committee will have a first meeting within the first three academic terms (one year) of enrolment into the doctoral program. At this first meeting, the student will normally present his/her general dissertation plan, including a rationale and brief description of any research projects that will be completed in order to successfully complete his or her dissertation. The general plan will be refined into a research proposal. The advisory committee will provide the student with advice, feedback and guidance on the dissertation plan, but they should not be directly involved in the writing of the proposal.

Written proposal submission

The student will finalize the preparation of a formal dissertation proposal including:

- **Abstract – Maximum 350 words**
- **Research Proposal – Maximum 11 pages (1.5 spacing), margins of 2.5 cm (1"), 12-point font, pages numbered**

The student should include the headings below, if applicable, or adapt to suit specific situations. *Suggested page amounts for sections are optional, but **the total maximum page limit is mandatory**. All material beyond 11 pages should be moved to appendices.*

1. Overview of proposed research – 1 page
 2. Background, Rationale, Research Question, Aims – 3 pages
 3. Research Design and Methods – 4 pages
 4. Significance and relevance of the anticipated findings – 1/2 to 1 page
 5. Knowledge Translation Plan – 1 page
- **Appendices – No page limit but use discretion**
 1. Comprehensive reference list

2. (if applicable): figures, tables, charts, photographs, questionnaires, information sheet and consent forms, detailed laboratory protocols, description of data sources, detailed project timeline with milestones, study governance structure, etc.

- **Budget**

Students are recommended to not underestimate the costs, and to include in-kind contributions if relevant, such that all costs are included in the budget.

Use the following headings to organize the budget:

- Research Staff
- Materials, Supplies and Services
- Travel
- Equipment (non-replenishable items, requested in year 1 only)

- **Budget Justification – Two pages**

The written proposal must be circulated by the student to the dissertation Proposal Examination Committee members (see below) and the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant at least two weeks (10 working days) prior to a scheduled oral defense of the proposal. The student is advised to check with each PEC member to see if they prefer an electronic copy or hard copy.

Establishing the dissertation Proposal Examination Committee (PEC)

The members of dissertation Proposal Examination Committee (PEC) will include at least one member of the student's dissertation advisory committee (to a maximum of 3), the supervisor, and one member from Queen's Academic Staff, as listed in the School of Graduate Studies Academic Calendar. This person is termed the **non-advisory committee member**. This person should have an "arm's length" relationship to the dissertation. This means that they should not have been involved in the development of the dissertation proposal. The person is normally internal to Queen's, and may be internal or external to the School of Rehabilitation Therapy. The person should be selected by consensus between the supervisor(s) and student. Any question about eligibility to serve in this role should be directed to the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) before confirming the examination date/time.

Once the PEC members are finalized and a planned date is established, the student and supervisor(s) communicate the information to the RHBS Graduate Assistant. The latter will then send a formal notification of the date/time and place for the examination to all PEC members and the student from the Chair's office. In the event that a PEC member cannot be physically present, the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant must be notified so teleconference (telephone or Internet) arrangements can be made.

Setting the date for the oral presentation/defense of the dissertation proposal

The defense of the dissertation proposal will be open, and it will normally run approximately 90 minutes. When it takes place during the fall or winter terms, it will be scheduled into the Rehabilitation Seminar Series where possible. Because attendance at the PhD Proposal Defense is one of the requirements of RHBS 803/903, every effort should be made by the supervisor(s) and student to schedule the proposal defense at the normal seminar time so all MSc and PhD students can attend.

To assist with the timely planning of the Seminar Series, the student and supervisor should plan to give the School's Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) at least 2 months' notice to schedule the oral defense. See the section about the oral defense below, for more information about organization of the event. The defense will be advertised as a session open to the School of Rehabilitation Therapy, like other Seminar Series presentations. In addition, the student and supervisor may invite other audience members.

Oral presentation and defense

The defense will be chaired by the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) (or delegate if the AD-RPPP is conflicted or not available); the Chair is not a voting member of the dissertation Proposal Examination Committee (PEC).

At the scheduled oral defense of the dissertation proposal, the student will present the proposed work, normally taking a maximum of 15 minutes. PEC members will each have an opportunity to question the student about the proposal and to make suggestions for improvement. Although there is no set order for questioning, the Chair will give special consideration to ensuring time for questions by the non-advisory committee member. If time permits, the audience attending the defense will also have the opportunity to pose questions, following the PEC. Normally the presentation with questions will last approximately one hour, with 15 minutes devoted to the presentation, 30-45 minutes to questions by the PEC, and any remaining time will be open to questions from the audience.

At the end of the questioning period, the audience and the doctoral student will be asked to leave the setting while the PEC deliberates and determines outcome.

Determination of possible outcomes

The PEC will determine the outcome of the proposal examination immediately after the student and audience have departed. The PEC considers both the written document and the performance in the oral examination in order to determine the outcome.

Possible outcomes

PASS: oral examination performance was satisfactory and the dissertation proposal document is satisfactory as is, or with no more than minor changes that can be overseen solely by the supervisor(s).

INCOMPLETE WITHOUT REPEATED ORAL DEFENSE: significant changes required to the study rationale or proposed methods but the PEC was satisfied with the student's oral defense.

INCOMPLETE WITH REPEATED ORAL DEFENSE: significant changes required to the study rationale or proposed methods, and if the student's performance on the oral examination was deemed to be less than fully satisfactory.

FAIL: weak dissertation proposal document and poor performance in the oral examination, and sufficiently poor that the PEC deems that remediation is not possible.

If the outcome is **PASS**, the student's comprehensive examination is considered successfully completed.

The Chair will list any requested minor revisions to the supervisor and student both orally following the exam and within one week in a formal letter. The supervisor will oversee revisions and inform the Chair when the revisions have been made. *Important:* if revisions are required, the comprehensive examination is not considered concluded until the supervisor communicates in writing to the Chair that the revisions have been made.

If the outcome is **INCOMPLETE**, the student progresses into a remediation period, described below.

An outcome of **INCOMPLETE** means that the study, as proposed, requires considerable revision in order to be feasible or scientifically sound, or that the student has not demonstrated sufficient command of the proposed project. The Chair will list the required changes to the supervisor and student both orally following the exam and within one week in a formal letter.

This outcome also means that the student must submit a revised written dissertation proposal for acceptance by the examining committee, along with a formal response outlining how the required changes were addressed. The student should submit these documents within 2 months of the date on which the student receives the list of required changes in writing. During this time, the Chair will arrange for the scheduling of the repeat oral defense, if required.

The PEC members will review the new documents submitted by the student and will each provide their appraisal of the documents. If there is no requirement for a repeated oral defense, the PEC members will provide their appraisals separately to the Chair, and recommend a **PASS** or **FAIL**. The Chair will only convene a meeting of the PEC if there are divergent views about the student's outcome. If there is a requirement for the student to do a repeated oral defense, the PEC members will provide their appraisals at that time. The format of the repeat oral defense will be the same as for the initial defense, except that it will be an unadvertised, closed session.

The only possible outcomes of the remediation period are **PASS** or **FAIL**, although a passing grade may be assigned if additional minor revisions are required. The majority of the PEC must vote for **FAIL** for the student to be assigned a **FAIL**.

If the outcome is **FAIL** at any point, the RHBS Program will recommend to the School of Graduate Studies that the student be asked to withdraw from the program. Completing the Comprehensive Examination in reverse order (i.e. completing Part B of the examination before completing Part A) is not grounds for appealing a **FAIL** grade on either Part of the examination.

Contingency planning, if needed

If the student is unexpectedly unavailable on the day of any examination, it will be postponed.

If the student encounters extenuating circumstances in the lead-up to either examination, he/she should contact the supervisor and the CEC Chair or PEC Chair, as appropriate, to make arrangements to account for the extenuating circumstances. Potential arrangements include extended deadlines or altered examination dates, if warranted.

If a member of the CEC becomes unavailable for the appraisal of the submission and/or the oral examination after Part A has begun, the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) (or CEC Chair, if not the AD(RPPP)) will consult with the supervisor(s) and student to determine if an acceptable substitute can be found to fulfill the original timeline, or if the process must be delayed or examination postponed. *A conclusive oral examination cannot be held without three examiner members of the CEC, present in person or via technology at a distance.*

If an advisory committee member of the PEC becomes unavailable for the appraisal of the dissertation proposal and/or the oral examination after Part B has been scheduled, the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) (or CEC Chair, if not the AD(RPPP)) will consult with the supervisor(s) and student to determine if there are enough other advisory committee members available to proceed on the original timeline, and if yes, the process will proceed as scheduled. If not, the remaining members of the PEC will determine how much of a delay or postponement is necessary to achieve an adequately constituted PEC.

If the external (non-advisory committee) member of the PEC becomes unavailable for the appraisal of the dissertation proposal and/or the oral examination after Part B has been scheduled, the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) (or CEC Chair, if not the AD(RPPP)) will consult with the supervisor(s) and student to determine if an acceptable substitute can be found to fulfill the original timeline, or if the process must be delayed or examination postponed. *A conclusive oral examination cannot be held without an non-advisory committee member of the PEC, present in person or via technology at a distance.*

If a Chair of either the CEC or PEC becomes unavailable to fulfill the Chair's duties, the Associate Director (Research and Post-Professional Programs) or delegate will make every effort to find a substitute Chair to ensure that the timeline goes ahead as scheduled.

Under no circumstances is the student's supervisor (or co-supervisor) permitted to serve as the Chair of either the CEC or PEC, or as an examiner in the CEC.

- Appendix A: Comprehensive Examination Timeline (to be completed by the RHBS Program Graduate Assistant)
- Appendix B: Form for Part A questions (to be completed by the Chair for Part A)
- Appendix C: Form for responses by CEC Examiners
- Appendix D: Form for recording outcome of Part A
- Appendix E: Form for recording outcome of Part B

**Rehabilitation Science Program
Comprehensive Examination Timeline**

STUDENT NAME: _____

SUPERVISOR: _____

CEC CHAIR: _____

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION COMMITTEE (CEC) EXAMINERS:

Area I:		(Rehabilitation Science)
Area II:		(Research Methodologies)
Area III:		(Research Specific)

WEEK	DATE	ACTION	TIME
PART A OF COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION			
Week 1	[specify date]	Meet with examiners re focus of their questions in each area	Normally, there is a 5-week reading period
Week 2	[specify date]	Review readings in the 3 areas	
Week 3	[specify date]	Examiners submit questions to Chair of CEC who sets the exam	
Week 4	[specify date]		
Week 5	[specify date]		
Week 6	[specify date]	Student picks up exam questions from Graduate Assistant	Student has 3 weeks to complete answers
Week 7	[specify date]		
Week 8	[specify date]		
Week 9	[specify date]	Student submits exam answers to Grad Assistant on this date	Examiners review answers and send report to the Chair two full working days prior to the oral
Week 10	[specify date]	Examiners indicate that written responses are of sufficient quality for oral examination to occur	
Week 11	[specify date]	Oral examination takes place	[specify date/time]
PART B OF COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION			
[specify month(s)]		Proposal Writing	Takes place within four months after Part A is completed
[specify month]		Proposal Submission	
[specify month]		Proposal Defense	[specify date/time when known]

PhD Comprehensive Examination, part A for

Questions selected by Chair, _____

AREA I: Rehabilitation Science

examiner: _____

[insert question here]

AREA II: Research Methodologies

examiner: _____

[insert question here]

AREA III: Research specific

examiner: _____

[insert question here]

CONFIDENTIAL WRITTEN EVALUATION
TO THE
CHAIR OF THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINING COMMITTEE

This report should comment on the overall quality of the written submission and summarize any particular concerns or points for discussion. The student's exam answers should not exceed 15 pages (double spaced and excluding references) for each question.

Name of Examiner:

Student:

Evaluation Due Date: Two days prior to the exam

Date of Exam:

Send this evaluation to the Chair of the Comprehensive Examination Committee, and copy to the RHBS Program GraduateAssistant.

This report should comment on the overall quality of the written submission and summarize any particular concerns or points for discussion.

Evaluation:

**School of Rehabilitation Therapy
Rehabilitation Science Program
PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION – PART A
REPORT OF THE EXAMINING COMMITTEE**

Date:

Student Name:

Select <u>one</u> .	Question #1: Rehabilitation Science
<input type="checkbox"/>	PASS: satisfactory performance on both the oral and written components.
<input type="checkbox"/>	INCOMPLETE: remedial work, as detailed below, is required before the outcome can be determined
<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIL: unsatisfactory performance on the oral and/or written components, not deemed to be addressable through remedial work
Signature of examiner:	
Name (print):	

Select <u>one</u> .	Question #2: Research methodologies
<input type="checkbox"/>	PASS: satisfactory performance on both the oral and written components.
<input type="checkbox"/>	INCOMPLETE: remedial work, as detailed below, is required before the outcome can be determined
<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIL: unsatisfactory performance on the oral and/or written components, not deemed to be addressable through remedial work
Signature of examiner:	
Name (print):	

Select <u>one</u> .	Question #3: Research specific
<input type="checkbox"/>	PASS: satisfactory performance on both the oral and written components.
<input type="checkbox"/>	INCOMPLETE: remedial work, as detailed below, is required before the outcome can be determined
<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIL: unsatisfactory performance on the oral and/or written components, not deemed to be addressable through remedial work
Signature of examiner:	
Name (print):	

Select <u>one</u> .	Overall outcome				
<input type="checkbox"/>	PASS	<input type="checkbox"/>	INCOMPLETE	<input type="checkbox"/>	FAIL
Signature of Chair:					
Name (print):					

Remedial work (if applicable, use other side of page as needed; specify areas, details and timelines)

**School of Rehabilitation Therapy
Rehabilitation Science Program
PhD COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION – PART B
REPORT OF THE PROPOSAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PEC)**

Date:

Student Name:

Role	Name, unit	PASS	Incomplete		FAIL	Signature
			without repeated oral	with repeated oral		
Supervisor (or 1 of 2 co-supervisors)						
Co-supervisor (if applicable)						
Examiner from Advisory Committee (AC)						
Additional Examiner from AC (if applicable)						
Examiner <u>external</u> to the AC						
Chair: RESULT						

Required Changes (use a separate sheet if necessary):