

University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Counseling Psychology Evaluation of Preliminary Examination Part 3 (Dissertation Proposal)

Examinee name: _____ Exam Date: _____

Evaluator names: _____

Please indicate your evaluation of the examinee on each of the items listed below. Circle the number to the right of each item that best describes your perceptions of the student's skills, based on your expectations of performance on each competency for students at the end of the 2nd year of doctoral study.

Note: A rating of 4 ("Meets expectations") or higher indicates that you consider that the student demonstrates developmentally appropriate mastery in terms of preparation for pre-doctoral internship.

A rating of "NR" indicates that you have not had the opportunity to observe this competency.

Scientific Knowledge	Needs attention	Emer- -ging	Meets Expec	Exceeds expectations	NR		
Based on written and oral presentations, the candidate:							
1. Demonstrates familiarity with relevant psychological theories and ability to apply these to understanding phenomena, formulating hypotheses in area of interest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Communicates importance for research (theory development) and practice (implications for conceptualization and/or intervention) of anticipated findings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Is able to evaluate research methods and critically examine study conclusions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Supports assertions by reference to empirical findings when available	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Clearly articulates the limitations of empirical data and scientific theories							
6. Clearly articulates the limitations of empirical data and scientific theories	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Understands core scientific conceptions of human behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Understands holistic, cultural, and contextual factors relevant to the research hypotheses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Comments:

Scientific Methods	Needs attention	Emer- -ging	Meets expec	Exceeds expectations	NR		
Based on written and oral presentations, the candidate:							
1. Critically evaluated research methods, data analyses, and conclusions of past research in the area	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Provided sufficient detail in describing past findings so that readers could understand findings and likely limitations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Justified proposed methods as appropriate to the research question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Knowledgeably described strengths and limitations of data collection procedures (e.g., reliability and validity data)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Clearly articulated and justified procedures for data analysis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Demonstrates the ability to use a scientific approach to knowledge generation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Comments:

	Needs attention		Emer-ging	Meets Expec	Exceeds expectations		NR
Ethical and Legal Standards and Policy							
1. Ability to apply standards and ethical decision-making principles to analysis of ethical dilemmas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Acts with honesty and integrity and in accordance with relevant ethical and legal standards	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Follows all policies and procedures of IRB/institutional research ethics	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Comments:							

	Needs attention		Emer-ging	Meets Expec	Exceeds expectations		NR
Professional Values and Attitudes							
1. Articulates professional identity as psychologist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Demonstrated a professional identity as a scientist-practitioner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Demonstrated professional comportment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Expresses concern for the welfare of others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Articulates a developmental, strengths-based focus	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Exhibited an orientation toward social justice	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Demonstrated professional management (meeting deadlines communicated with dissertation chair and committee, communicated clearly regarding proposal process, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Comments:							

	Needs attention		Emer-ging	Meets Expec	Exceeds expectations		NR
Communication Skills							
1. Congruence of verbal and nonverbal communication skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Shows a mastery of scientific writing consistent with advanced doctoral study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Organized the oral presentation well and used presentation materials (i.e., handouts, PowerPoint) effectively	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Used allotted oral presentation time efficiently; covered the most critical elements of the proposal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Was responsive to questions and feedback, able to “think on their feet.”	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Comments:							

Examinee’s Overall Strengths (if needed, please add additional sheet for comments)

Examinee’s Areas for Growth (if needed, please add additional sheet for comments)

Required Revisions (required for successful completion of preliminary examination—Contingent Pass only)

Student Signature _____ **Date** _____

Examiner 1: _____ **Date** _____

Examiner 2: _____ **Date** _____

Advisor Signature _____ **Date** _____

Note: Advisor signature certifies that student has satisfactorily completed any required revisions to the written dissertation proposal, and demonstrates readiness for internship by meeting expectations in all competency areas reviewed here.

Considerations for evaluating introduction and literature review (Ch. 1 and 2)

Title: clear and concise as to what is being studied

Introduction:

- Provides a clear and general description of the background of the study
- Provides a clear and concise description of the relevant factors/constructs used in the study
- Provides a clear description of the hypotheses of the study
- Has a clear logical flow from general background, relevant factors/constructs, and to the hypotheses (funnel approach)

Literature review:

- Provides in-depth information of the background of the study
- Provides in-depth information of the relevant factors/constructs used in the study
- Provides an in-depth explanation as to how hypotheses are deduced
- Maintains a logical flow from general background, relevant factors/constructs, and to the hypotheses (funnel approach)

Considerations for evaluating methods chapter (Ch. 3)

Participants: characteristics clearly described, including:

- Number of participants and where they will be recruited
- Demographics being collected, including age (*M*, *SD*, *range*, and if not normally distributed, *Mdn*), gender (*N* and %), race/ ethnicity/culture (*N* and %), socioeconomic status, education, employment, relationship status, etc.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria
- Other:

Measures: sufficient information provided for each measure, including:

- Description of the construct being measured
- How the measurement is taken (e.g., self-report, observer rating, clinical interview, physiological)
- Validity (e.g., construct, content, convergence, divergence, criterion, context/population)
- Reliability (e.g., internal consistency, test-retest, interrater agreement)
- Other:

Procedures: sufficient information provided so that others could reasonably replicate the study, including:

- Where and how participant recruitments will occur
- Setting in which the study will occur
- (If experimental study) how randomization will occur
- What participants will do (and in what chronological order)
- Other:

Quantitative study:

- (If atypical data structure) the data structure is clearly described (e.g., nested)
- Proposed analyses are consistent with data structure
- (If latent variables are involved) method to construct variables clearly described
- (If modeling is involved) structural model is clearly described, as well as other plausible, competing models
- (If non-normal data) distributional properties of the data are clearly described
- Proposed analyses are compatible with data distribution
- Other:

Qualitative study:

- Type of research method is clearly described
- (If involving interview) degree of structure (e.g., semi-structured) and specific questions that will be asked
- How data will be coded/analyzed (e.g., open, axial, selective)
- Product pursued (e.g., ethnographic description, phenomenological description, theory generation)
- Reflexivity and auditing procedures are clearly described
- Other: