**Summary Dissertation Proposal Committee Meeting**

Student name:

Report provided by:

Date:

List committee members and indicate which were present/absent:

Please indicate the date of the next committee meeting:

*Students should meet with their dissertation committee at least once every 6 months*

**Please assign one of the following three outcomes regarding the proposal as a whole:**

* + Approve – the proposed studies describe a series of studies that, if successfully accomplished and communicated, would lead to the doctoral degree. The proposal is well-written, requiring no change.

* + Conditionally approve with the addition of recommended changes, the proposed studies describe a series of studies that, if successfully accomplished and communicated, would lead to the doctoral degree. The record of proposal defense must indicate exactly what the student must do to move from a “conditional accept” to “accept”. The student has one month to make the changes. When acceptable, the Chair of the Dissertation Studies Committee will provide a revised record of proposal defense to the NGP Curriculum and Tracking Committee Chair.
  + Serious reservations: the proposal describes a series of studies that are fatally flawed, too risky, too descriptive, too lacking in preliminary data or indication of feasibility, or not related to neuroscience. The student must work together with the mentor to revise and add new aims. The newly written proposal must then be presented to the committee. A timeline of 2 months is recommended.

**Please elaborate on the outcome decision indicated above by addressing the following:**

* Comment on the quality of the written proposal and indicate what, if any, revisions are required and the date that they are required. For example, it is not uncommon for committee members to ask for revisions on data collection and statistical analysis methods, although any part of the proposal is fair game.
* Comment on the amount of and quality of the preliminary data. Does the preliminary data indicate technical feasibility?
* Comment on the quality of the oral presentation and ability to answer questions in the public presentation.
* Comment on the quality of the student’s discussion and defense of the proposal in the closed committee meeting. Are there any concerns over the student’s conceptual or technical mastery of the project?
* Please briefly outline the agreed upon research goals for the next 6 months.