

## Avital Sternin Comprehensive Exam

| Supervisors                          | Committee   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Dr. Jessica Grahn<br>Dr. Adrian Owen | Dr. J Bruce Morton (Psychology)<br>Dr. Perry Klein (Education)<br>Dr. Jonathan De Souza (Music) |

### Outline:

- An outline of major areas to be covered in the paper, and a proposed reference list.

Student Deadline – Jan 23, 2017

- The outline is approved by the supervisor and **one** committee member (the advisory committee)

Advisory Committee Deadline: Jan 30, 2017

- Feedback provided within 1 week of receiving draft from supervisor and **one** committee member (advisory committee)
- Committee member: **Dr. Jonathan De Souza**

### First Draft:

Student Deadline – March 20, 2017

- 8 weeks from outline submission

Advisory Committee Deadline: April 3, 2017

- Feedback provided within 2 weeks of receiving draft from supervisor and **one** committee member (advisory committee) (could be different committee member than above)
- Committee member: **Dr. J Bruce Morton**

### Final Written Paper:

Student Deadline – May 15, 2017

- 6 weeks from draft feedback
- The final paper is read by all three committee members

Full Committee Evaluation Deadline – May 29, 2017

- Feedback provided within 2 weeks of receiving paper
- The student is informed of the outcome of the written examination. If the student has obtained a Conditional Pass or Failure, remedial measures, if any, will be specified.

### Revised Written Paper (if required):

- Students who receive a Conditional Pass will be required to submit a revised version of the paper in response to remedial measures specified by the committee.

Student Deadline – June 12, 2017

- Within 2 weeks of receiving feedback

Full Committee Evaluation Deadline – June 26, 2017

- Feedback provided within 2 weeks of receiving revised paper

### Oral examinations (if required):

- An oral examination based on the revised version of the written paper will be scheduled as soon as possible after the written evaluation (within 1 week)

Student Deadline: July 3, 2017

Full Committee Evaluation Oral Deadline: July 10, 2017

- Within 1 week of oral examination

**Content:**

It is expected that this paper will (1) make a substantive and original contribution to knowledge in the content area covered in the paper. (2) That the overall quality of the paper should, at the minimum, be at the level that the paper would be seriously considered for publication; that is, a “revise and re-submit”, as opposed to an outright rejection.

Your advisory and evaluation committee members have extensive experience in reviewing journal articles. As such, if they felt your paper would receive a “reject” recommendation from a journal, they would evaluate your paper as a “fail”. A paper that meets one, but not both, of the requirements state above necessary to be graded as a “pass”, would receive a grade of “conditional pass”.

**Feedback and evaluation:**

The criterion for evaluating the paper will be (1) the extent to which it provides an original and substantive contribution to our understanding of the domain of interest, and (2) the overall quality of the paper is, at minimum, at the level that the paper would be seriously considered for publication; that is, a “revise and re-submit”. Students receive feedback on a draft, which provides an opportunity for improving the paper before the final submission. In addition, students may have an oral examination on the content area covered by the paper. The purpose of the oral examination is to give the committee members an opportunity to seek clarification of points and issues contained in the paper.

**Conditions for completion:**

The comprehensive committee will determine whether a student has obtained a PASS, CONDITIONAL PASS, or FAILURE, on the written examination (i.e., major paper). A student will pass if at least two committee members have assigned “Passes”, with the third assigning, at minimum, a “Conditional Pass”. A student will Fail, if at least two committee members have assigned a Fail. Anything else will be considered a Conditional Pass. A student who fails the written examination will be withdrawn from the Ph.D. program.

At the discretion of the clinical program, students who receive a Conditional Pass will be required to submit a revised version of the paper in response to remedial measures specified by the committee, and may also need to complete an oral examination. In such cases, the revised version of the paper and oral examination (if required) will be graded as pass/fail; both the revised paper and oral examination would need to be graded as a Pass (by at least two of the three committee members) in order for the student to continue in the program. A student who does not pass both the revised paper and oral examination would be withdrawn from the Ph.D. program.

The schedule for the comprehensive examination has various tasks designed to allow you to get feedback along the way. Consider both your advisor and second reader as similar to academic colleagues who would give you comments and feedback on a major project.

## **For the student – Getting Feedback from the Advisory Committee – First Draft**

### Advisor

- You may have meetings with your advisor to get input on specific decisions related to the content of the paper. You can present issues, etc. that pertain to preparing your comps.
- Your advisor may suggest additional readings, literatures to look at, and discuss with you some conceptual ideas that you may wish to pursue.
- Carefully consider the feedback you receive and use this information to help you write your paper.
- However, you are ultimately responsible for the paper.
- Your advisor's input will be similar to consulting with a colleague for assistance with making decisions in writing a manuscript.
- You are encouraged to discuss the nature and timing of feedback from your advisor during the process of completing the outline/reference list.

### Second reader

- Comments and feedback from your second reader should be done prior to handing in your outline and reading list.
- It is highly recommended that you meet with your second reader very early on in the process to let him or her know what you are doing (or considering doing) for your paper.
- Your second reader may also have some ideas and readings to suggest.
- Thus, it is important to think early on about whom you want as a second reader.
- This also gives this faculty member a chance to consider and schedule in your comps paper.

### Evaluation and feedback from the advisory committee on the draft

The advisory committee will provide written comments on the draft. It is not uncommon for the advisory committee to come back with suggestions to cut major sections of the paper, if they feel the scope of the paper is too broad. The committee may also recommend substantive expansion to subsections felt to be lacking in detail.

Your advisor and second reader will provide ratings using a feedback form identical to that used in the final evaluation. Use this feedback. If the committee has substantive concerns about the paper, feedback at this point provides you with the opportunity to revise and improve your paper prior to the final evaluation.

After you submit the draft of your comps you will receive written feedback. This is the only time you can expect to receive written feedback from your committee. Plan your time accordingly. To maximize the quality of feedback from your committee you need to submit a solid draft.

In addition to this written feedback, many students find it helpful to have a meeting with their advisor and second reader to ensure they understand the feedback provided.