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Ph.D. program in Communicative Sciences and Disorders

The Ph.D. program in the Department of Communicative Sciences and Disorders has as its goal the development of outstanding scholars, trained as strong independent researchers and as effective teachers. As such, this program is designed for students seeking advanced knowledge and research skills in speech and language for both typical and atypical populations. The training environment is a place where faculty members are actively pursuing both theoretical questions about the nature of communicative sciences and the application of these questions to clinically diverse populations.

Program graduates will thus have both a broad base of knowledge about communicative sciences and disorders and significant in-depth preparation in their special areas of concentration within the discipline. In addition, students will be presented with the opportunity for a variety of interdisciplinary experiences and skills to enhance their research careers.

The Department encourages a range of interests and backgrounds in applicants to the program, and we will help to develop programs of study that are most appropriate for each individual student. Thus, each student's program is designed in consultation with the student's primary advisor. Further, each doctoral student will go through a rigorous mentoring process involving the primary advisor. In addition, research experiences with members of the faculty of the department and university will be available as appropriate to the student's program of study. It is expected that students will engage in scholarly, publishable research endeavors throughout their course of study at New York University.

The following information is intended to supplement that which is provided in the Steinhardt handbook for doctoral study. In general, Steinhardt requirements focus on admission and completion formalities; certain examinations and the dissertation; the makeup of committees that conduct the examinations of the students; and the sequencing of events leading up to completion of the degree requirements. The department requirements further address coursework, research output, teaching, and the development of the dissertation prospectus and independent dissertation project.

Broad overview of PhD Program Requirements

The PhD program is designed to provide training in content areas, in conducting research, and in teaching. These areas are all critical to the success of our students once they graduate from the program.

Course requirements: 43 points (see curriculum on page 5 for more details)

Research requirements (see page 7 for more details)
- Candidacy requirements: 2 original qualifying research papers due within first three years
- Doctoral candidate requirements: dissertation proposal, dissertation

Teaching requirements: Teach a minimum of one course as instructor of record (see page 9)
Doctoral Faculty

Adam Buchwald, Ph.D., Associate Professor (Director of Doctoral Program)
(Johns Hopkins University, 2005); buchwald@nyu.edu

Maria Grigos, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, Associate Professor
(Columbia University, 2002), maria.grigos@nyu.edu

Harriet Klein, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, Professor
(Columbia University, 1978) harriet.klein@nyu.edu

Susannah Levi, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
(University of Washington, 2004), svlevi@nyu.edu

Tara McAllister Byun, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
(MIT, 2009), tara.byun@nyu.edu

Sonja Molfenter, PhD., CCC-SLP (Canada), Assistant Professor (Beginning Spring 2014)
(University of Toronto, 2013)

Christina Reuterskiöld, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, Associate Professor (Department Chair)
(Lund University, 1999) ecw4@nyu.edu

Celia Stewart, Ph.D., CCC-SLP, Associate Professor
(New York University, 1993) cs8@nyu.edu

Diana Van Lancker Sidtis, Ph.D., CCC-SLP
(Brown University, 1975) diana.sidtis@nyu.edu
Ph.D. Curriculum
(43 points for students entering with Masters)

I. Graduate Methods courses – 15 points total (possible courses below)

Select ONE Research Design course from the following (3 pts total):
RESCH-GE 2132: Principles of Empirical Research (3 pts)
APSY-GE 2073: Research Design and Methodology in the Behavioral Sciences I (3 pts)

Required (take these or similar courses) (9 pts total).
RESCH-GE 2001: Statistics for the Behavioral and Social Sciences I (3 pts)
RESCH-GE 2002: Data Analysis for the Behavioral and Social Sciences II (3 pts)
RESCH-GE 2003: Intermediate Quantitative Methods: The General Linear Model (3 pts)

Select ADDITIONAL Research Design course(s) from the following (3 pts):
RESCH-GE 2004: Advanced Modeling I: Topics in Multivariate Analysis (3 pts)
RESCH-GE 2011: Topics in Advanced Quantitative Methods: Classification & Clustering (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2012: Topics in Advanced Quantitative Methods: Causal Inference (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2013: Missing Data (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2040: Multi-level Modeling: Growth Curve (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2041: Practicum in Multi-level Modeling: Growth Curve (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2042: Multi-Level Modeling: Nested Data (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2043: Practicum in Multi-Level Modeling: Nested Data (2 pts)
RESCH-GE 2140: Approaches to Qualitative Inquiry (3 pts)
CSCD-GE 2109: Critical Evaluation of Research (3 pts)
RESCH-GE 3001: Dissertation Proposal Seminar (this or equivalent required by Steinhardt)

II. Specialization and Cognate courses – 18 points total (partial list of possible courses below)
APSY-GE.2261: Emotional Development in Childhood: Organization and Neurobiology
APSY-GE 2198: Cognitive Development
BIOE-GA.1008/2334: Topics in Bioethics
CSCD-GE 2130: Perception and Production of Speech
CSCD-GE 2402: Approaches to Natural Language: Methods and Procedures (1 pt)
CSCD-GE 3001: Seminal Readings in Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology
CSCD-GE 3021: Advanced Studies in Language and Speech
LANED-GE 2206: Second Language Acquisition: Theory and Research
LING-GA 1210: Phonology I
LING-GA 3110: Seminar in Phonetics
LING-GA 1510: Sociolinguistics
LING-GA 2220: Laboratory Phonology
LING-GA 2710: Neurolinguistics
LING-GA 3510: Seminar in Sociolinguistics (Prerequisite: LING-GA 1510 or permission)
LING-GA 3710: Seminar in Neurolinguistics
MPATC-GE 2042: Psychology of Music
OT-GE.3301: Evidence-Based Practice
PSYCH-GA 2002: Psychology of Music
PSYCH-GA 2012: Physiological Basis of Behavior
PSYCH-GA 2031: Neuropsychology
PSYCH-GA 204X: Cognitive Neuroscience
PSYCH-GA 204X: Emotion and its development
PSYCH-GA 2209: Cognitive Development
PSYCH-GA 2221: Behavioral and Cognitive Neuroscience
PSYCH-GA 3210: Seminar in Psycholinguistics
PSYCH-GA 3220: Seminar in Cognitive, Perceptual, and Language Development
IV. Research Colloquium – 5 points total

E34.2420 Research Colloquium (0-1 pt/semester; repeatable)
- Students must attend Research Colloquium every semester. Course may be taken for 1 point and 0 points in alternate semesters for a total of 5 points.

V. Doctoral Seminar – 5 points total

E34.3400: Doctoral Seminar in Communicative Sciences and Disorders (0-1 pt/semester; repeatable)
- Students must attend Doctoral Seminar every semester. Course may be taken for 1 point and 0 points in alternate semesters for a total of 5 points. (This course satisfies the Steinhardt requirement for Dissertation Proposal Seminar)

Research landmarks throughout program (dates are approximate)

1st paper due ~ Feb. 1, Year 2
2nd paper due ~ End of, Year 3
Dissertation proposal due ~ May 1, Year 4
Dissertation due ~ May 1, Year 5
**Research qualifying paper requirements**

The mission of fostering the development of strong independent researchers is supported by our qualifying paper (QP) requirements in which students complete two research papers in their first three years. The goal of these papers is to provide students with the experience of putting together multiple research projects prior to their dissertation. QPs will have the format of research articles, including literature reviews, methods, results, and discussion. The expectation is that the research reported in these papers meets the standards of quality associated with peer-reviewed journals in the field.

The papers are intended to provide depth to the student’s studies from an early point in the program. In addition, the rationale behind two distinct papers is that this will help to provide an element of breadth. Towards this end, it is strongly encouraged that the two papers incorporate different methodological approaches to address questions of interest. This will typically involve a “lab rotation” in which the two papers are produced under the mentorship of different advisors. Each paper will be read by a primary advisor and two additional readers with enough expertise to evaluate the research. This committee should be formed early in the project and an initial meeting should take place early on in the process to receive input on the scope and design of the project. In addition, part of the evaluation of each paper will consist of an oral examination after handing in each paper, in which the students will present and defend their work. The defense will be scheduled once all committee members agree in writing that the paper is ready to be defended.

The papers may quite often focus on the same topic that the dissertation will eventually focus on. Each research project will have a primary mentor responsible for overseeing the successful completion of the work and offering guidance and mentorship when necessary. The papers may focus on a topic that is directly related to a faculty member’s research; however, the ideas and research in the paper should be those of the student (as guided by the mentor). Students are encouraged to select one or two other persons to form a committee with the advisor to review the proposal idea before proceeding with the project.

Continuation in the program requires that the student successfully complete these projects. The suggested time frame is:

QP1: February 1, Year 2

QP2: End of year 3

Extensions may be granted at the discretion of the advisory panel for each student, providing there is a plan in place for the student to finish the requirement in a timely fashion.
Dissertation Proposal

The dissertation proposal is an official document that provides the blueprint for the dissertation. The proposal will consist of an introduction, including background and context of the topic; a scholarly literature review, critically discussing relevant research articles and books, concluding with a rationale for the study; and a method section, fully describing the details of the research plan, including participants, procedures, and materials. The proposal is reviewed by the student’s three person committee (which must meet at least once prior to scheduling a defense). The proposal committee then works with the student to schedule the proposal panel review which minimally includes the main supervisor and two outside panel readers, although the entire committee is encouraged to attend. Readers are selected to be knowledgeable and competent in the area of research of the candidate. One reader is selected from outside the department. The Dissertation Committee Chair provides the Doctoral Committee with the names of outside readers in advance of the Proposal Panel Review.

The final oral examination is scheduled on completion of the dissertation. The oral defense panel consists of the Dissertation Committee members and two outside readers, one chosen from outside of the department. The outside reader’s names are provided in advance to the Doctoral Committee.

The Dissertation Proposal Review (From: Steinhardt Doctoral Handbook*)

The procedures for reviewing dissertation proposals vary among the different departments; however, the following School policies apply to all departments and programs:

- The committee chairperson and both committee members must sign the Dissertation Proposal Cover Sheet (see appendix) indicating their approval of the proposal for review by the panel.
- The dissertation committee must meet as a group at least once prior to the filing of the proposal for review.
- Both the candidate and the dissertation committee chairperson are required to attend the review.
- Attendance by a minimum of two reviewers (external to the dissertation committee) is required.
- Attendance by the committee members is optional.
- The recommendations of the proposal review panel are advisory.

After the proposal review, the proposal review panel coordinator will notify you of the outcome in writing (with copies to the dissertation committee chairperson and members and to the Office of Graduate Studies). The proposal review panel will recommend that you proceed in one of the following ways:

- If the panel vote results in a “pass,” the panel will recommend that you carry out the research and dissertation writing as proposed (there may be minor revisions suggested that are not officially noted).
- If the panel vote results in a “deferred pass” or “pass with conditions,” the panel will recommend that you address the concerns of the panel in writing (with copies to the committee chairperson and members and to the Office of Graduate Studies). In some cases the proposal review panel or the dissertation committee may recommend that you submit a revised proposal reflecting the revisions suggested by the panel. Two copies of the revised proposal must also be submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies.
- If the panel does not approve the proposal, you will be asked to rewrite the proposal and submit it for a second proposal review.
Because the proposal review panel is an advisory committee, your dissertation committee may choose not to incorporate some or all of the proposal review panel’s recommendations. In the event that the panel’s suggestions are not incorporated, you will be expected to provide a written rationale explaining this decision. This rationale should bear the signature of the dissertation committee chairperson. As is the case with all correspondence regarding the proposal review, copies should be distributed to the committee members and to the Office of Graduate Studies.

A copy of the proposal, the review panel’s outcome and notes, and your response to the panel’s notes are given to each of the two faculty members who serve as outside readers on the final oral examination of the dissertation.


**Teaching requirement**

Students participate in teaching Masters or Undergraduate Level courses at levels appropriate to their experience, beginning with assisting a faculty member, co-teaching a course, and finally having full responsibility of one or more courses. Full responsibility for a course will not occur until at least the 3rd year of doctoral study. Being given a course to teach is contingent on satisfying the research requirements of the program.

**Student Evaluations**

All doctoral students will be evaluated continuously on their progress in the program. Self-evaluations will be completed at the end of each semester with reference to the student’s progress through the program, their academic achievements, and their goals for the upcoming semester. The forms will be included in an evaluation of the student’s progress by the entire doctoral faculty. This evaluation will highlight strengths and areas that require attention to enable the student to successfully complete the program and pursue a career. Students will receive reports of these evaluations from the Doctoral Committee after each semester.

**Statement on Academic Integrity**

All doctoral students are responsible for understanding and complying with the NYU Steinhardt Statement on Academic Integrity. A copy of this statement is available on the Steinhardt webpage at [http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/policies/academic_integrity](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/policies/academic_integrity).
Ph.D. Curriculum in CSD  
(for students entering without a Masters)  

73 points total

I. Masters-level CSD courses—30 points total (possible courses below)

Graduate Level Normal Process Course – (a choice of one 3 point course from the following is required):

- CSCD-GE 2130 Perception & Production of Speech
- APSY-GE 2138 Human Growth and Development
- APSY-GE 2271 Survey of Developmental Psychology
- APSY-GE 2272 Adolescent Development

Speech Disorders Courses – (all of these courses are required- 21 credits):

- CSCD-GE 2016 Motor Speech Disorders
- CSCD-GE 2021 Adult Language Disorders
- CSCD-GE 2028 Fluency Disorders
- CSCD-GE 2037 Voice Disorders
- CSCD-GE 2039 Language Disorders: Children
- CSCD-GE 2060 Dysphagia in Children and Adults
- CSCD-GE 2108 Phonological Analysis of Normal and Disordered Speech

Electives - At least six credits of the following courses are required:

- CSCD-GE 2015 Augmentative Communication (1)
- CSCD-GE 2019 Therapeutic Approaches in Speech Pathology: Voice Disorders
- CSCD-GE 2020 Therapeutic Approaches in Speech Pathology: Aphasia
- CSCD-GE 2022 Craniofacial Anomalies (3)
- CSCD-GE 2023 Neurogenic Speech Disorders in Children
- CSCD-GE 2062 Dysphagia in Infants & Toddlers (1)
- CSCD-GE 2109 Critical Evaluation of Research (3)
- CSCD-GE 2114 Computerized Analysis of Language Transcripts (1)
- CSCD-GE 2402 Approaches to Natural Language: Methods and Procedures (1)
- CSCD-GE 2420 Communicative Disorders Research Colloquium (1)

II. Remaining 43 points and research requirements same as curriculum on page 5-6
# PhD program progress form

**Name:** _______________________________  **Year of entry:** ___________________

## Research requirements

### Paper 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary mentor</th>
<th>First reader</th>
<th>Second reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Title:** ________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date paper accepted</th>
<th>Mentor initials</th>
<th>First reader initials</th>
<th>Second reader initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral exam date</th>
<th>Mentor initials</th>
<th>First reader initials</th>
<th>Second reader initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Paper 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary mentor</th>
<th>First reader</th>
<th>Second reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Title:** ________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date paper accepted</th>
<th>Mentor initials</th>
<th>First reader initials</th>
<th>Second reader initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral exam date</th>
<th>Mentor initials</th>
<th>First reader initials</th>
<th>Second reader initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Dissertation Proposal

**Committee:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary mentor</th>
<th>Department internal member</th>
<th>Outside member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Review panel:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First panel member</th>
<th>Second panel member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Date proposal accepted**  

(Please attach notice of proposal acceptance from Office of Graduate Studies)

## Dissertation Defense

**Committee:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary mentor</th>
<th>Department internal member</th>
<th>Outside member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Review panel:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First panel member</th>
<th>Second panel member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Defense date**  

(Please attach notice of proposal acceptance from Office of Graduate Studies)

**Title:** ____________________________________________
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## Course requirements

### Graduate Methods courses (15 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number/title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># of credits</th>
<th>grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specialization courses (18 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course number/title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th># of credits</th>
<th>grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Doctoral Seminar (5 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>P/F</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Colloquium (5 credits total)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>P/F</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outcome Quality Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of the issue being addressed</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presents interesting questions and provides a thoughtful statement of the issue and its broad significance beyond the empirical scope of the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides a general discussion of the question or issues within the scope of the empirical work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not provide a clear discussion of the immediate or broader questions and/or issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and Previous Work</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places the work within a larger context. Appropriately integrates relevant material. Builds a strong case for the research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifies and cites the key literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not identify, cite, or interpret important, relevant literature related to the student’s contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology/Approach</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative in use of original or existing methodology. Study design shows comprehensive grasp of methods used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates competent use of existing methods. Design of study allows an adequate test of the hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Analysis (For QPs and potentially for pilot data in the proposal)</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robust, meaningful, interesting results obtained from innovative data analyses (where relevant). Provides insightful arguments for or against the hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundamental analyses are executed and interpreted appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Conclusion (For QPs and potentially for pilot data in the proposal)</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Places the study in a larger theoretical context. Identifies the significance and limitations of the research. Informs our understanding of the nature of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarizes and restates the original research questions and the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality and Substance</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the originality and substance consistent with top-tier research within the sub-discipline. Will make a very strong contribution to the literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work represents an original contribution to the literature by building incrementally on previous work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Written (a) and Oral (b) Communication</td>
<td><strong>Exceeds expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicates research clearly and professionally. Demonstrates excellent command of scientific style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meets expectations</strong> <strong>Does not meet expectations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The writing and/or presentation accurately describe the underlying research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check one:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poorly written and/or presented; cannot convey the basic nature of the research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Written Comments (Optional)

Statement of the Problem
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Literature and Previous Work
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Methodology/Approach
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Results/Analysis
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Discussion/Conclusion
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Originality and Substance
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Quality of Written (a) and Oral (b) Communication
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________