Preliminary Oral Examination Report
Doctoral Degree

This is to certify that the undersigned, as a committee of the Graduate School, have given

________________________          ________________          ____________________
Last Name                      First                      Middle or Former

a preliminary oral examination for the Ph.D. degree in the major field of Chemical Engineering

on the date of ________________________________

We recommend that the results be recorded as (check one of the following):

☐ Passed the examination without reservations

☐ Passed the examination with reservations
   NOTE: Within one week of the examination, the committee must send the student a
   letter that clearly stipulates the reservations and the steps required to remove
   them. A copy of this letter must be attached to this form when it is returned to
   the Graduate Student Committee.

☐ Failed the examination
   NOTE: One retake is permitted only by unanimous consent of the examining committee.
   Each committee member must indicate whether a retake is approved.

Committee members must indicate their vote by signing their name in the appropriate column
below:

| EXAMINING COMMITTEE | Pass | Pass With Reservations | Fail | Approve Retake?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RICE UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICAL AND BIOMOLECULAR ENGINEERING

Evaluation of PhD Thesis Proposal

Student: ____________________________

Date of Presentation: ________________

Committee Member: __________________

Please review guidelines for evaluation on the reverse and provide your assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Grade 1 (Unsatisfactory) to 5 (Excellent)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written proposal, organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written proposal, quality of writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Signature: _________________________________________________________
GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

Use the following scale:

5 (Excellent); 4 (Very Good); 3 (Satisfactory); 2 (Fair); 1 (Unsatisfactory).

**Objective**
- Excellent: Compelling statement of objective that demonstrates the challenge of the research and its applications
- Satisfactory: Objective and applications are clearly stated, motivated, and challenging
- Fair: Objective or applications partially clear and too simple
- Unsatisfactory: Objective and potential applications are not clear

**Literature review**
- Excellent: Identifies all relevant results and techniques from the literature and synthesizes them well
- Satisfactory: Cites major works and places them in context
- Fair: Misses a few major works or places them out of context
- Unsatisfactory: Fails to cite or assimilate previous work

**Research results**
- Excellent: Experiments and/or theory, computations well chosen and executed and interpreted fully and correctly
- Satisfactory: Experiments and/or theory, computations are reasonable but some errors exist or interpretation is incomplete
- Fair: Minimal results but well-motivated and interpreted
- Unsatisfactory: Minimal results and/or major errors in results or analysis

**Proposed research**
- Excellent: Well thought out experiments and/or theory to achieve novel results and meet objective; includes potential open-ended developments
- Satisfactory: Good overall plan needing some further development
- Fair: Plan is actionable but has minor flaws or ambiguity
- Unsatisfactory: Sketchy outline of future work with few specifics

**Written proposal, organization**
- Excellent: Logical progression of thought within overall proposal and within each section; figures illustrate main points
- Satisfactory: Occasional portion of reasoning omitted or misplaced
- Fair: Few important statements are not sufficiently motivated; order of presentation is not always logical or effective.
- Unsatisfactory: Repetition, misplaced items, poor figures hinder reader understanding

**Written proposal, quality of writing**
- Excellent: Ideas expressed clearly and concisely in fluent prose with minimal typos or grammatical errors
- Satisfactory: Coherent presentation with average style and limited typos, grammatical errors
- Fair: Some parts difficult to understand, noticeable errors
- Unsatisfactory: Significant parts difficult to understand, numerous errors

**Oral presentation**
- Excellent: Engaging, polished presentation with well crafted slides that illustrate key points and emphasize conclusions
- Satisfactory: Solid presentation with coherent narrative, conclusions Presentation is understandable but not fully convincing
- Fair: Too much or too little detail; goals and directions not clear; order of slides not logical; poor slides; reads directly from many slides
- Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal significant gaps in understanding thesis work and its context

**Response to questions**
- Excellent: Complete answers that demonstrate deep understanding of research field beyond contents of thesis
- Satisfactory: Competent answers that demonstrate understanding of issues directly relevant to thesis
- Fair: Answer reveal minor gaps in understanding thesis work or directly related areas
- Unsatisfactory: Answers reveal significant gaps in understanding thesis work and its context