



I. INSTRUCTIONS

Upon completion of submission of the doctoral thesis and subsequent defense, the student's Committee Chair will coordinate completion of the form and all signatures and will submit the form to the SPH Doctoral Program Committee via email to Daniel.Ehlke@downstate.edu with subject line "Dissertation Approval Form". Decisions regarding acceptance of the form and accompanying dissertation will be sent to the student and committee chair via email with a copy to the chair of the department. The dissertation must be successfully defended by April 1st and sections I through VI of this form must be received, along with the final accepted version of the dissertation, by April 15th in a given academic year in order to graduate that year. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that all documents are completed and sent on time and that receipt of acknowledgement is documented.

II. STUDENT INFORMATION

Student Name:	
Student ID #:	
Concentration:	

III. DISSERTATION TITLE, ABSTRACT, AND DEFENSE DATE

Title:	
Abstract:	
Date of Dissertation Defense:	



IV. ASSESSMENT RUBRIC AND OUTCOME

The Doctoral Committee Chair will obtain consensus from the committee on each section of the rubric. Detailed comments are required when a 'not satisfactory' is given in any section. It is expected that any 'unsatisfactory' ratings will result in an outcome of major revisions or a failure in section V, and an additional form will be submitted upon submission of accepted modifications.

	Assessment	Comments
Background: The written product and presentation demonstrate clear knowledge and depth of understanding of the selected public health area. The literature review reflects a rigorous synthesis of the topic area.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Significance and objectives: The objectives addressed in the written product are clearly linked to the background and identify a focus with clear public health applicability.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Approach: The design of the project(s) and the methods used to address the primary objectives are clearly articulated and sufficiently described. The approach is adequate to address the study aims.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Outcomes: Results are clearly, concisely, and accurately conveyed. Results are interpreted in the context of strengths and limitations of the approach.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Implications of the project(s) for public health practice: The results are described in relation to their implications for public health practice. Additional steps needed for translation of findings to public health practice are considered.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Written product: The document is clearly written and organized, free from grammatical errors, and with citations, tables, and figures organized per SPH requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Oral presentation: The oral presentation is clear, organized, and professionally presented. The presentation demonstrates synthesis of doctoral competencies and depth and breadth of knowledge of the chosen topic.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Synthesis of competencies: DrPH competencies are clearly articulated and integrated in the written product. Three DrPH competencies, at least one of which is foundational and another which is concentration specific are synthesized. Competencies should be the same as those included on the approved Dissertation Proposal Form. The written document and presentation should demonstrate a clear application and synthesis of the selected competencies. Below please add each competency addressed.		
Competency 1 (paste below):	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Competency 2 (paste below):	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	
Competency 3 (paste below):	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	



V. OUTCOME OF REVIEW

It is expected that doctoral students will not defend their dissertation until all committee members feel that the written product is in acceptable condition and does not require major revisions. When an outcome is for major revisions or a failure, a revised form must be submitted when the document is accepted.

Outcome of Dissertation Defense and Written Product:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted, no / minor revisions <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted, pending major revisions <input type="checkbox"/> Not accepted - Failure
Summary of Major Revisions or Reasons for Failure. A summary is not required when minor revisions are requested.	

VI. STUDENT AND DISSERTATION COMMITTEE SIGNATURES

The student and all committee members confirm by signing below that they agree on the content of this review. If there are more than three committee members, please submit an additional form with signature.

Student signature and date:	
Committee chair signature and date:	
Committee member signature and date:	
Committee member signature and date:	

VII. SPH DEAN SIGNATURE

This section is completed when the dissertation is in its final accepted version and is submitted with the committee-approved document. By signing below, the SPH Dean confirms agreement with the doctoral committee's recommendation.

SPH Dean signature and date:	
------------------------------	--

To be completed by the Chair of the SPH Doctoral Program Committee:	
Doctoral Review Outcome:	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved (Summarize required modifications below)
Signature and date:	