

**North Carolina State University
Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering
Graduate Office**

Qualifying Review Recommendation

To: Dr. Leda Lunardi, Director of Graduate Programs

From: The ECE Advisory Committee Members

Date: _____

Re: _____ ID # _____
Student name

By majority vote, the above named student:

_____ should be allowed to continue in the ECE Ph.D. Program without conditions

_____ should be allowed to continue in the ECE Ph.D. Program under the conditions listed below

_____ should not be allowed to continue in the ECE Ph.D. Program (add comments)

Comments/Conditions: _____

Required Signatures:

Continue Unconditionally	Continue Conditionally	Do Not Continue
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

- **Yes** _____ **No** _____ We have discussed with the above student his/her requirements for financial support. We believe the student's financial needs can be met by the student's own financial resources or by the chair's research funding.
- **Yes** _____ **No** _____ We do not expect the above student will need to rely on a Departmental TA for support beyond what is allowed under Departmental/and or University guidelines.

Graduate Office

Advisory Committee Qualifying Review Guidelines

The purpose of the Qualifying Review is to allow the student's ECE Advisory Committee Members to evaluate the student early in her/his program, and to recommend to the Director of Graduate Programs whether the student should continue in the program. The committee recommendation should represent the majority of the members.

The attached form must be completed by the Advisory Committee of each Ph.D. student before the end of the student's third term of enrollment in the Ph.D. program. It must be returned to the ECE Graduate Office with the signatures of all ECE members on the student's advisory committee. The recommendation each member is asked to give should be based on the overall potential for the student to successfully complete the remainder of her/his program. The committee is encouraged to meet as a group with the student and ask whatever questions they deem necessary to help them make the evaluation. The student should be asked to present to the committee the results of the required individual studies course. The evaluation should include the student's academic performance to-date, including special consideration of the work the student has performed since entering the Ph.D. program.

GPA

The average GPA of Ph.D. students in the ECE Department is over 3.7, and very few students have successfully completed the program with less than a 3.5. Therefore, the committee should address their rationale to support continuation for any student who has less than a 3.5, particularly during her/his Ph.D. work. This does NOT mean that each and every Ph.D. student with less than 3.5 gpa should be rejected. It DOES mean that the academic potential of a student with a GPA of less than 3.5 should be carefully evaluated by the committee.

POTENTIAL FOR RESEARCH

The committee should make a judgment on whether the student has the potential to perform high-quality research. The committee should assess the student's written and oral reports of the individual studies/research course. Evaluation of the student's performance in this course should provide valuable information on the student's work habits, ability to work independently, and ability to communicate.

FINANCIAL NEEDS OF THE STUDENT

The committee should discuss with the student her/his financial plans for the remainder of the student's period of study. What financial support is the student expected to require for the remainder of the period of study? How does the student expect to meet these needs? Is the student expecting TA support? (The general rule is that Ph.D. students should not be a TA for more than one year, and that those who have completed one year will be given a lower priority for appointments.) If the student expects RA support, can this support be reasonably expected?