

**The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center UTHealth  
Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences**

**Advisory Committee Meeting Report for \_\_\_\_\_** *(student's name)*

This completed report must be returned to [gsbs.reports@uth.tmc.edu](mailto:gsbs.reports@uth.tmc.edu) as a PDF file *within 10 business days* from the date of the meeting and copied to the advisor, student and all advisory committee members (whether they were present at the meeting or not). The meeting will be recorded by GSBS only if a report is received.

**Date of Meeting:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Part A. To be completed by the advisor with committee members present.**

**Recommendations from the committee to the student:**

**Expected timeline for completions of major objectives and degree** *(Required for all PhD students who have completed the third year at GSBS and all MS students after the first year. If the time to degree completion cannot yet be determined, then the committee should define a timeline for more immediate goals.)*

**Approval by Committee Members** (at least 4 committee members must be present at the meeting or by video/call in but **ALL members must sign the report whether they were present for the meeting or not**)

| <b>Name</b> <i>(print name)</i> | <b>Signature</b> | <b>Date signed</b> | <b>At meeting Y/N?</b><br><small>If attendance is via video or call in, please indicate so</small> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|
| Advisor:                        |                  |                    |  |
| Member:                         |                  |                    |  |
| Member:                         |                  |                    |  |
| Member:                         |                  |                    |  |
| Member:                         |                  |                    |  |
| Member:                         |                  |                    |  |

The student provided a complete written pre-meeting report to the committee. Yes  No

The committee feels the student is making sufficient progress toward degree completion. Yes  No

If no, please explain \_\_\_\_\_

Recommended date for next meeting (GSBS requires a meeting every six months): \_\_\_\_\_

**The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center UTHealth  
Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences**

**Advisory Committee Meeting Report for \_\_\_\_\_** *(student's name)*

**Note: The committee is asked to fill out a single copy of the attached evaluation table and to share it with the student. In addition to guidance for the trainee, this table provides vital data that is used in accreditation of the GSBS.**

**Part B. To be completed by student.**

1. Attach the completed pre-meeting report including the biosketch
2. Provide a response to the committee's recommendations.

How will the recommendations of the committee be addressed?

**Student signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center UTHealth Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences**  
**Evaluation of Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Advisor Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Meeting:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Return this evaluation with the completed meeting report to: [gsbs.reports@uth.tmc.edu](mailto:gsbs.reports@uth.tmc.edu)**

**The report and evaluation should also be sent to the student and all committee members.**

|   | Poor (1)   | Developing (2)  | Good (3)   | Outstanding (4)  | Score  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Knowledge</b>                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Poor breadth or depth of understanding of the area of study;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Could not apply information learned in another context to issue(s) at hand.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Limited breadth or depth of understanding of the subject;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Limited ability to apply information from another context to project.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient breadth and depth of understanding;<br><input type="checkbox"/> With help, could apply information from another context to the project.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid breadth and depth of knowledge;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Able to integrate information from multiple sources.  | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Hypothesis and Aims</b>                    | <input type="checkbox"/> No hypothesis or rationale provided;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Aims unfocused;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Aims not related to hypothesis.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Hypothesis imprecise/poorly stated;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Significance of hypothesis is unclear;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Individual aims are focused, but don't clearly address the hypothesis.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Hypothesis well-stated with adequate rationale;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Significance of hypothesis is clear;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Aims address the hypothesis but need modification or more focus.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Significance, rationale and novelty of hypothesis well described;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Well-conceived aims that directly and completely address the hypothesis.  | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Experimental Approach</b>                  | <input type="checkbox"/> No clear experimental design;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Pitfalls of techniques not understood.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Experiments lack critical controls, but experimental design evident;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Theory behind methods not well understood, limited understanding of pitfalls of methods.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Experiments relevant to the aims;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Experiments need more quantitative analysis;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Approach clear but need some alternate approaches.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Experiments well-designed with appropriate controls and proper analysis;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understands the theory and practice of the methods, indicates pitfalls and uses alternate methods.   | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Experimental Results and Data Analysis</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Results not interpreted or not interpretable;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Data not analyzed or presented in a coherent fashion, no insight in analyzing data at deeper level shown.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Results interpreted, but serious flaws in analysis approach;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Data presentation is unclear and incoherent in some cases, little insight into meaning of data.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation consistent with data;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Data analysis and presentation clear and understandable, some evidence of deeper interpretation and analysis of data.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Results clear and very well explained;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Data presentation is highly organized and crystal clear, deep analysis and understanding of all the data and their implications.   | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Communication and Collaboration</b>        | <input type="checkbox"/> Disorganized slides and/or write-up with grammatical errors;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Did not understand/address the questions asked;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Poor English language skills;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Does not interact well with others in the lab.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Slides or write-up not very clear;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understood most of the questions but provided only partial answers;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Spoken English was, for the most part, understandable;<br><input type="checkbox"/> With prodding, asks other lab members for help, or offers aid to others.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Write-up and slides largely well written;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understood questions and provided adequate answers;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Spoken English readily understood;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Interacts well with other lab members – will ask for help and offers aid to others.                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Slides and write-up clearly written in the appropriate format;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understood the questions and provided clear, thorough answers;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Took the discussion to a higher level;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Interacts freely with lab members, and works seamlessly with collaborators in other labs and at other institutions.  | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Technical Skills</b>                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Does not understand theory behind techniques and no evidence of troubleshooting capacity;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Cannot repeat experiments with the same protocols;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Does not use lab notebook or poor lab notebook documentation.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Has difficulty troubleshooting;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Experiments need to be repeated multiple times to generate reproducible data;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Uses lab notebook, but documentation poor or not up-to-date.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Can troubleshoot most problems;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Data are reproducible;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Always uses lab notebook and lab notebook well-organized, but still not up-to-date at times.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Understands theory behind techniques and is excellent at troubleshooting;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Consistently reproduces data and is technically outstanding in the lab;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Lab notebooks are always used, very well organized and always up-to-date.   | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| <b>Ethical Conduct of Research</b>            | <input type="checkbox"/> Is unaware that the research was performed under an active animal or human subject IRB-approved protocol (if applicable);<br><input type="checkbox"/> Does not demonstrate understanding of the social consequences of the research;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Is not aware of, and does not adhere to safety protocols;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Does not contribute to lab upkeep – is not a good lab citizen. | <input type="checkbox"/> Could not describe how IRB-approved protocol applied to the work at hand or did not think it was important (if applicable);<br><input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited understanding of the social consequences of the research;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Is aware of, but does not adhere to safety protocols;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Usually, but not always, contributes to lab upkeep. | <input type="checkbox"/> Could readily describe how the research conformed to the stipulations of the active IRB-approved protocol (if applicable);<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understands the social consequences of the research;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Is aware of and adheres to safety protocols;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to lab upkeep. | <input type="checkbox"/> Wrote own protocol for the use of animal/human subjects and had it approved by the IRB (if applicable);<br><input type="checkbox"/> Understands the social consequences of the laboratory's research and can identify ramifications;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Evaluates lab safety protocols and suggests changes to enhance safety;<br><input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to lab upkeep and helps others perform their assigned maintenance duties. | <input type="checkbox"/> 1<br><input type="checkbox"/> 2<br><input type="checkbox"/> 3<br><input type="checkbox"/> 4 |