

Appendix D

Qualifying Examination (QE) Process

According to the University of Guelph [Graduate Calendar](#), “As a qualifying examination, consideration is to be given not only (1) to the student’s knowledge of the subject matter and ability to integrate the material derived from his or her studies, but also (2) to the student’s ability and promise in research. The examining committee, therefore, will receive from the [advisory committee](#) a written evaluation of the quality of the student’s **research performance** to date and of the **student’s potential as a researcher**. The examining committee will determine the relative importance to be given to these two major components of the qualifying examination.”

The Department of Family Relations and Applied Nutrition has developed the following qualifying examination process in keeping with this regulation. The QE provides an explicit point early in the student’s work for determination of the appropriateness of a given student officially entering the doctoral program. The purposes of the QE are to ensure that the student has attained sufficient breadth and depth of the knowledge, and has conceptual abilities that may include the integration of material derived from their studies and critical thinking abilities. Upon successful completion of the exam, the doctoral student officially becomes a ‘doctoral candidate’. Identified competencies for the QE are as follows:

1. Ability to use, describe, and evaluate theory;
2. Specialization in an area of research literature that will serve as a broad basis for the doctoral thesis proposal*;
3. Demonstration of proficiency in and critical consideration of research methodology that will serve as a broad basis for the doctoral thesis proposal*;
4. Ability to demonstrate independent writing;
5. Ability to communicate and synthesize information, arguments, and analyses, accurately and reliably in oral and written form;
6. Ability to construct a logical argument and to see flaws in other arguments;
7. Ability to construct well-written paper(s), using the most recent, discipline-specific style of referencing; and
8. Demonstration of professional and ethical behaviour, completing the QE process with academic integrity and professional and social responsibility.

*While the readings and work conducted for the QE contributes to a student’s specialization in an area of research literature and research methodology that will serve as a broad basis for the doctoral thesis proposal, the written responses are not intended to be “copied and pasted” directly into their dissertation proposal. The work conducted contributes to the student’s knowledge in the literature upon which they will draw to write their research proposal.

EXAMINATION COMMITTEE

The student’s advisor, in collaboration with the student, suggests the composition of the qualifying examination committee and submits the [Qualifying Examination Committee Appointment Form](#) to the Graduate Program Assistant. **This form is due by the middle of April (semester 2)**. The Examination Committee consists of 5 members:

- 1) Two members of the student’s advisory committee
- 2) Two additional members of the graduate faculty who are not members of the advisory committee
- 3) The Chair of the examination committee. As per University policy, this person is the Department Chair or designate; in practice, the Graduate Program Assistant consults with the Department Chair and the role

typically alternates between the Department Chair or their designate and the Graduate Coordinator, except when the student's advisor is the Chair or Graduate Coordinator.

NOTE: At least **one** member of the qualifying examination committee must be from outside the department; this requirement is most readily met by naming the external advisory committee member to the examination committee (n.b., a new external advisory committee member cannot be added as "Special Graduate Faculty" for the sole purpose of the qualifying examination committee).

QE Committee members are expected to:

- Review all materials and forms in a timely manner;
- Provide input to the contextual statement and reading lists;
- Schedule time for required components (including initial meeting in mid-May, providing questions in August, assessing written component during early October, meeting to discuss written component two weeks following submission of written responses, oral defense typically during first week of November);
- Propose 2 relevant questions on specific topics (see below) for the written component (excluding Advisor);
- Assess the student's written component using the provided rubric and additional written feedback;
- Assess the student's oral component based on the seven QE competencies and provide oral and written feedback (including general feedback during the QE, and specific feedback post-QE);
- Maintain confidentiality of deliberations (regarding both written and oral components); and
- Provide feedback on the QE process to the QE Chair/Graduate Coordinator.

SCHEDULE

Required course work listed in the "Typical Course of Study" (see [PhD AHN Typical Course of Study](#); [PhD FRHD Typical Course of Study](#)) up to and including Semester 3 should typically be completed before students complete their qualifying examination with the exception of required courses not offered prior to the QE deadline. In the case that a student has not yet taken a course that could be advantageous toward completion of the QE, the student will work with their advisor and committee members to ensure that they are appropriately prepared. In accordance with the University of Guelph guidelines, students are required to complete a qualifying examination **no later than the end of the 5th semester**. This is the same deadline by which all PhD students must have completed their first presentation to the large group in Research Seminar (see [PhD Schedule of Dates and Deadlines](#)).

The FRAN PhD QE consists of two components (written and oral) both of which are guided by a contextual statement and reading list. The QE covers theory, specialization in a field of research literature, and research methodology. Upon completing all required courses and the QE satisfactorily, the student will be deemed to have met the departmental standards and will become a candidate for the PhD degree. If not accomplished during semester 4, the qualifying examination is completed in semester 5. ***Whether the student has completed the written component or not, the qualifying examination must be held by the end of semester 5.*** A decision of FAIL will be the normal outcome if the written component is not submitted in time for the qualifying exam, and a second exam can be scheduled, within 6 months, at the discretion of the examination committee.

NOTE: Students do not register for UNIV*7000 Doctoral Qualifying Examination. Rather, the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies adds the course to the student's transcript once the QE result has been reported to them by the department.

COMPONENTS OF THE QUALIFYING EXAMINATION

In consultation with their QE committee, each student prepares a document (Contextual Statement & Reading List) that sets up the parameters for their QE. Students must pass the written take-home component to proceed to the oral component. Students must pass both components (oral and written) to pass the QE. Each

component is explained in more detail below. *A checklist of responsibilities and timelines is provided in Appendix E.*

1) Contextual Statement & Reading List

The contextual statement (1.5-2 single spaced pages) consists of three paragraphs: one related to each grouping (i.e., Theory, Research Specialization, and Research Methodology) followed by the approved Reading List for all three areas. The contextual statement is intended to provide the rationale for the selected reading list and an overview of the key question(s) the student intends to address within each set of readings. It must be clear to which reading list each selected reading pertains. The approximate number of items for each of the three groupings for the reading list are as follows: 20-40 items for Theory, 20-40 items for Research Specialization (20-40 items), and 15-20 items for Research Methodology. Items may include articles, book chapters, or books; if full books are included, the total number of items should be reduced to reflect the greater length of the books.

By early May, students are expected to provide a draft reading list and the corresponding contextual statement paragraphs to their Advisor. In consultation with the student, the Advisor adds/removes readings, suggests changes, and sends the document to the QE committee members for comments and additional reading list inclusion suggestions (staying within the maximum reading list numbers) prior to a committee meeting to discuss and clarify the student's interests. Feedback is provided to the student at the meeting and edits made within two weeks, at which time the edited document is submitted to Advisor/committee for final approval. Committee members are expected to stay within the two week timeframe; if something occurs that delays this feedback, students will be allotted an equivalent amount of additional time for their remaining deadlines. The final approved document should be available to students by end of May (Semester 3).

Within the first week of June, the Advisor forwards a copy of the approved Contextual Statement & Reading List document to the Graduate Program Assistant for student's file along with the completed [QE "Contextual Statement and Reading List" Approval Form](#). Once the reading list is finalized and approved, no further changes can be made. [Please ensure that all committee members have agreed to subsequent due dates on the form, so that everyone can plan their Fall semester accordingly.]

Students are expected to read, synthesize, and critically evaluate the readings from the middle of April until the end of August (Semester 3) in preparation for the written and oral components.

2) Written (take-home) Component

The QE committee develops six questions for the student to answer as part of their take-home examination. This is to be completed in a collaborative manner, utilizing the contextual statement and reading list as a guide. Each committee member will provide at least one question, collaborating to ensure that the six questions include the following: two questions relating to theory, two questions relating to the research specialization, one question relating to the research methodology, and one question that covers multiple lists.

- On the agreed upon date (in the first week of September¹), students will receive from their QE committee the six take-home examination questions by 9am on a weekday.
- Students must answer four of the six questions with at least one question from each reading list and one additional question. Each answer must be no more than 12 pages, excluding repetition of question at the beginning of the paper and references, using a 12 Times New Roman font, 2.0 line spacing, 1" margins, and the most recent referencing style (as agreed on by student and QE committee).
- All responses must be saved in one document, with the question at the beginning of each response and a reference list at the end of each response. This document must be submitted to the UNIV*7500 CourseLink

¹ Students can choose to select an earlier date; however, this is only allowable with full consent from their QE committee and with corresponding changes to the scheduled dates for the remaining components. All of these dates must be indicated on the QE Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form.

site to the “Written drafts” dropbox so that a Turnitin report can be produced; a copy of this report must be submitted with the written component.

- The written component is to be submitted to the QE committee along with the Turnitin report and required supplementary materials via email by students by 4pm on the agreed upon date within the first week of October (date is 4 weeks after questions provided, Semester 4).

Supplementary materials: Students are required to submit a copy of their CV including details on research experience to-date (e.g., research-related positions, knowledge dissemination activities), a copy of their unofficial transcript with average showing, and a summary of all student progress report rankings to-date (obtained from their advisor along with any needed contextual clarification such as being on leave).

The student is able to consult with members of the qualifying examination committee during the course of writing their responses for clarification of the examination question(s), access to reference materials, etc. The written material may not be shared by students (or reviewed by examiners) until the QE has been completed and submitted for evaluation.

3) Oral Component

The oral component of the QE involves a defence of the written component. This is a **closed** session, only including the student and members of the QE committee. This defence typically occurs for 1.5-2 hours. See note below re: scheduling of the oral component. After the questioning period, the student leaves the room and there is a closed discussion among members of the examination committee, considering all components of the Qualifying Exam.

The student will proceed to the oral defence only if the written component is deemed defensible. Students are given 1 week to prepare for outcome 1, and 2 weeks to prepare for outcome 2. (see “Assessment of the Qualifying Examination” section for details on these outcomes). The oral component should be scheduled no later than the first week of November, Semester 4. The date of the oral component is negotiated between the student and the QE committee. From an administrative perspective, the room booking of the oral defence is coordinated through the Graduate Program Assistant, typically informed by the advisor.

The student will begin the oral defense with a 15-20 minute oral presentation. Use this time as an opportunity to do any of the following:

- Build on your written responses;
- Address gaps in your written responses; and/or
- Demonstrate how your thinking has changed since your written responses (reminder that there is about a one month gap between submission and oral).
- **Tip:** Avoid only providing a summary of your written responses (as your audience is comprised of only your QE committee).

Following the presentation, there will typically be two rounds of questions (e.g., average of 10-15 minutes per examiner). In oral defense, the student may be asked about written responses and other readings from the reading lists. The committee may also ask questions about the supplementary materials to obtain further information on research potential (e.g., questions about additional research projects the student has been involved with). The question order will begin with the members of the committee not on the advisory committee, then the advisory committee member, followed by the advisor.

Written Feedback: Within one week following a successful QE oral examination, the advisor will provide the student with a written compilation of the committee’s feedback, highlighting the student’s strengths and areas for improvement related to each of the learning outcomes associated with the QE. A copy of this feedback must also be sent to the Graduate Program Assistant, for placement in the student’s file.

ASSESSMENT OF THE QUALIFYING EXAMINATION

The purpose of the qualifying examination is to assess students' knowledge of the relevant subject matter and their ability to critically analyze, integrate, and evaluate theoretical, methodological, and substantive knowledge, and to assess their preparedness to undertake research for the PhD dissertation and develop an analysis of their research findings. As such, students are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the foundations of relevant theories and demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the broad literature in the field as well as theoretical and methodological approaches relevant to that specific field.

Written and oral defenses add rigour and demonstrate different and complementary skill sets, and give the opportunity to demonstrate capacity across the QE competencies. Thus, students will be assessed on the following competencies for each response using the provided rubric (see Appendix F):

1. Ability to use, describe, and evaluate theory;
2. Specialization in an area of research literature that will serve as a broad basis for the doctoral thesis proposal ;
3. Demonstration of proficiency in and critical consideration of research methodology that will serve as a broad basis for the doctoral thesis proposal;
4. Ability to demonstrate independent writing;
5. Ability to communicate and synthesize information, arguments, and analyses, accurately and reliably in oral and written forms;
6. Ability to construct a logical argument and to see flaws in other arguments;
7. Ability to construct well-written paper(s), using the most recent, discipline-specific style of referencing; and
8. Demonstration of professional and ethical behaviour, completing the QE process with academic integrity and professional and social responsibility.

As a qualifying examination, consideration is to be given by the examining committee not only (1) to the student's knowledge of the subject matter and ability to integrate the material derived from their studies, but also (2) to the student's ability and promise in research. The examining committee, therefore, will review the student's CV and transcript as further evidence of the student's potential as a researcher prior to the oral deliberations. The examining committee will also receive from the advisory committee a written evaluation of the quality of the student's research performance to-date and of the student's potential as a researcher prior to the oral deliberations. The examining committee will determine the relative importance to be given to these two major components of the qualifying examination.

The students will be deemed to have passed the qualifying examination if not more than one member of the examining committee votes negatively on each component of the QE. An abstention will be regarded as a negative vote. The QE Chair communicates the results (pass or fail) to the Dean of Graduate Studies by completing the **Report on Qualifying Examination Form** and provides detailed written feedback to the student. Within our department, there are three possible outcomes to the written component:

Outcome 1: Passed Written Component – Proceed to the oral component

- The QE committee agrees that at least three of the four written answers are defensible and all of the QE competencies have been demonstrated to a satisfactory level and hence the student may proceed to the oral component. The student is given one week to prepare for their oral component.

Outcome 2: Written Component Conditional Pass – Proceed to oral component with feedback

- The QE committee agrees that at least two of the four written answers are defensible but are divided on at least two of the responses and/or assessed at least one of the QE competencies as not demonstrated to a satisfactory level. Therefore, the student is given general written feedback about key areas that they need to address in a satisfactory manner during the oral component. The student is given two weeks to prepare for their oral component.

Outcome 3: Failed Written Component – Rewrite due to quality of work issues

- If a student submits more than two written answers that the QE committee deems to be not defensible, then the student has to resubmit two to three written answers (students are given one week per re-written response). Committee must relay this decision (via QE Chair) within three weeks of QE submission to both student and Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (OGPS).
- Oral defense (provided defensible rewritten answers) is to be scheduled no later than the first week of January (Semester 5).

If the student passes on their first written component, but fails on the first oral exam, they will redo the oral exam within three weeks of the failure (before end of first week of December, Semester 4). QE Chair must relay this decision to student and OGPS. In this case, clear written communication to student from committee on quality issues is required (through QE Chair).

Note: Fails automatically constitute “unsatisfactory” on Graduate Student Progress Report unless the student passes their second attempt within the same semester.

If the student fails any two attempts (e.g., both written OR one written and one oral OR both oral), the QE Chair will submit a formal Required to Withdraw (RTW) recommendation to the Board of Graduate Studies via OGPS.

TIPS FOR STUDENTS TO CONSIDER DURING THE QUALIFYING EXAMINATION PROCESS

- The QE process is the point in your program where you gain specialization in an area of research literature and methodology, in addition to further developing your communication and critical thinking skills.
- Remember that passing the qualifying examination should be your first priority during the first four semesters of your doctoral program. The qualifying examination determines whether you will be allowed to continue in the program.
- Be sure that you and your advisor meet regularly during this period to help you keep on track.
- Make time for research and writing, especially in semester 4. It is advisable to arrange your time accordingly during this time. For example, you may plan to reduce your course load during this time and avoid taking on responsibilities such as teaching a course.
- It is possible that written responses from your QE process could be developed into publishable papers; if you wish to consider this, please consult with your advisor following completion of your QE.

Appendix E

QE Timelines and Responsibilities Chart

QE Stage:	Task <i>(Note: Required Forms Listed in Bold)</i>	Timeframe	Responsible
SEMESTER 1/2			
Preparatory work	Consideration of research specialization in discussion with Advisor. Begin literature review and reading in area to prepare ideas for contextual statement and content for reading list.	September through April	Student in collaboration with Advisor
SEMESTER 2			
Form QE Committee	Submit signed QE Committee Appointment Form to Graduate Program Assistant.	Mid-April	Advisor in collaboration with Student
	Overview of QE process to QE committee members external to the department.	End of April	Advisor
SEMESTER 3			
Contextual Statement and Reading List	Submit contextual statement and reading lists to Advisor for review. Ensure separate sections for each of the 3 groupings: Theory (20-40 items), Research Specialization (20-40 items), and Research Methodology (15-20 items).	Early-May	Student
	Meet as a committee with student to discuss contextual statement, provide feedback and additional readings list inclusions for contextual statement and reading list.	Mid-May	Student & QE Committee
	Incorporate feedback from QE committee and edit contextual statement and reading lists.	Mid- to Late-May	Student
	Review edited contextual statement and reading lists for approval.	Late-May	QE Committee
	PhD QE Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form (with attachment) submitted to Graduate Program Assistant. QE committee and student receives the final approved version of Contextual Statement and Reading List document.	First week of June	Advisor
Reading	Student carefully read, synthesize, and critically evaluate their reading list items, paying attention to their contextual statement and the QE Competencies.	Mid-April to Late-August	Student

QE Stage:	Task (Note: Required Forms Listed in Bold)	Timeframe	Responsible
Prep QE Questions	Decide who will provide which type of QE questions (Reminder: 2 related to theory; 2 related to research specialization; 1 related to research methodology; and 1 that covers multiple lists). [Note: This process can be facilitated by having a meeting to discuss and plan for the questions.]	Between May and beginning of August	Advisor in collaboration with QE Committee
	Compile questions received from QE committee members, edit if required to avoid duplication, and send questions back to the QE committee for approval prior to submitting to the student.	Mid- to Late-August	Advisor
SEMESTER 4			
Written Component	Release 6 take-home exam questions to student (cc QE committee and Graduate Program Assistant). Students respond to at least 1 question from each grouping (theory, research specialization, and research methodology), along with another question from any of the groupings.	First week September (date specified in the Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form) [Must be sent to the student by 9am on a weekday]	Advisor
	Submit written responses to the 4 selected questions to QE Committee Members 4 weeks after receipt of take-home exam question. All responses saved in one document, with the question noted at the beginning of each response and a reference list at the end of each response. Along with question responses, submit required supplementary materials (CV, unofficial transcript with average showing, and summary of all student progress report rankings to-date).	First week October (date specified in the Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form) [Must be submitted by 4pm on a weekday]	Student
	Submit request for QE paperwork (i.e., Report on Qualifying Exam) to the Office of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (OGPS).	First week October	Graduate Program Assistant
	Individually assess each written reading response and document feedback using rubric (see Appendix F). Note: As 65% is the minimum level for a pass at a graduate level, rubric ratings must all be at or above the "Fair" level.	Two weeks following submission of responses	QE Committee

QE Stage:	Task (Note: Required Forms Listed in Bold)	Timeframe	Responsible
	QE Committee meets to discuss collective assessment.	Two weeks after submission of responses (third week of October; date specified in the Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form)	QE Committee (includes QE Chair)
	Notify student of the outcome of the collective deliberations (cc QE committee and Graduate Program Assistant): Outcome 1 (pass written – proceed to oral); Outcome 2 (conditional pass written – proceed to oral with feedback*); or Outcome 3 (fail written – rewrite).	Three weeks after student submits written responses	Advisor/QE Chair communicates outcomes to the student.
	Letter addressed to QE chair signed by all members of the advisory committee; evaluates the student’s capacity to complete independent research based on the activities and evidence accumulated to-date, comments on the GRA/GSA and other areas of skill development.	One week prior to oral defence.	Advisor, in consultation with Advisory Committee
Written Component Re-write (if applicable)	Submits re-written responses to the required questions to QE Committee Members. All responses saved in one document, with the question noted at the beginning of each response and a reference list at the end of each response. Along with question responses, submit required supplementary materials (CV, unofficial transcript with average showing, and summary of all student progress report rankings to-date).	One week per re-written response; two to three weeks, depending on number requiring re-writing.	Student
Re-written Component (if applicable)	Notify student of the outcome of the collective deliberations (cc QE committee and Graduate Program Assistant): Outcome 1 (pass written – proceed to oral); or Outcome 2 (conditional pass written – proceed to oral with feedback*).	Within three weeks of student’s re-submission.	Advisor/QE Chair communicates outcomes to the student.

QE Stage:	Task (Note: Required Forms Listed in Bold)	Timeframe	Responsible
Oral Component	Student provides a 15-20-minute oral presentation	Outcome 1 – first week November (one week following notification of outcome; date specified in the Contextual Statement and Reading List Approval Form); Outcome 2 – second week of November (two weeks following notification of outcome); or Outcome 3 no later than first week of January	Student QE Committee
	Committee discusses student’s performance	During deliberations	QE Committee Members
Post-QE	Provide student with a summary of strengths and areas for improvement related to the QE Competencies for both the written and oral components. Send a copy to the Graduate Program Assistant (to archive in student’s file).	1 week post successfully Oral Component	QE Chair

*Note: Given this is an examination context, it is important that all feedback provided to the student is written in a manner that does not do the intellectual work for the student.

Appendix F

QE Written Component Assessment Rubric

CATEGORY	Competency	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Introduction/ Purpose	5, 6, 7	*exceptional introduction in which purpose and relevance are well-established **purpose is exceptionally clear, well-developed, and rational.	*proficient introduction of topic/purpose that is relevant. **purpose is clear and rational.	*basic introduction in which topic is stated but lacks relevance. **purpose is somewhat clear and rational.	*weak or no introduction of topic. **the topic or purpose is unclear, weak or missing.
Quality of Information/ Evidence	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	*topic is exceptionally presented (coherent), extremely detailed, and historically accurate. **information clearly relates to the purpose.	*information relates to the main topic. **paper is well-presented in detail and from a variety of sources.	*information relates to the main topic, few details and/or examples are given. **a limited variety of sources used.	*information has little or nothing to do with the topic/purpose. **information has weak or no connection to the topic.
Support of Topic/ Purpose/ Analysis	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	*exceptionally critical, relevant and consistent connections made between evidence and topic/purpose. **excellent analysis.	*consistent connections made between evidence and topic/purpose **good analysis.	*some connections made between evidence and topic/purpose. **some analysis.	*limited or no connections made between evidence and purpose. **lack of analysis.
Organization/ Development of Research Paper	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	*exceptionally clear, logical, mature, and thorough development of topic with excellent transitions between and within paragraphs.	*clear and logical order that supports topic with good transitions between and within paragraphs.	*somewhat clear and logical development with basic transitions between and within paragraphs.	*lacks development of ideas with weak or no transitions between and within paragraphs.
Conclusion	1, 2, 3, 5, 6	*excellent summary of topic with concluding ideas that are impactful.	*good summary of topic with clear concluding ideas.	*basic summary of topic with some final concluding ideas.	*lack of summary of topic.

CATEGORY	Competency	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Scientific Style	5, 7, 8	<p>*style is scientific, logical and objective. Note: one study does not yield definitive knowledge of a finding so phrase appropriately. Use past tense when appropriate.</p> <p>**word choice is specific, purposeful, dynamic and varied.</p> <p>***sentences are clear, concise and to the point.</p>	<p>*scientific style is used that is logical and objective.</p> <p>**word choice is specific and purposeful, and somewhat varied throughout.</p> <p>***sentences are mostly clear, concise, and to the point.</p>	<p>*scientific style is used that is appropriate for given purpose.</p> <p>**word choice is often unspecific, generic, redundant, and clichéd.</p> <p>***sentences are somewhat unclear or not concise.</p>	<p>*style is inappropriate or does not address given purpose, etc.</p> <p>**word choice is excessively redundant, clichéd, and unspecific.</p> <p>***sentences are very unclear.</p>
Citation Format, Usage, & References	7, 8	<p>*control of grammar, usage, and mechanics.</p> <p>**entirely free of spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors. Avoid using quotations unless absolutely necessary.</p> <p>***reference entries entirely correct.</p>	<p>*may contain a few spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors.</p> <p>**reference entries mostly correct.</p>	<p>*contains several spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors which detract from the paper's readability.</p> <p>**frequent errors in reference format.</p>	<p>*so many spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors that the paper cannot be understood.</p> <p>**references lack format/numerous errors.</p>

QEs are recorded on student transcripts simply as “SAT” (satisfied); however, for evaluation and feedback purposes, the following grading scale is included: A+ 90-100% • A 85-89 (Excellent) • A- 80-84 • B+ 77-79 • B 73-76 (Good) • B- 70-72 • C+ 67-69 • C 65-66 (Fair) • F 0-64 (Poor)

Additional Comments: