



Master Professional Review Committee Guidelines

The Master Professional Review Committee is composed of the Director of Education, a National Master Facilitator, a Class 'A' Member in the same area of expertise as the applicant, the Chairman of Education Committee, and an academic advisor.

The process for Master Professional Designation is as follows:

1. Applicant reviews application criteria and submits application package to Director of Education.
2. Application package is reviewed by Master Professional Review Committee
3. Feedback and/or approval from Review Committee will be provided to applicant by Director of Education
4. Thesis submitted by Applicant within twenty four (24) months of acceptance of the application for Master Professional
5. Applicant's sixty (60) minute oral defence of thesis to review committee
6. Recommendation from the Review Committee will go to the PGA of Canada's National Board for acceptance of Application and pending Master Professional status.
7. If Master Professional application is approved, the final thesis will be permanently placed in PGA of Canada library and website.

REVIEW COMMITTEE'S ETIQUETTE AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It is important to remember that the review committee is asked to provide an informed opinion about a thesis and then recommend it be accepted or rejected to the national board of directors. If any member of the review committee disagrees with the conclusion of the committee as a whole, it is incumbent upon the reviewer to provide definitive reasons or appropriate citations, not simply make remarks such as, "I just don't believe your data," or "It can't possibly be so." If a reviewer has a bias against the applicant, he/she should excuse him/herself from reviewing the paper. The responsibilities of a review committee member can be summarized as follows.

1. The review committee should provide an honest, critical assessment of the research. The review committee's job is to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, provide suggestions for improvement, and clearly state what must be done to raise the level of enthusiasm for the work. The review committee should not manipulate the process to force the applicant to address issues interesting or important to a review committee member but peripheral to the objective(s) of the paper.



2. The review committee should maintain confidentiality about the existence and substance of the manuscript. It is not appropriate to share the manuscript or to discuss it in detail with others or even to reveal the existence of the submission before publication.
3. The review committee must not participate in plagiarism. It is obviously a very serious transgression to take data or novel concepts from any thesis to advance your own work before the thesis is published.
4. The review committee should always avoid, or disclose, any conflicts of interest. For example, any member of the review committee should decline to review a thesis on a subject in which he/she is involved in a contentious dispute and does not feel that a fair review can be provided. The reviewer should also avoid biases that influence the scientific basis for a review. For example, if the reviewer has a close personal or professional relationship with the applicant such that his/her objectivity would be compromised. Scholarly merit should be the basis for all reviews.
5. The review committee should ensure that a reasonable degree of expertise in the applicant's area is represented on the committee to allow for an objective review. The review committee also has the unpleasant responsibility of reporting suspected duplicate publication, fraud, plagiarism, or ethical concerns
6. The review committee should review in a collegial, constructive manner. There is nothing more difficult for an applicant than to receive a sarcastic, destructive review. However, the reviewer should not shy away from discussing the weaknesses and strengths of the presentation. No one likes to have their work rejected, but a carefully worded review with appropriate suggestions for revision can be very helpful. In fact, the applicant would most likely prefer to have their paper rejected if the review process uncovered errors in the study.
7. Reviewing is both a privilege and responsibility. It takes time to prepare a useful, critical review. Moreover, it clearly is a service to the PGA of Canada, to the golf industry at large, and to the reviewer because the reviewer becomes privy to the latest in cutting-edge research. Peer review is the heart and soul of scientific publishing and should be an integral part of the PGA of Canada's policy on Master Professional designation. The most important reward for you as a member of the review committee is your contribution to the quality of published work for the PGA of Canada's.



REVIEW GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSIONS

Proposed Topic: The committee shall review the proposed topics based on the following criteria.

- 1) Clear thesis statement - what is being argued? What is being researched?
- 2) Will the paper add to the knowledge base of the PGA of Canada in a meaningful and beneficial manner?

The thesis statement must include the following details:

- Information about the overall goals of the proposal
- The proposed methods of research such as literature review and data collection
- Methods of analysis of the collected data and synthesis of reviewed information
- Anticipated advances to golf science or the go
- If industry that will result from the thesis
- Proposed Length for the statement: 200-300 words

Thesis Paper:

The committee shall review the thesis paper based on the following criteria:

- 1) Rationale - why is this work important? What does it contribute to the PGA of Canada and the golf industry?
- 2) The writing should be stylistically acceptable and grammatically correct - there should be very few, if any, mechanical errors. There should be a logical organization to the material and the paper must follow the guidelines as set out in the APA format.
- 3) Is the research method consistent with the question asked? Different claims (normative and empirical) require different kind of evidence and argument.
- 4) Do the conclusions drawn follow logically from the research/study? In other words, are the claimed implications of the thesis supported by the work?

Oral Defense:

The committee shall review the oral defense based on the following criteria:

1. Did the applicant clearly articulate the main points of the paper in the time allocated?
2. Did the oral defense conclusions match with the written material presented?
3. Was the applicant able to successfully answer all questions posed by the review committee?