This message is for HD PhD students:

Here’s the Annual Review Memo that explains the process and gives the deadline date. In a few minutes I will send you an update of the report you submitted last year unless you sent it to me as a pdf instead of a word file. If possible, please send me your new report as a word file so I can update it for you next year.

TO: HD Graduate Students in the PhD Program

FROM: Elaine Wethington, Current Director of Graduate Studies
Richard Depue, Director of Graduate Studies beginning July 1, 2013

RE: Graduate Student Review

DATE: April 19, 2013

The Graduate Review Committee of the field of Human Development reviews the progress of all continuing graduate students at the end of each spring semester. This review has two main purposes: (a) to provide feedback on performance and progress that might be helpful to students and their Special Committees, and (b) to evaluate relative qualifications for various types of financial support. Students must submit an annual review to be considered for departmental support the next year.

The Graduate Review Committee consists of four graduate faculty members elected for two-year terms, and the Director of Graduate Studies, ex-officio. In the election process, graduate students are first asked to nominate faculty members to the committee. Graduate faculty then vote for persons from the slate nominated by graduate students. The 2012-2013 committee members are Steve Ceci, Cindy Hazan, Corinna Loeckenhoff, Anthony Ong, and Elaine Wethington, (non-voting DGS).

Review Committee members read the files of continuing students and independently arrive at an overall rating for each student. The general criteria that guide the Review Committee's judgments include the following:

1. **Academic Progress.** For students early in their doctoral program, evaluation is based mainly on the number, scope, and level of courses and seminars taken and the extent to which they reflect a coherent program of study that builds strength in the major and minor areas of concentration, as well as grades and written evaluations from instructors. For more advanced students, evaluation is based mainly on the timely completion of field and Graduate School requirements such as pre-doctoral research projects (or Master's thesis) and the Admission to Candidacy Examination.

2. **Research Progress.** Reviewers typically look for evidence of productive involvement in research that is appropriate to a student's level of training and time in the program. This research experience may have been acquired through special studies with the major advisor or some other faculty member, through assistantship responsibilities, through independent research on a pre-doctoral project, Master's thesis, or Ph.D. thesis, etc. Research progress can also be indicated by research presentations at professional meetings, submission and publication of research manuscripts, etc.

3. **Assistantship Experiences and Contributions.** Reviewers examine the nature of assistantship experiences, the responsibilities assigned, the quality of performance in carrying out assistantship
responsibilities, and the contributions made in teaching, research, and/or extension assignments (paid or volunteer).

4. **Annual Report by Student.** Reviewers consult a student's annual report to understand a student's academic and professional goals, to determine how the current and projected program of graduate education (courses, seminars, research involvement, etc.) serve these goals, to assess academic and research progress, to review a student's history of support, and to examine a student's written work.

After members of the Graduate Review Committee have completed their ratings, the Review Committee meets and each student's folder is discussed. Summary comments concerning the strengths and/or weaknesses of a student's program and funding for the next academic year are then communicated to the student and the Chair of the student's Special Committee.

In addition to the considerations listed above, the Field has also specified the following criteria for support eligibility (see the HD Graduate Field Handbook and the First Year Student Survival Guide).

1. The "A" examination should be passed prior to beginning the seventh unit of residence (this is also a Graduate School requirement).

2. Ph.D. students who have completed ten units of residence are normally eligible for departmental (and some fellowship) support only after all eligible students with fewer than ten units have been supported. Ten units of residence typically represent five years of study for students entering with B.A. or B.S. degrees.

All continuing students should submit review folders even if they are not requesting departmental financial support for the upcoming academic year.

---

The following materials are required for each student's review folder. All materials for your review must be returned as word files to Bonnie Biata by **May 24, 2013**.

1. **Evaluation Forms from Faculty**
   A. Evaluation Form from the chair of your special committee.
   B. Evaluation Form from each Minor Member of your Special Committee.
   C. Evaluation Form from each person supervising you in a Research or Teaching Assistantship during the current academic year.
   D. Evaluation Form from Fall and Spring HD course instructors. (Evaluations from courses outside HD are optional).

II. **Student's Annual Report:**

III. **Student’s Vita:**

IV. A sample of your written work (e.g., thesis, grant proposal, conference presentation, manuscript).

Each student is responsible for providing all materials for his or her folder. Please check with Bonnie Biata at least a week before the deadline to see if any materials are missing so you can remind faculty members.

**The deadline for completing the assembly of review folders is May 24, 2013.**

xc: HD Graduate Faculty