



Oregon State University

College of Health

Annual Academic Process & Review Form **Graduate Students in HDFS**

Due Dates: **June 1st (student)**
 June 15th (faculty)

Graduate students are reviewed on an annual basis by the student's advisor/major professor(s). The annual academic review should be completed every academic year.

Timeline to complete the annual academic review process:

1. STUDENT Prior to June 1, submits the following documents to the Graduate Program Manager:
 - a. Written student self-review (see explanation below)
 - b. Latest approved Program of Study (if completed)
 - c. Annual Academic Review Form, with Section A completed
2. STUDENT Schedules a meeting with their major professor(s) to discuss the student's academic progress and annual review. This meeting should take place between June 4 and June 15, after the HDFS Graduate Faculty Review Meeting.
3. FACULTY & STUDENT During the meeting, 1) the student and major professor(s) will discuss the student's academic progress using the documents submitted by the student earlier; 2) the major professor(s) will complete the faculty review of student section; and 3) the student and major professor(s) will sign the document's signature page.
4. FACULTY Completed and signed forms, along with the documents submitted to the major professor(s) for review are then sent to the graduate program manager no later than June 15.

EXPLANATION OF REVIEW CRITERIA

The annual academic review is focused on the extent to which the student is making satisfactory academic progress in relation the HDFS Roadmap for Timely Completion, shown below, as approved by the faculty 09/2017.

HDFS Roadmap for Timely Degree Completion

Attending graduate school represents a substantial investment on the part of both the student and the faculty. The return on this investment is optimized when students make timely progress toward their terminal degrees.

Clear communication about expectations for student progress is therefore paramount. In the spirit of promoting such communication, the HDFS Graduate Committee has created the following roadmap for successful completion of the PhD:

Typical Timeline for HDFS Graduate Students:

Benchmark	Enter Without Master's		Enter With Master's	
	Expected	Deadline	Expected	Deadline
Identify Thesis Topic	End of Year 1	End of Year 1	n/a	n/a
Submit MS Program of Study	End of Year 1	Fall of Year 2	n/a	n/a
Propose Thesis	Fall of Year 2	End of Year 2	n/a	n/a
Defend Thesis/Thesis-Like Project	End of Year 2	End of Year 3	End of Year 1	End of Year 1
Form Dissertation Committee	Fall of Year 3	Fall of Year 4	Fall of Year 2	End of Year 2

Submit PhD Program of Study	Winter of Year 3	Winter of Year 4	Winter of Year 2	Fall of Year 3
Complete Written and Oral Comprehensive Exams	End of Year 3	End of Year 4	Fall of Year 3	Fall of Year 4
Propose Dissertation	End of Year 4	End of Year 5	End of Year 3	End of Year 4
Defend Dissertation	End of Year 5	End of Year 6	End of Year 4	End of Year 5

The above roadmap provides students and faculty guidance for understanding expectations for timely academic progress but is not strictly prescriptive. An individual student's rate of progress may deviate from the above roadmap with approval of the major professor and HDFS graduate faculty.

Students who fail to reach any end-of-year benchmark should be more thoroughly assessed to determine whether or not they are making satisfactory academic progress. Students who fail to reach any of the above benchmarks will be classified into one of the following categories by majority vote of a committee consisting of: two standing members of the HDFS graduate committee and one Head of the School of Social and Behavioral Health Sciences. In order to provide students with a safe space in which he or she can openly discuss barriers to adequate progress, the student's primary advisor cannot serve as a member of the committee. The primary advisor will instead prepare written statements that describe barriers to progress and will provide these statements to the review committee. The review committee will meet with the student in person to discuss barriers to progress. Based on all evidence, the committee will then classify the student into one of three categories and will work with the student and faculty to create a new plan for achieving satisfactory academic progress. This new plan must be filed with the SOBE Doctoral Programs Manager and will supersede the timing of benchmarks listed above. Possible classifications for students who fail to meet one or more benchmarks:

- **Satisfactory, but not timely, progress:** Students in this designation have missed one or more acceptable deadlines but are likely to reach all benchmarks associated with missed deadlines within two academic terms (not including summer term). This designation will not impact eligibility for assistantships (i.e., GTA or GRA assignments), but students with this designation will not be eligible to receive program-determined fellowships.

- **Satisfactory, but not timely progress due to hardship:** Students with this determination have missed one or more acceptable deadlines, but the committee has determined that the student would have met all acceptable deadlines were it not for an unanticipated hardship. Hardships may include personal hardships (e.g., major illness or injury, death of a close family member) or professional hardships (e.g., an unanticipated barrier to data collection). A designation of not making timely progress due to hardship will not impact a student's eligibility for fellowships or assistantships.
- **Not satisfactory progress:** Students in this designation have missed one or more acceptable deadlines. The committee has furthermore determined that this failure was not the result of a hardship and that the student is not likely to reach all benchmarks associated with missed deadlines within two academic terms (not including summer term). Students with this designation are not eligible for program-determined fellowships and will be reported to the Graduate School as not making adequate academic progress. Students with this designation are therefore ineligible to receive assistantships (i.e., GTA or GRA assignments).

Students may submit a letter of rebuttal to their major professor(s) if they do not agree with any part of the major professor(s)'s evaluation. Any rebuttal(s) must be submitted along with the final review to be filed in the student's file.

EXPLANATION OF REVIEWS

Student Self-Review

The student self-review should address the criteria used in the assessment of satisfactory academic progress as your statement serves as a foundation for the review with your major professor(s). In a minimum of two paragraphs, please evaluate your academic progress. Address the following as relevant: performance in coursework and Program of Study, completion of Written Comprehensive Exam, completion of Preliminary Oral Exam and approval of proposal, work on dissertation, assistantship(s) and assistantship performance, independent research, awards, honor, professional activities, etc. Also address your plans for the coming academic year.

Faculty Review of Student

Use the student's self-review, the completed Annual Academic Review Form from the student, as well as any assistantship evaluations provided by the School, as a basis for your discussion with the student about their academic progress. Please comment on important and relevant points related to educational and scholarly performance, progress toward benchmarks, as well as any additional information providing context for performance (e.g., skill development, productivity and time-management, noted growth, agency, and/or actions in based on previous annual review). Please also provide specific recommendation(s) for the coming academic year(s) for facilitating student progress moving forward, as well as any additional relevant issues discussed during your meeting.

Annual Academic Review Form Acknowledgements

All review materials, including the student's self-review, are placed in the student's permanent file within the School.

Signatures (below) confirm that the student and major professor(s) have discussed the review materials and that the student has received a copy of the materials. Student signatures do not indicate agreement or disagreement.

Date of Review:

Major Professor(s) Name (print):

Major Professor(s) Signature(s):

Graduate Student Name (print):

Graduate Student Signature:

Annual Academic Process & Review Form Graduate Students in HDFS

Due Dates: **June 1st (students)**
 June 15th (faculty)

SECTION A – Student to complete prior to meeting with major professor(s).

Student Name: _____ *Date:* _____
Major Professor(s): _____
Start Term/Year: _____ *Year in Program:* _____
Current Degree Program: MS PhD

MS Program Benchmarks

Thesis topic identified? Yes No N/A

What is the topic? If "No", indicate timeline for identification:

--	--

Thesis committee formed? Yes No N/A

Who are the committee members? If "No", indicate timeline for formation:

--	--

MS Program of Study submitted? Yes No N/A

Month/Year submitted? If "No", indicate timeline for submission:

--	--

Thesis successfully proposed? Yes No N/A

Month/Year of proposal? If "No", indicate timeline for proposal:

What is the title of thesis proposal?	

Thesis successfully defended? Yes No N/A

Month/Year of defense? If "No", indicate timeline for defense:

What is the title of final thesis?	

PhD Program Benchmarks

Thesis-like project* completed? Yes No N/A

Month/Year of completion? If "No", indicate timeline for completion:

What is the title of thesis-like project?	

**Thesis-like project requirement only applies to students who were directly admitted into the PhD program*

Dissertation topic identified? Yes No N/A

What is the topic? If "No", indicate timeline for identification:

--	--

Dissertation committee formed? Yes No N/A

Who are the committee members? If "No", indicate timeline for formation:

--	--

PhD Program of Study submitted? Yes No N/A

Month/Year submitted? If "No", indicate timeline for submission:

--	--

Written Preliminary Exam successfully completed? Yes No N/A

Month/Year completed? If "No", indicate timeline for completion:

--	--

Oral Preliminary Exam
successfully completed?
Month/Year completed?

Yes

No

N/A

If "No", indicate timeline for completion:

--	--

Dissertation successfully proposed?
Month/Year of proposal?

Yes

No

N/A

If "No", indicate timeline for completion:

What is the title of dissertation proposal?	

Dissertation successfully defended?
Month/Year of defense?

Yes

No

N/A

If "No", indicate timeline for completion:

What is the final title of dissertation?	

Coursework Completed and Grades

Current Cumulative GPA: _____

Course	Cr.	Title	Term & Year Completed	Grade
Theory Courses				
HDFS 511	4	Theories of Development		
HDFS 519	4	The Life Course		
HDFS 546	4	Theories of Family Studies		
Substantive Courses				
HDFS 516	4	Child Development		
HDFS 517	4	Adolescent Development		
HDFS 518	4	Adult Development & Aging		
HDFS 533	4	Social Policy & Human Development		
HDFS 541	4	Family Studies		
Methods Courses				
H 515	3	Research Methods		
HDFS 529	1	Introductory Data Analysis with SAS		
HDFS 531	4	Applied Quantitative Methods I: ANOVA		
HDFS 532	4	Applied Quantitative Methods II: Linear Regression		
HDFS 534	4	Social Program and Policy Evaluation		
HDFS 538	4	Qualitative Research Methods I		
HDFS 539	4	Qualitative Research Methods II		
HDFS 630	3	Structural Equation Modeling		
HDFS 630	3	Longitudinal/Multilevel Modeling		
Public Health Courses				
H 523	4	Foundations of Public Health		
MS – Research and Thesis Credits				
HDFS 501	4	Research		
HDFS 503	6	Thesis		
PhD – Research and Dissertation/Thesis Credits				
HDFS 601	6	Research		
HDFS 603	36	Thesis		
Electives				
HDFS 547	3	Families and Poverty		
HDFS 587	3	Social Gerontology		
HDFS 639	4	Community-Based Participatory Research		
HDFS 665	1	Teaching in Human Development & HDFS		
HDFS 685	4	Race, Class, Culture & Aging		
All other courses taken (including PAC courses)*				

*attach a separate sheet if necessary

SECTION B – Faculty to complete during meeting with student

Faculty Review and Commentary for student

Specific recommendations (if any):

Progress Performance Rating

Satisfactory	Satisfactory, but not timely	Satisfactory, but not timely due to hardship	Not satisfactory *
--------------	---------------------------------	--	--------------------

*If "Not satisfactory", student and major professor(s) must attach a plan for improvement.