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First Review

A. Purpose

1. To monitor and evaluate the student’s progress in the doctoral program; and

2. To advise the student on plans for his/her program of study.

B. Scheduling

The first review will be scheduled when the student has completed approximately 18 hours of graduate credit in PETE doctoral program at the University of Texas at Austin.

The review will be scheduled twice during the year: A Friday afternoon in October and in April, respectively.

C. Procedures

Students must complete and submit a Request for First Year Review form to the Program Adviser of the PETE program before September 15th for the October review, or before March 15th for the April review.

The Request for First Year Review will require that the student provide the following information:

- A list of all courses completed at UT with grades noted.
- Vitae.
- A one-page written summary of the student’s academic and experiential background that is education related.
- A one-page written statement of the student’s career goals and a plan of engagement for future research.
- One example of an empirical or data driven project.

The review also consists of an interview with the PETE faculty about the previous information.

D. Review Criteria

1. A grade point of at least 3.0 maintained over the 18 hours with no grade lower than a B. Any course grade lower than a B will be subject to further review by the First Year Review Panel, and the instructor of the course in question. A GPA below 3.0 could lead to dismissal from the program.

2. At least one course in research methodology (either Intro to Qualitative Research, Intro to Quantitative Research or Systems of Inquiry);
3. A minimum of 9 of the first 18 hours of course work to have been taken in the PETE program area.

4. No more than 3 semester hours taken Credit/No credit in the initial 18 hours.

5. At least submitting one conference abstract.

6. Attending at least one professional conference.

7. At least 20 hours of engagement in research based activities.

E. Decisions

Decisions will be made by consensus of the PETE faculty as to whether the student should be recommended for continuation, probation, or termination from the program.

Probation conditions will be specified for each probationary student. It is expected that conditions will entail such prescription as coursework, independent readings, etc.

Dismissal options will follow recommendations of the Graduate School.

F. Reporting Procedures

The Faculty will provide feedback for each student reviewed within two weeks following the review by email and a copy will be maintained in the student's file. The results of the review will also be sent to all members of the PETE faculty.

Mid-Program Review:

A. Purpose

1. To monitor and evaluate the student’s progress in the doctoral program; and

2. To advise the student on plans for his/her program of study and preparation for Candidacy Examination and Review.

B. Scheduling

The Mid-program Review will be conducted by area faculty sometime between the student’s 27th and 36th hours of completed coursework.

The review will be scheduled twice during the year: A Friday afternoon in October and in April, respectively.

C. Procedures

Students are expected to be actively involved in research as part of their doctoral studies before the Mid-Program Review. As part of their doctoral experience, students will likely complete a study (or
series of studies) under the direction of faculty. The Mid-Program Review focuses on the student’s involvement in research.

Students will be required to submit the following documents to the PETE program adviser by September 15th for the October review or by March 15th for the April review.

- A portfolio documenting their research activities, which should include all research activities completed during enrollment in the doctoral program.
- Vitae.
- A list of all courses completed at UT with grades noted.

Students will present an oral report of their work to the PETE faculty (not to exceed 15 minutes) at the scheduled review. Faculty may ask questions related to the contents of the research portfolio.

Faculty will also review the student’s program of work and performance. Students will be given an opportunity to describe their plans for program completion (e.g., schedule of course, research plans).

D. Review Criteria

Faculty members will independently assess the student’s developing abilities as a researcher, the quality and rigor of research completed, and academic preparation in light of the expectations and requirements of doctoral candidacy.

Once the student’s oral presentation is completed, the PETE area faculty will discuss the student’s portfolio, and judge its merits. All faculty will vote whether a student passes, passes with conditions, or fails the Mid-Program review.

Split decisions or ambiguity of judgment may necessitate review of the research report by any additional faculty member selected by the committee.

E. Decision

Decisions will be made by consensus of the Area faculty. A Mid-Program Review will result in one of the several decisions.

A decision of Pass means the student will be invited to continue work in the program as planned. A decision of Pass typically will also include a recommendation to the Graduate Adviser that the student may precede with the Candidacy Exams at the appropriate time.

A decision of Pass with Conditions means the student will be allowed to continue work in the program as long as certain conditions are met. The imposition of these conditions is intended to help the student strengthen areas that are of concern to the faculty (e.g., additional research coursework, additional involvement in research projects).

Dismissal options will carry the recommendation that the student drop from the program or that the student redo the Mid-Program review during the next administration period. In the case of a recommendation to redo, the student will be given specific suggestions on how to strengthen areas of weakness. A dismissal recommendation will be exercised with strict adherence to the guidelines of the Graduate School.
F. Reporting Procedures

The Faculty will provide feedback for each student reviewed and will circulate that recommendation to all members of the PETE faculty. This will be communicated to the student promptly by email and a copy will be maintained in the student's file.

Candidacy Examination and Review

To be admitted by candidacy for the Ph.D. students are evaluated by the faculty in PETE program area through a written examination

A. Purpose

The purpose of this Review is to determine the acceptability of Ph.D. students to be advanced to candidacy. Candidacy status enables students to enroll for dissertation research and writing.

B. Candidacy Review Committee Constituency

The Candidacy Review Committee will consist of five faculty members. At least two members will be PETE faculty members. The student will select the chairperson (potential dissertation chair) from the PETE faculty. The chairperson and the student will work together to form the committee. At least one committee member must be from outside the department.

C. Description of the Candidacy Examination

Each member of the committee will submit one question to the designated chair of the student’s committee. The questions relate more specifically to the student’s areas of expertise, interest, and research. The student will respond to four of the five questions during the allotted time (four hours).

D. Scheduling/Procedures

When a student has completed nearly all of his/her coursework (or during the semester prior to the completion of all coursework), the student is ready to schedule the Candidacy Examination.

Paperwork and procedures discussed below should be completed before Sept 15 for the fall semester, or before March 1 for the spring semester.

Step 1: When students are ready to begin their candidacy examination, they should choose the Candidacy Examination Committee which will supervise them through the written exam.

Step 2: When students have secured agreement of five faculty members to serve on the Candidacy Examination Committee, they pick up from the Graduate Coordinator in SZB 406 the following two forms: 1) Intent to Take C&I Doctoral Candidacy Exam, and 2) Program of Work. The Intent form asks for a listing of the names of the Candidacy Examination Committee members. The Program of Work form is to be completed by typing or word processing. Both the
Intent and Program of Work form should be returned to the Graduate Coordinator before qualifying exams.

**Step 3:** The Graduate Coordinator will then send a memo appointing the Candidacy student’s Program of Work. The Graduate Coordinator will oversee the Candidacy Examination process.

**E. Decision**

During this Review, faculty members will discuss and assess the quality of the student’s work on the written exam; review the student’s coursework and research papers; offer suggestions, answer questions, and make recommendations. The overall purpose of the Review is to determine the student’s suitability to advance to candidacy and to begin dissertation work. At the close of the review, the Committee will inform the student of its decision:

- a) advance to candidacy;
- b) advance to candidacy with conditions;
- c) continue in program without advancement; or
- d) drop from program.

An Advance to Candidacy decision means that the Committee will recommend that the student be advanced to candidacy immediately.

A decision to Advance to Candidacy with Conditions means that the Curriculum Studies faculty will recommend that the student be advanced to candidacy, but will require that the student meet certain conditions.

A decision to Continue in Program without Advancement prevents students from advancing to candidacy until students meet specified conditions.

In both Advance to Candidacy and Continue in Program without Advancement decisions, the imposition of conditions intends to help the student strengthen areas of concern to the faculty. Conditions may take several forms (e.g., additional course work, additional involvement in research projects, additional courses in other departments). The Candidacy Review Committee chair will monitor student work and the conditions set and will report to the Curriculum and Instruction Graduate Coordinator when the student has met the conditions.

A decision to Drop from the Program will carry the recommendation that the student be dropped from the program or that the student retake the written exam. In case of a recommendation to retake the written exam, the Committee will make specific suggestions to the student about how to strengthen areas of weakness. Graduate Studies Committee policy permits students one retake.

The Candidacy Review Committee Chair reports results of the written exam deliberations to the C&I Graduate Adviser. Subsequently, the C&I Graduate Studies Committee votes on the recommendation to advance to candidacy. The C&I Graduate Coordinator then will notify the student of the results and guide the preparation and submission of candidacy papers.