Social Studies Education

Evaluating Ph.D. Students in Social Studies Education

First 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.

B. Scheduling and Procedures
1. Submit for review to the Social Studies Education Program Adviser

   At the conclusion of approximately 12 semester hours of course work at UT Austin, or not later than 12 months after initial enrollment in the program, the student will submit to the Social Studies Education Program Adviser the following evidence (as a portfolio):

   a. Program of Work Form (obtained from the C & I Graduate Coordinator) listing course work completed with professors and grades received noted (in UT Austin courses and other relevant courses);

   b. vitae;

   c. plan of engagement for future research;

   d. one example of an edited empirical or data driven project (e.g. case study, oral history, historical text analysis) along with the original draft including faculty comments (if the paper is co-written, the graduate student should detail their role in completing the project);

   e. Program Review form.

2. Criteria to be employed in this review include:

   a. completion of approximately 12 semester hours;

   b. no “credit/no credit” courses taken during the first 12 hours;

   c. acceptable grade point average: any course grade lower than a B will be subject to further review by the First Program Review Panel, and the instructor of the course in question. (A GPA below 3.0 may lead to dismissal from the program);
d. a one page plan for engagement in an acceptable research project/activity (e.g., as a course requirement, independent project, collaboration w/professor and/or graduate student colleague);

e. at least one course in research methodology (including either an Intro to Qualitative Research, Intro to Quantitative Research or Systems of Inquiry);

f. a minimum of 6 of the first 12 hours of course work to have been taken in the Social Studies Education program area;

g. participate in a 1st year review conference with faculty.

3. Procedures

Students are expected to be actively involved in research as part of their doctoral studies before the First Year Program Review. As part of the doctoral experience, students will likely complete a study (or series of studies) under the direction of faculty. The First Program Review focuses on the student’s involvement in research. Students will be required to submit for consideration a portfolio documenting their activities. The research portfolio will be submitted to the Program Adviser by an announced date.

Students will present an oral report of their work to the program area faculty (not to exceed 15 minutes) at the scheduled review. Faculty may ask questions related to the contents of the First Program Review 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 courses, research plans).

C. Decisions and Reporting Procedure

1. Review Criteria
Faculty members will 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 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 First Program Review. The vote will be conducted by secret or voice ballot of the faculty who attend the review, with majority ruling.

2. Decision
Decisions will be made by consensus of the program area 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 (see http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/)

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

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 Qualifying Examination and Review.

B. Scheduling and Procedures
1. Submit for Review to the Social Studies Education Program Adviser
   At the conclusion of approximately 36 semester hours of course work at UT Austin, or not later than 24 months after initial enrollment in the program, the student will submit to the Social Studies Program Adviser the following evidence (as a portfolio):
   a. Program of Work Form (obtained from the C & I Graduate Coordinator) listing course work completed with professors and grades received noted (in UT Austin courses and other relevant courses);

   b. vitae;

   c. plan of engagement for future research;

   d. one example of an edited empirical or data driven project (e.g. case study, oral history, historical text analysis) along with the original draft including faculty comments (if the paper is co-written, the graduate student should detail their role in completing the project);

   e. Program Review form.

2. Criteria to be employed in this review include:
   a. completion of approximately 36 semester hours;

   b. acceptable grade point average: any course grade lower than a B will be subject to further review by the Mid-Program Review panel, and the instructor of the course in question. (A GPA below 3.0 could lead to dismissal from the program);

   c. a one page plan for engagement in an acceptable research project/activity (e.g., as a course requirement, independent project, collaboration w/professor and/or graduate student colleague);
d. completion of research methodology;

e. a minimum of 12 of the first 36 hours of course work to have been taken in the Social Studies Education program area;

f. participate in a Mid-Program Review conference with faculty.

3. Procedures

Students are expected to be actively involved in research as part of their doctoral studies before the Mid-Program Review. As part of the 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 for consideration a portfolio documenting their activities. The research portfolio will be submitted to the Program Adviser by an announced date.

Students will present an oral report of their work to the program area faculty (not to exceed 15 minutes) at the scheduled review. Faculty may ask questions related to the contents of the Mid-Program Review 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 courses, research plans, etc.)

C. Decisions and Reporting Procedure

1. Review Criteria
Faculty members will 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 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 First Program Review. The vote will be conducted by secret or voice ballot of the faculty who attend the review, with majority ruling.

2. Decision
Decisions will be made by consensus of the Area 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 (see http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/ ).
The Faculty will provide feedback for each student reviewed and will circulate that recommendation to all members of the Social Studies Education Program faculty. This will be communicated to the student promptly by email and a copy will be maintained in the student's file.

Qualifying Exam and Advancement to Candidacy

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. Qualifying Exam Committee Constituency

The Qualifying Exam Committee will consist of five faculty members. At least three members will be faculty members in Curriculum and Instruction and at least two members will be Social Studies Education Program Area faculty members. The student will select the chairperson (potential dissertation chair) from the Social Studies Education Program Area faculty. The student must also select at least one faculty member from outside the Curriculum and Instruction department (GSC) to serve on this committee.

C. Components of Qualifying Exam

The Qualifying Examination consists of two parts:

1. Written: Each member of the Qualifying Exam Committee will submit one question to the designated chair of the student’s committee. The questions will reflect the core areas of the program, the research sequence and will relate specifically to the student’s areas of expertise, interest, and research. The student will respond to the questions during an allotted time (4 day weekend).

2. Oral Defense: A two-hour oral examination conducted by the student’s Qualifying Exam Committee and open to any additional readers of the examination who have interest in the student’s performance will be conducted. It is expected that the entire written examination serve as the basis for the oral defense.

D. Scheduling/Procedures

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

The Committee chair should decide paperwork and procedures discussed below.

Step 1: When students are ready to begin their Qualifying Examinations, they should choose the Qualifying Examination Chair and Committee that will supervise them through the two parts of the exam.
Step 2: When students have secured agreement of five faculty members to serve on the Qualifying Examination Committee, they pick up from the C&I Graduate Coordinator in SZB 406 the following two forms: 1) Intent to Take C&I Doctoral Qualifying Examination, and 2) Program of Work. The Intent form asks for a listing of the names of the Qualifying 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 C&I Graduate Coordinator in order to schedule the qualifying examinations.

Step 3: The C&I Graduate Coordinator will forward the Procedure Memo for Qualifying Exams to the committee. It is the responsibility of the Qualifying Examination Committee chair to gather the examination questions one week before the written exam date and forward them to the C&I Graduate Coordinator. The C&I Graduate Coordinator will forward the exam questions to the graduate student, collect the responses from the graduate student, and distribute the Oral Qualifying Examination Memo, the candidacy exam questions, and the graduate student’s responses to all committee members.

E. Decision

During this Review, faculty members will discuss and assess the quality of the student’s work on the Written and Oral Defense; 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 Social Studies Program Area 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 these 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 coursework, additional involvement in research projects, additional courses in other departments). The Qualifying Exam Committee Chair will monitor student work and the conditions set and will report to the Curriculum and Instruction C&I 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 and Oral Defense. In case of a recommendation to retake the Written and Oral Defense, 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 Qualifying Exam Committee Chair reports results of the Written and Oral Defense 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.