Second-Year Review Summary Sheet

Doctoral students are generally expected to complete their Ph.D. programs in approximately four years. They are required to make substantial progress relative to program goals and individual plans of study. Program progress for each student is assessed informally on an ongoing basis; however, students are officially evaluated annually. The Second-Year Review the official annual evaluation during the second year.

**Description:** The Second-Year Review is the culminating experience of your second year of doctoral study. The review provides an opportunity for students to demonstrate their ability to critically review research and plan their own empirical research study. It is not an exam, but an opportunity to check in to make sure you are making progress in all areas. You will share with your advisor, and one other faculty member, an article critique and a pre-dissertation research proposal. Before the scheduled review, the faculty will read your documents. During the review, you will complete a brief oral presentation of your work with questions and feedback from the committee. You will schedule this review for one hour.

**Required Components:**

1. **Article Critique**—There are two options available for the article critique:
   1. **Option 1**: Critically examine one article on substantive and methodological content; the article must be of the same substantive and methodological content for your proposed study (see #2, below)
   2. **Option 2**: Participate in a manuscript peer-review with your advisor and submit a de-identified review. If the review was completed with your advisor, only submit your contributions to the review.
2. **Pre-Dissertation Research.** Students will complete a proposal for an empirical study to be completed for the comprehensive exam. The proposal should be in manuscript form and length, including: (1) introduction (e.g., conceptual/theoretical framing; brief review of research; purpose statement and research questions) and (2) method (e.g., participants, data collection, data analysis). The empirical study can employ any quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method in a primary or secondary analysis. An IRB proposal should also be included if applicable. Usually this will be initiated in a research design course, then developed into a comprehensive exam product. Any changes to the pre-dissertation research should be approved by the student’s committee. The student may start this research after successful completion of their Second Year Review.
3. **Statements.** Updated research statement that includes a developed conceptual framework related to your research agenda.
4. **Updated CV**

**Evaluation:** Determination should be made whether the student is making acceptable progress, needs improvement (which requires a remedial plan), or is making unacceptable progress (which may lead to program termination). If the student performance needs improvement, then specify the steps that are being taken to remediate the progress, including conducting another annual review at the end of the next term (Fall, Spring, Summer). Making inadequate progress for two consecutive review periods can provide grounds for program termination.

Second-Year Review Progress Evaluation Form

Student Name:       Specialization:

Date of Second-Year Review:

Second-Year Review Document Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Article Critique Submission | Pre-Dissertation Research Proposal |
| Option 1  Option 2 | Primary data analysis  Secondary data analysis  Qualitative  Quantitative (including single case)  Mixed Methods  IRB proposal attached (if applicable) |

Evaluation Committee:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Committee member type | Name | Signature |
| Advisor |  |  |
| Specialization Member |  |  |

Advisor Feedback

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article Critique | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Pre-Dissertation Research Proposal | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Research, Teaching, Service Statements | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Updated CV | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Overall Conclusion | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |

If needs improvement or unacceptable progress were selected for any component, notes are required.

Specialization Member Feedback

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article Critique | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Pre-Dissertation Research Proposal | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Research, Teaching, Service Statements | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Updated CV | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |
| Overall Conclusion | Adequate Progress | Needs Improvement | Unacceptable Progress |

If needs improvement or unacceptable progress were selected for any component, notes are required.

Notes (and if required, remediation plan, including date of next review):

Outcome of Second-Year Review

Adequate Progress

Needs Improvement (remediation plan detailed above)

Unacceptable Progress (remediation or program termination summary detailed above)

If applicable, date of next review:

Advisor Signature Date

Specialization Member Signature Date

Student Signature Date

*Please email this form and your approved Pre-Dissertation Research Proposal to* [*specialeduadm@ku.edu*](mailto:specialeduadm@ku.edu)