WSE Guide to Effective Annual Reviews

All enrolled and active PhD students *(including coursework-focused PhDs, Nonresidents, and PhD students on internships/co-ops)* must be evaluated <u>annually</u> starting with their first year in the program.

Please see the policy for the broad stroke requirements: http://homewoodgrad.jhu.edu/academics/policies/. The Dean's and Provost's Offices will be overseeing and tracking the completion of all annual reviews.

There is no universal template for Annual Reviews, but there are three major components that must be addressed for each student per annual review:

Student Self-Evaluation

- Students should document what they accomplished over the last year, and note specifically any accomplishment(s) of which the department may not be aware. Examples include: papers in review/published, posters presented, presentations or guest lectures given, and/or grant proposals in progress, submitted or funded. Students should note if they had any teaching assistant duties.
- Students should also list their research/academic/professional goals for the next year and share an assessment of their progress and expected timeline for meeting program goals and degree completion.

Faculty Advisor/Department/Committee Evaluation

- The faculty advisor* should document goals for the student for the next year and share an assessment of the student's progress over the past year. There should be mention of a timeline for meeting program goals and degree completion; and any concerns regarding performance. Funding, research changes, TA expectations should be confirmed and clarified as well.
- If a student has not been performing well, this can be an opportunity to place them on a TA, academic, and/or research probation. Any probation should be outlined in a separate letter with clear terms and deadlines. The Office of Academic Affairs (Christine Kavanagh, Assistant Dean) can assist with the policy, probation templates, and best practices.

Discussion

- The student and their faculty advisor* should meet (preferably in-person, but alternatively by Skype, phone, Face Time, etc.) to discuss both the student's self-evaluation and the advisor/department/committee's evaluation.
  - Concerns, questions, and needed clarifications should be addressed in this meeting
  - If there are irreconcilable concerns, the DGS and/or Chair should be consulted.

Departmental Responsibilities

- Programs are responsible for initiating the process and ensuring its completion.
- Programs are responsible for uploading a fully completed and signed Annual Review packet for each PhD student into the PhD SIS Module promptly following the discussion of the annual review, and no later than before the first day of classes each academic year.
- Programs are responsible for completing its evaluation of the student *even if a student doesn't comply/engage in the process.*
  - If a student doesn't respond to requests to participate in the annual review process, a note should be placed with the department's evaluation upload citing that the student did not comply.
- *Faculty Advisors should be the primary department representative. If there is no faculty advisor or the advisor and student are unable to work on the evaluation together, the DGS and/or Chair may stand in for the advisor in exceptional circumstances to complete both the evaluation and discussion of progress with the student. If there is a committee, it must be engaged in the evaluative process.
  - If the student's primary research advisor resides in a different department or division of the university, it is still the department's responsibility to ensure that the annual review has been completed by all parties.
- There should be no mention of a student's mental or physical health or of any other students in any documentation created by the department/advisor/committee.
- Programs with master's students conducting research/capstone/thesis work are encouraged to follow this process as well, but they do not need to upload the reviews to SIS.

.