

# DOCTORAL STUDENT REVIEW FOR RESEARCH READINESS

## Purpose of the Research Readiness Review

The purpose of the Research Readiness Review process (RRR) is to aid the student, academic advisor and the Area in evaluating the student's current level of competence in research-writing and helping identify particular directions to follow for further growth (see Doctoral Program Handbook). Research Readiness Review is both a diagnostic and evaluative assessment of student work, and may even be a component of a developmental process.

## Elements of the Review

Research Readiness Review consists of three phases: **phase one** - a professor evaluates a research paper written by the student for her/his 4000 level or above course, both in the context of the requirements for the course and for RRR. This process is repeated a second time by a different professor evaluating a different paper for a different 4000 level or above course. The principal components of this phase of the review are the graded papers themselves and the *Doctoral Student Review for Research Readiness* forms; **phase two** - the student reviews the professors' evaluations with his/her advisor; **phase three** - the advisor presents a summary of the evaluations to the Area and the Area decides whether or not the review is successful. (*IDS, CRLG/CHSR and the Joint degree programs use a different process in the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase; see their Area Protocols for directions*)

- a) **To the Student:** Please complete this side of the form, except for the paper grade, and submit this to your professor with your research paper for the course. Once the professor returns the paper and form to you, it is your responsibility to forward the materials on to your advisor. You must do this twice, for two different papers with two different professors. It is your responsibility to schedule a meeting with your advisor to discuss the assessments by the two course professors. You must also submit copies of the two completed forms to the **Academic Secretary**.
- b) **To the Professor:** Please enter the grade for the paper, complete the back of this form, and return the form and the paper to the student.
- c) **To the Advisor:** the student should submit two forms, along with two graded papers to you. The student should schedule a meeting with you to discuss the evaluations. You should write to the student after the meeting, explicitly documenting the student's strengths and challenges identified from the professors' evaluations. You should then schedule time with your Area to complete the review. (See *IDS, CRLG/CHSR and the Joint degree programs* for alternative approach to this step) You should report the results of the Area review to the **Academic Secretary**.
- d) **To the Area:** the Area minutes should reflect the decision regarding the student's review.
- e) The **Academic Secretary** will report the results of the review via electronic mail to the student, advisor, and Area Convener.

Print or type:

GTU student mailbox (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester & Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number & Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper or Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Length in pages: \_\_\_\_\_ Date turned in: \_\_\_\_\_ Paper Grade: \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Advisor: \_\_\_\_\_ Advisor's School: \_\_\_\_\_

Advisor's email address: \_\_\_\_\_

	Unable to discern	Does not meet Scholarly standards	Satisfactorily meets scholarly standards	Scholarly standards achieved with excellence
<b><u>STYLE</u></b>				
1. Adequate use of the English language: grammar, diction, style, etc.	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Use of proper footnote/endnote or other documentation procedures.	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Professional appearance of work.	( )	( )	( )	( )

**FAMILIARITY WITH AND ABILITY TO USE RESOURCES EFFECTIVELY**

4. Demonstrated ability to perform research in the field of concentration.	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Ability to employ primary resources.	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Ability to employ secondary or critical sources.	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Familiarity with pertinent current journals.	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Familiarity with library resources (including electronic, as appropriate) in the field of concentration.	( )	( )	( )	( )

**PRESENTATION/ANALYSIS**

9. Ability to conceptualize and define a topic.	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Demonstrated ability to state differing positions and arguments clearly, fairly and evenhandedly.	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Skill at organization and focused presentation.	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Evidence of familiarity with appropriate methodologies	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Potential for future achievement in scholarly research and writing.	( )	( )	( )	( )

Summative Grade (scale 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest): \_\_\_\_\_

Summative Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor's Name (please print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Professor's Signature

Date returned  
to student: \_\_\_\_\_