

Graduate Student Evaluation Procedures

Overview

At the annual student evaluation meeting, each student is evaluated with respect to five dimensions: research and scholarship, academic performance, progress through the program, teaching, and service. Where applicable, both recent and cumulative performance are considered. Ideally, the student and the supervisor should monitor performance with respect to these dimensions throughout the year, and supervisory committees may consider setting goals or milestones to be met prior to the student evaluation meeting. The student's supervisory committee is responsible for assessing and summarizing the performance of the student for the evaluation meeting and framing specific recommendations where appropriate. The assessment and recommendations of the supervisory committee are amended and approved by faculty at the evaluation meeting as it sees fit.

Procedure

There are three steps to the evaluation procedure. First, a student prepares a report on his or her recent work and submits this report, along with a current CV, to his or her supervisory committee. Second, the supervisory committee prepares an assessment for the annual evaluation meeting. Third, faculty meet at the annual evaluation meeting to approve or amend each of the supervisory committee assessments. (These steps are summarized on the attached timeline chart.)

Student Reports

Sometime during the second term (January - March), supervisors request a report on recent work from each student. The report should list all of the work and progress performed in the last year that is relevant to each of the evaluation dimensions. Examples of the kinds of information that might be provided are:

- Papers submitted or published
- Presentations or posters presented
- Manuscripts or drafts completed
- Progress milestones completed
- Significant and concrete progress on research projects
- Teaching or important assistantship responsibilities
- Awards and scholarships
- Service activities
- Courses taken and grades received or anticipated

The report, along with a current CV, is submitted to the supervisor, who is responsible for circulating this material to the supervisory committee.

Supervisory Committee Assessment

Sometime before the middle of April, the supervisory committee assesses the student's performance. Generally, the committee should consider each dimension (research and scholarship, academic performance, progress through the program, teaching, and service), and agree on a rating for both recent and cumulative performance. Where applicable, that rating should consist of one of the labels, "excellent," "good," "satisfactory," "weak," or "inadequate," along with a brief (1-3 sentence) explanation. In order to foster common standards of assessment, guidelines have been framed for the use of this scale with respect to each dimension. Where appropriate, the explanation should make reference to those guidelines. However, the committee's task is to provide an informed and intelligent assessment of the student's performance, and the guidelines should be interpreted only heuristically.

The committee should also agree on an overall assessment of the student's performance using the same scale. However, it is recognized that the weight each dimension might have in such an overall assessment will vary with the student's situation and goals.

In some cases, the committee may provide specific recommendations concerning a student and his or her program. Normally, some form of recommendation would be presented in at least those cases where a student's performance is "inadequate" in some respect. Recommendations might include specific activities intended to remediate weaknesses in a student's performance (e.g., courses that need to be taken, timelines that need to be adhered to) or advice to the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies concerning such things as program extensions. In extreme cases, the recommendations might pertain to the termination of a student's program or transfer to a terminal Master's program. Recommendations could also include special commendations for exemplary performance.

Face-to-face meetings of the supervisory committee (without the student) are recommended for assessing a student's performance, particularly if there are problematic circumstances or specific recommendations to consider. However, it is recognized that in more routine cases it may be efficient for the supervisor to prepare a draft assessment and for the supervisory committee to discuss that draft via email. If a student does not have a supervisory committee in place in April, the assessment is prepared by the supervisor in consultation with the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies.

The student is provided with a copy of the assessment. Students may add brief comments on the assessment if they wish. The supervisory committee assessment, any comments by the student, and the student's report and CV is submitted to the Graduate Program Assistant by the supervisor by the middle of April.

Evaluation Meeting Procedure

Faculty meet annually as the graduate student evaluation committee, normally in May. Well before that meeting, faculty are provided with two sets of materials: the supervisory committee reports on each student, and the student reports and CVs. It is expected that the principal materials used during the evaluation will be the supervisory committee assessments. However, the student reports and CVs might be consulted in difficult cases. Faculty should review the committee assessments prior to the evaluation meeting.

At the evaluation meeting, students are considered by seniority, beginning with the most senior and finishing with the first-year students. For each student, the supervisor will first have an opportunity to highlight aspects of a student's performance that may not be clear from the submitted assessment. However, since faculty will already have had a chance to review the reports, it should not be necessary to reiterate that assessment in detail. Each assessment is treated as a motion (but with no second required). In the ensuing discussion of the assessment, faculty may amend that assessment using the usual parliamentary procedures. Specific recommendations are dealt with separately, after voting on the committee's assessment. Because the assessment passed by faculty is potentially different than that prepared by the supervisory committee, the supervisor may or may not wish to move the recommendations that were prepared in the assessment. If a recommendation is moved, a second is required. Recommendations may also be moved by other faculty at the meeting. In some circumstances, the evaluation committee may vote to reconvene at a later date to consider specific cases (e.g., if a particular deadline is not met).

Subsequent to the evaluation meeting, the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies writes to each student informing him or her of the deliberations at the meeting and the outcome of any votes that were taken on his or her case.

At the following year's evaluation meeting, the Associate Chair reports on how each of the recommendations was carried out or implemented, as well as any other actions taken with respect to a student's program.

Appeals

Any recommendation that may have a negative impact on a student's funding priority or status in the program may be appealed. Appeals should be made in writing to the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies within two weeks of being informed of the recommendation. A recommendation may explicitly indicate that appeals should be directed to the graduate student evaluation committee; if that is the case, the committee should be reconvened as soon as possible to consider the appeal. Otherwise, the appeal is considered by an ad hoc appeals committee consisting of the Chair, the Associate Chair for Graduate Studies, and the student's supervisor. In either case, the student may address the appeals committee in person if they wish.

Assessment Guidelines

Research and Scholarship

Research is an essential component of a graduate student's training in our program. Several of the mandatory program requirements (First- and Second-Year Research Projects, Master's Thesis, and Dissertation) ensure that students complete a minimum amount of research in order to graduate. However, it is recognized that graduate students must also be productive in presenting and publishing their research if they are to be successful. The rationale for the following guidelines is that an excellent student will have a number of tangible, published results by the time they graduate and that such a strong record of publication is generally a prerequisite for desirable postdoctoral positions and academic employment. An assessment of **Excellent** performance is thus applied at each level of seniority when a student appears to be on track for having a publication record of this caliber by the time they graduate. In contrast, an assessment of **Inadequate** would apply when a student seems to be making little progress or effort in developing a research program and there is little evidence of research productivity. An assessment of **Satisfactory** would be appropriate for a student with minimal research productivity consistent with program requirements but who is unlikely to complete his or her degree with a strong record of research contributions.

The following two tables (Table 1 is for recent performance and Table 2 is for cumulative performance) provide some *examples* that may serve as standards for evaluating a student on the research dimension. Judgment should be exercised in applying these to any given student and research domain. The evaluation includes both cumulative productivity and recent productivity within the past year. In addition, for both recent and cumulative research performance, the standards differ depending on year in the program. Finally, it is recognized that (a) the minimum time taken to complete and publish research can vary dramatically depending on the nature of the research, and (b) the quality and impact of the students' research contributions are more important than the quantity of publications. Therefore, the standards used for evaluating research productivity must be applied with some flexibility. The following examples show the kinds of research productivity that one might see in a student for each category of evaluation.

Table 1

Research and Scholarship Assessment Guidelines – Recent Performance (in Last Year)

Year	Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
<i>First-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a research project and submitted the work for publication to a refereed journal. Completed an original and important research project. Presentation of results accepted at a national conference this summer and the student is preparing a manuscript for publication.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a major research project and presented results at Royce. Acquired sophisticated techniques required for the student's research, designed an important and original research project, and made substantial progress in collecting the data.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiated a research project and collected substantial portion of the data.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recently initiated a research project but has not made substantial progress on the project.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only occasionally worked in the lab and has not designed or initiated a research project.
<i>Senior Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed a new experiment, gave a presentation at an international conference and has one new first-authored publication in refereed journal Made substantial progress on two new research projects. Has new second-authored publication and submitted abstract for talk at international conference. Gave presentation at Royce.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed research project, presented work at Royce and a national conference, and submitted paper for publication.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completed publishable research project and is preparing manuscript for publication. Gave talk at Royce.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very near completion of research project but has not presented or written a paper in past year other than to meet program requirements.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked on research project but has not completed any experiments or presented any of the work in past year.

Note. Because of the limited time frame, it is expected that very few first-year students would fall into the extreme categories of either excellent or inadequate.

Table 2

Research and Scholarship Assessment Guidelines – Cumulative Performance

Year	Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
<i>First-year Students</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Normally not applicable for first-year students, but publications and presentations from the undergraduate program can be noted and would be considered excellent.]
<i>Second-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one first-authored paper in refereed journal, submitted another for publication and presented at national conference.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at international conference and has paper accepted for publication.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completed publishable research project and has paper almost ready for submission to journal. Presented at national conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at Royce but has not submitted paper or presented at major conference.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has not completed any research projects and has no publications or presentations.
<i>Third-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has two major publications and one submitted paper. Presented at both national and international conferences. • Has first-authored publication in a first-tiered journal and presented at several national and international conferences.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one first-authored publication and presented at a national and international conference.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one paper accepted for publication and presented at a national conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at a national conference but no publications.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented only at local conferences.
<i>Fourth-year Students</i>	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three first- and one second-authored publication. Presented at national and international conferences and won award for best student presentation at major national conference. • Has first-author publication in first-tiered journal and two additional publications. Gave two presentations at international conferences.
	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has two publications as well as submitted paper and several conference presentations.
	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has one journal publication and one submitted paper. Presented at a national and an international conference.
	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gave several national and international conference presentations and has one second-authored publication.
	Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presented at national conferences but has no published or submitted papers.

Recommendations

Normally, supervisory committees should bring a recommendation to the evaluation meeting whenever a student is assessed as **Inadequate** with respect to research and scholarship. The recommendation should identify steps that should be taken to improve research productivity, and might describe specific timelines, activities, or goals for the student. Ideally, such a recommendation would be based on the results of a problem-solving and planning process that included both the student and the supervisory committee.

Academic Performance

Academic achievement is an essential component to a graduate's student training in our program and is assessed largely through course grades. The basis for these guidelines derives primarily from the use of GPA by the University and FGSR. "First-class standing" is defined as a GPA of 3.5, and this corresponds to an assessment of **Good** in these guidelines. A GPA of 3.0 is FGSR's minimum standard for admission, and this corresponds to **Satisfactory**. According to FGSR's rules, a student with a GPA of less than 2.7 cannot convocate and a student with a GPA in the range of 2.3-2.7 can only be continued in the program on recommendation of the Department. Thus, a GPA of less than 2.7 is regarded as **Inadequate**. Where applicable, students should be assessed with respect to recent performance in the last academic year and cumulative performance over the time they have been in the program. (When there are no grades to be considered, the assessment would normally be **Not Applicable**.)

Based on these considerations, the following guidelines are for assigning assessment of academic performance based on GPA. In some cases, supervisory committees may wish to deviate from these guidelines if there are special considerations (e.g., a student receives a relatively low mark in a course outside of the Department and his or her main research area).

Table 3

Academic Performance Guidelines

Assessment	Minimum GPA
Excellent	3.7
Good	3.5
Satisfactory	3.0
Weak	2.7
Inadequate	—

In addition, any failing mark (i.e., a grade of C or less) in the last year would normally warrant an assessment of **Inadequate** for recent academic performance.

Typically, grades for the most recent term will not yet be available when the supervisory committee meets to agree on an assessment. In that case, the committee should use the grades that are available together with the student's best estimate of the grades likely to be received. If necessary, the assessment can be changed at the evaluation meeting (when all grades should be available).

Recommendations

A recommendation would normally be moved by the supervisor whenever a student's academic performance is assessed as **Inadequate**. Typically, this recommendation would indicate which further courses should be taken, when those courses should be taken, and the minimum grade that must be attained. Failure to meet the expectations approved by faculty in such a recommendation could be grounds for an **Inadequate** assessment in subsequent years.

Progress in the Program

Progress Grids

The following tables should be used as a guide in assessing students' progress in the program. Several considerations motivate these guidelines. First, an assessment of **Excellent** with respect to progress in the program would be represented by the completion of the PhD in 4 years (beginning with a Bachelor's degree) or 3 years (beginning with an external Master's degree.) (These are the nominal durations of our program as described in the Calendar.) Second, an assessment of **Inadequate** would apply if a student takes longer than 7 years to complete the PhD (beginning with a Bachelor's degree) or 6 years (beginning with an external Master's degree). (FGSR's limit on the duration of a PhD program is 6 years, regardless of whether they begin with a Bachelor's or Master's degree.) The guidelines for cumulative progress at each year in the program represent an estimate of whether the student is on track for these outcomes by September of the current year. Assessments of recent progress (in the last year) should generally correspond to cumulative progress for students who are moving at a consistent rate through the program. An assessment of **Inadequate** would apply for recent progress when a student makes no tangible progress over the course of the previous year.

In the tables, the following notation is used: E = excellent, G = good, S = satisfactory, W = weak, and I = inadequate. Milestones 1 and 2 are somewhat different for students who enter with an external Master's degree since such students do not complete a First-Year Research Project. Instead, these students may need to complete some additional background preparation at the discretion of their supervisory committee, who would be responsible for assessing whether that preparation was complete.

Table 4
Cumulative Progress, Entering with a Bachelor's
Prior to September 2010

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 FYRP Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 FYRP prospectus submitted	W	I	I	I	I	I	I
3 FYRP initiated (data collected)	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
4 FYRP preliminary draft	G	W	I	I	I	I	I
5 FYRP completed	E	W	I	I	I	I	I
6 SYRP/Masters topic accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	W	I	I	I	I	I
7 SYRP/Masters initiated (data collected)	-	S	W	I	I	I	I
8 SYRP/Masters preliminary draft	-	G	W	I	I	I	I
9 SYRP/Masters oral exam completed successfully	-	E	S	W	I	I	I
10 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	-	E	G	S	W	I	I
11 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
12 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
13 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	-	E	G	S	W	I
14 Dissertation initiated (data collected)	-	-	-	G	G	S	W
15 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	-	-	E	G	S	W
16 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation						

Table 4B

Cumulative Progress, Entering with a Bachelor's in September 2010 or Later

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 FYRP Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 FYRP prospectus submitted	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
3 FYRP initiated	S	I	I	I	I	I	I
4 FYRP data collected	G	I	I	I	I	I	I
5 FYRP completed (presentation or paper)	E	I	I	I	I	I	I
6 SYRP/Master's topic accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	I	I	I	I	I	I
7 SYRP/Master's initiated	-	W	I	I	I	I	I
8 SYRP/Master's data collected	-	S	W	I	I	I	I
9 SYRP/Master's preliminary draft	-	G	W	I	I	I	I
10 SYRP/Master's oral exam completed successfully	-	E	S	I	I	I	I
11 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	-	E	G	S	W	I	I
12 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
13 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	-	-	E	S	W	I	I
14 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	-	-	E	G	S	W	I
15 Dissertation initiated	-	-	-	G	S	W	I
16 Dissertation data collected	-	-	-	G	S	W	I
17 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	-	-	E	G	S	W
18 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation						

Projected Duration of Program from Entry to PhD Completion

E = Excellent = on track for 4 years (2-year SYRP/Master's and 2-year PhD)

G = Good = on track for 5 years (2-year SYRP/Master's and 3-year PhD)

S = Satisfactory = on track for 6 years

W = Weak = on track for 7 years

I = Inadequate = more than 7 years

Vertical lines indicate end of funding after two years (at SYRP/Master's level) and after another three years (at PhD level)

Table 5

Cumulative Progress, Entering with Master's Prior to September 2010

Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1 ^m Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 ^m Background preparation substantially complete	S	W	I	I	I	I
10 Candidacy Exam reading list approved	G	S	W	I	I	I
11 Qualifying Exam completed successfully	E	G	W	I	I	I
12 Candidacy Exam completed successfully	E	G	W	I	I	I
13 Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Cttee	E	E	S	W	I	I
14 Dissertation initiated (data collected)	-	E	G	S	W	I
15 Dissertation preliminary draft	-	E	E	G	S	W
16 Dissertation defended	No further evaluation					

Table 5B

**Cumulative Progress, Entering with Master's from Another Program
 in September 2010 or Later**

	Most Recently Completed Milestone	Year in Program in May					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1 ^M	Supervisor/Committee selected	I	I	I	I	I	I
2 ^M	Background preparation substantially complete	G	W	I	I	I	I
11	Candidacy Exam reading list approved	E	G	S	W	I	I
12	Qualifying Exam completed successfully	E	E	S	W	I	I
13	Candidacy Exam completed successfully	E	E	S	W	I	I
14	Dissertation proposal accepted by Supervisory Committee	E	E	G	S	W	I
15	Dissertation initiated	-	E	G	S	W	I
16	Dissertation data collected	-	E	G	S	W	I
17	Dissertation preliminary draft	-	E	E	G	S	W
18	Dissertation defended	No further evaluation					

Note. ^M = milestone is specific to students entering with Master's from another program.

Projected Duration of Program from Entry to PhD Completion

- E = Excellent = on track for 3 years
- G = Good = on track for 4 years
- S = Satisfactory = on track for 5 years
- W = Weak = on track for 6 years
- I = Inadequate = more than 6 years

Vertical line indicates end of funding after four years.

Table 6

Recent Progress in Program, Entering with Bachelor's or Master's

Number of New Milestones	
Reached Since Previous Evaluation	Rating
4+	Excellent
3	Good
2	Satisfactory
1	Weak
0	Inadequate

Note. These guidelines should be interpreted heuristically and the rating based on an informed assessment of the student's performance in moving through the program at a consistent rate.

Recommendations

A specific recommendation will normally be made whenever a student's recent or cumulative progress is **Inadequate**. A typical recommendation would outline a workable timetable for accomplishing program milestones that would, at a minimum, allow the student's recent progress to be assessed as **Satisfactory** at next year's meeting. When a student is approaching FGSR's program time limits, the recommendation should incorporate advice to the Associate Chair concerning requests to FGSR for program extensions, including an expected completion date. In extreme cases involving inadequate progress over a sustained period, a recommendation may be conveyed to FGSR that the student not be allowed to register in succeeding terms.

Teaching

Teaching is an optional component to a graduate student’s training in our program. Teaching can include a variety of activities, ranging from serving as a teaching assistant to delivering an entire course as an instructor. A teaching rating is viewed as being optional because teaching is not a requirement for graduating in good standing from our program. Furthermore, students with scholarships or research assistantships may choose not to be involved in such activities. However, to the extent that students are involved in teaching activities, these activities should be considered in the evaluation.

The following are some guidelines for evaluating a student on the teaching dimension. In general, an assessment of **Excellent** should be used when there has been some formal recognition of merit, while an assessment of **Good** would apply if there is clear evidence for performance beyond what is normally expected. Less than satisfactory assessments would only apply if there are significant problems with a student’s performance that need to be addressed. If a student has no teaching activities to report, then the assessment should simply be **Not Applicable**.

Table 7

Teaching Assessment Guidelines

Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved in teaching activities (as a lecturer or teaching assistant) and was recognized by a Departmental or University Award.
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Senior Student:</i> successfully delivered a lecture course, an activity which could provide important experience prior to seeking an academic position. <i>Junior Student:</i> served as teaching assistant and commended by course instructor for being particularly helpful.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching assistant
Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because teaching activities are optional, a rating in this category would be used only in isolated circumstances. For example, if a senior student has been advised to deliver a lecture course as preparation for an academic career but has not done so or is involved in too many teaching activities to the detriment of other activities, a supervisory committee might use this rating.
Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This rating would not be appropriate unless the student’s teaching activities involved professional misconduct or other seriously unprofessional behaviour.

Service

Service is an optional component to a graduate student's training in our program. Service can include a variety of activities, including being a member of Departmental committees, being involved in University-level activities (e.g., GSA), and being a volunteer in activities outside of the University (e.g., serving as a student mentor, a science fair judge, a fundraiser for a nonprofit organization). To the extent that students choose to become involved in service activities, these activities should be considered in the evaluation.

The following are some guidelines for evaluating a student on the service dimension. Generally, an assessment of **Satisfactory** would be applied when there is a significant service contribution, while **Excellent** should be used when the student's service contribution has been formally recognized. This dimension should be viewed as optional, and if a student has no service activities to report, then the assessment should simply be **Not Applicable**.

Table 8

Service Assessment Guidelines

Assessment	Examples of Student Performance
Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in substantial service activities and merit of service was formally recognized (e.g., by external award).
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in substantial service activities. While the notion of "substantial" is subjective, an assessment in this category might correspond to service activity involving more than an hour/week for an extended period of time.
Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Involved in service activities. Typically, this assessment would correspond to service activity involving an hour/week or less (e.g., being a student representative on a Departmental committee that met monthly or biweekly).
Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Because service activities are optional, an assessment in this category would ordinarily not be used. If a student has been overextending him or herself on service activities, has been cautioned about this by a supervisory committee, and has not acted on this information, then this assessment might be appropriate.
Inadequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none">This rating would not be appropriate.

Timeline of Tasks for Graduate Student Assessment

<i>Date</i>	<i>Assoc. Chair</i>	<i>Supervisor</i>	<i>Student</i>	<i>Supervisory Comm.</i>	<i>Faculty</i>
Early Mar.	Sends reminders to students & faculty	Requests report from student			
Mar.			Prepares annual report & CV, submits to supervisor		
Late Mar.		Distributes report & CV to supervisory comm.			
Early Apr.				Meets & agrees on annual assessment	
Mid Apr.			Optionally comments on assessment		
Mid Apr.		Submits student report, CV, & assessment to Assoc. Chair			
Early May	Distributes materials to faculty				
May					Amends and approves assessments at evaluation meeting
Late May	Informs students of actions taken at evaluation meeting				

Evaluation Meeting Procedure

Prior to meeting, faculty review assessments, reports, and CVs.

The following procedure is normally followed at evaluation meeting for each student, from most to least senior:

1. The Associate Chair reports on compliance with last year's recommendations and other actions taken with respect to student.
2. The supervisor has an opportunity to make additional comments or late committee changes to assessment.
3. The committee's assessment is moved (automatic; no second required).
 - 3.1. Faculty discusses assessment.
 - 3.2. Amendments to assessment are entertained (second required).
 - 3.2.1. Faculty discusses amendments
 - 3.2.2. Faculty vote on amendments
 - 3.3. Faculty vote on assessment (as amended)
4. If appropriate, the supervisor (or other faculty member) moves specific recommendations (second required).
 - 4.1. Faculty discusses recommendations.
 - 4.2. Faculty vote on recommendations
5. Informal suggestions for student's letter are entertained (no formal motions or votes).

Revision History

Provisionally adopted for 2005, March 14, 2005 (Guidelines unofficial)

Revision adopted November 23, 2005

Editorial revision, November 2008

Revision to renumber tables, June 2009

Revision to tables on basis of motions in Council, March 11, 2011