



Annual PhD Candidate Report

Rationale

1. Oversight mechanism to annually review progress of all PhD students past Qualifying Exam.
2. Match reflections and expectations of student and advisor, and provide feedback to both on progress, time-line and feasibility of project.
3. Allow the department to identify potential issues in PhD progress, so that corrective measures can be taken early.
4. Efficient mechanism with minimal burden on student, advisor and committee.

Annual PhD Candidate Report

Each PhD student who has passed the PhD Qualifying Examination submits an annual progress report. The PhD advisor adds comments. The Graduate Committee assesses and provides feedback.

Due: 1 May, every year, until the student successfully defends a thesis, to the Physics Graduate Advisor.

Format: Not more than 1 page total. Standard NSF/DOE grant proposal requirements (11pt, ≥ 6 lines per inch, 1-inch margins, etc.; main criterion: readability.). Template LATEXfile provided, see Appendix. Only electronic submissions as .pdf file are accepted.

Student provides: On typically 2 page, progress description **in the past year** in own words, with:

- student name, proposal title, 1st Semester in program, date;
- notable achievements or problems (e.g. modifications of the research plan and why they are necessary);
- a list of presentations (outside GW) and publications since the last Annual Report (including proceedings; indicating submitted, accepted, published; full bibliographic information);
- an updated, brief time-line to defense which indicates deviations from the proposal;
- *If pre-Proposal:* add timeline to PhD Proposal; if no advisor, detail activities to join a research group.
- any other comments and concerns.

Beyond possibly 1-2 introductory lines, one should assume that the reader is familiar with the PhD Proposal.

Advisor provides: On typically 1 page: *If pre-Proposal:* leave blank if no provisional advisor.

- assessment of student progress in past year;
- expectation when the thesis will be finished/projected Proposal date;
- any other comments and concerns;
- date.

Evaluation: The student's departmental Mentor and Thesis Research Committee (Readers at the PhD Proposal Examination) receive a copy and may be invited to comment. In order to assess the report, the Graduate Committee may ask student and advisor for additional information. The Committee records its conclusions and relays them to student, advisor and thesis Research Committee. Usually, one sentence will be sufficient. Based on its conclusions, the Committee may take additional action, as appropriate. Report and comments become part of the student's file.

Failure to meet requirements: Non-compliance can have severe consequences, including but not limited to: termination of GTA or GRA stipends, and termination from the program due to lack of academic progress. The advisor is honor-bound to meet the deadline. Only written outside documentation that student and advisor were incapacitated by reasons beyond their control is a valid excuse for late filing.