

### ***Guidelines and Scoring Policy for Second Year Research Papers (SYRP)***

In accordance with the Graduate Council and the University policy, completion of this benchmark requirement conforms with timeline of the Ph.D. in Education Program of Study. It is dictated by normative time to degree and must be met by the end of Fall Quarter of the third year. (See Student Handbook). Late papers will not be accepted and a score of no pass or fail will be assigned.

### **SUBMISSION OF SYRP:**

For the 2017-2018 cycle, Second Year Research Papers (SYRP) can be submitted at any point but no later than **Friday, September 14, 2018 at 4:30 p.m.** Submission by the end of classes of the spring quarter (June 14, 2018) is strongly encouraged so that students can revise their papers over the summer. All efforts will be made to start the faculty review process immediately after a paper is turned in. Papers turned in by June 14, 2018 will be reviewed and returned to the students by the end of June. If a student cannot get their paper turned in on/after June 14, we still encourage them to submit it before September 14, 2018 so that they will have longer to revise it. We will do all we can to make sure such papers are reviewed in a timely manner so that the student can begin revisions as quickly as possible. To expedite the review process, the student and advisor need to notify the PhD staff (Sarah Singh) by May 21, 2018 when the paper will be submitted. The advisory needs to suggest two reviewers by May 21, 2018 so that we can recruit the two reviewers well before June 14.

Students should submit two electronic **.docx** copies to Sarah Singh, [sksingh@uci.edu](mailto:sksingh@uci.edu). Name document in the following format: **LastName\_FirstName\_2017-2018\_SYRP.docx**. One copy will include the student's name and one copy will include the student's name and the other will be without any student identification.

### **SCORING PROCESS:**

Our goal is to provide a good learning experience on this project given that this is the first research paper many of the students will have written. Our second goal is to facilitate each of our students getting papers under review for publication in journals as quickly as possible. To meet these goals, our scoring system is designed to provide the kind of feedback needed to facilitate the creation of a publishable paper. We assume that each student will have received strong mentoring from his/her advisor and from the instructor of the second-year writing course prior to submitting the paper for review by the faculty.

**In the first round of faculty review,** two faculty members recommended by the student's advisor or the program director will be asked to review the paper and return their review within 12 days. Our goal in selecting the reviewers is to ensure an interdisciplinary review that also spreads the distribution of work across the entire senate faculty. Neither reviewer will be the student's advisor. Initially students' names will not be provided, so the faculty can make their initial review blind. Once their review has been turned in on the evaluation forms provided, reviewers will be informed as to the name of the student, so they can talk directly with the student as the student prepares their revision. Each reader will provide a comprehensive review with specific suggestions for improving the paper. No grade will be given. All students will revise their papers based on this feedback. Essentially this means all students may receive the equivalent of a "revise-resubmit" evaluation from a journal that is appropriate for their paper as written. *However, if the paper is judged by the two reviewers as passable at the time, they can recommend to the PhD steering committee that the paper be given a provisional pass at the time. The two reviewers should indicate to Sarah via email if s/he believes the first version is ready for provisional pass without a revision.*

If the paper was turned in by July 30, the student must turn their revised paper along with a detailed response to the reviewers to Sarah Singh by September 14, 2018. It will then go back to original reviewers for the second round of review.

If the paper was turned in on September 14, 2018, the two faculty reviewers will be given 12 days to give feedback and the student will have 25 days to prepare their revised paper and their response letter to the reviewers. Under optimal conditions this will make the revised paper due no later than October 29, 2018.

### **SECOND ROUND SUBMISSION**

- ❖ **Provisional Pass** – Indicates that the paper is nearly ready to submit for publication to a research journal. Students who receive a score of provisional pass should work closely with their advisor to further revise the paper so that it is ready for submission. Upon evidence of advisor approval of the revisions, and the submission of the paper to a refereed journal, the provisional pass is converted to an official pass. ***Students must receive this official pass before they are allowed to complete and defend their dissertation proposal and then be advanced to candidacy if they pass this defense.*** Failure to complete the process and receive the official pass by the Third-Year Dissertation proposal milestone deadline will result in recommendation to the Graduate Dean for disqualification from continuing in the Ph.D. in Education program.
- ❖ **No Pass** – Indicates that the paper has not passed and that substantial revisions are required before it is ready to submit for publication. *The student has 25 days to complete the revisions and resubmit for Third Round Submission.*

### **THIRD ROUND SUBMISSION (for students who receive a No Pass after second round submission)**

Following resubmission, the paper is sent to the same two readers as previously, but the Ph.D. Steering Committee reserves the right to send the paper to alternate or additional readers. Readers then recommend one of the following scores on the second submission.

- ❖ **Provisional Pass** – Indicates same as above
- ❖ **Fail** – Indicates that the paper has not passed on the final round.

If a student's paper is in the third round, then the Reader comments and recommended score is submitted to the Ph.D. Steering Committee, which makes the final determination of the paper's score at this point. If a score of Fail is upheld by the Steering Committee, the student is recommended to the Graduate Dean for disqualification from the Ph.D. in Education program. The Ph.D. Steering Committee also renders a separate judgment as to whether the paper is of sufficient quality to award the Master of Arts degree, provided that all other MA requirements have been met.

**Formal notification of scores is made via email letter from the Director. Letters are accompanied by comments from the two (or more) readers.**

### **CONSULTING THE PUBLICATION GUIDELINES OF THE JOURNAL FOR WHICH THE PAPER IS BEING PREPARED:**

Students should consult the publication guidelines of the major journal that is being considered as a publication outlet. The guidelines provide valuable directions for preparing papers. It is recommended, but not required, that students indicate on **the title** page the name of the preferred journal. If the selected journal follows a format different from APA, the student should note this on the **cover page**.

As with all doctoral work, students should work closely with their advisors. Doctoral students are expected to demonstrate initiative, and regularly meet with their advisors. The Ph.D. Steering Committee has established the following guidelines concerning faculty and outside support for this benchmark event:

- ❖ Students should work closely with their advisor on conceptual content, but the final product must be the student's work.
- ❖ Ph.D. Steering Committee members confirm that students may have two advisor reviews of their second-year research papers prior to the initial submission. If students pursue this option, they should allow sufficient time for advisors to read their paper in detail (at least, two weeks is a reasonable length of time).

**SYRP EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES:**

***As with other benchmark activities in this program, the faculty consider the Second-Year Research Paper an important step forward in student's academic development and devote considerable time to reviewing and critiquing this submission. Therefore, the formal submission of the Second-Year Research Paper should represent a student's best effort.***

***As with all doctoral work, students should work closely with their advisors. Doctoral students are expected to demonstrate initiative, and regularly meet with their advisors. The final product must be the Students' Work.***

***Progress on the Second-Year Research Paper is part of a Student's Annual Report of Student Progress (ARSP) the year it is due. Review of the completion of the Second-Year Research Paper is part of a Student's ARSP in the subsequent year.***