



University of Colorado
Denver

School of Education & Human Development

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Education and Human Development Student Handbook

For Students Entering Fall 2021

Table of Contents

PREFACE	4
NONDISCRIMINATION	4
TITLE IX NOTICE OF NON-DISCRIMINATION	5
PHD QUICK MATRICULATION GUIDE	6
WELCOME	8
PROGRAM OVERVIEW	9
Program Goal	9
Student Outcomes	9
EXPECTATIONS FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS	9
EXPECTATIONS OF DOCTORAL FACULTY	10
PROGRAM FACULTY	10
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	10
Conditions of Admission to the Program.....	10
Plan of Study	10
Research Apprenticeship	11
Teaching Practicum or Equivalent Experience.....	11
Assessment	12
CURRICULUM DESCRIPTION	13
<i>Core Content</i> - 12 credits	13
Research Methods – 18 credits.....	14
Concentration – 18 credit hours.....	14
Dissertation: 27 credits total.....	15
PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	15
1st Year Annual Review.....	16
2nd Year Annual Review	16
3rd Year Annual Review	16
Comprehensive Examination Review and Admission to Candidacy	17
Advancement to Candidacy	18
Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	18
Dissertation Defense.....	19
Student Exit and Follow up Surveys.....	20
Program Review	21
ACADEMIC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES	21
Advising Policies and Procedures.....	21
The Primary Advisor.....	21
The Academic Services Doctoral Advisor	22
Program Committee	22
Incomplete Grade Policy.....	22
Transfer Standards.....	22
Transfer Credits.....	23
Graduation Requirements	23
Time Limit to Degree.....	24
Leave of Absence	24
Conflict Resolution Protocol	24
Academic Probation/Discontinuance	25
Student Academic Honor and Conduct Code, Academic Grievances, Misconduct and Appeals.....	26
Academic Grievances.....	26
Academic Misconduct.....	26
THE DISSERTATION PROCESS	26
The Dissertation Advisor.....	27
Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB).....	29
Human Subject Review Forms	29
Research Misconduct.....	30
The Final Examination (Oral Defense of the Dissertation).....	30

Examination Procedures	31
Dissertation Formatting and Electronic Submission	31
FINANCIAL AID	32
Types of Aid.....	32
Graduate Research Assistant	32
Graduate Part-Time Instructor.....	33
Graduate Assistant.....	33
Scholarships	33
Sponsored Research Assistantships	33
External Funding	34
Travel Awards for Students Presenting at National Meetings.....	34
APPENDIX A: CONCENTRATION AREAS	35
Math Education.....	35
Science Education	35
Critical Studies in Education.....	35
Leadership for Educational Organizations	35
Inclusive Early Childhood Education	35
Research, Assessment, and Evaluation	36
Family Science and Human Development	36
APPENDIX B: CORE COURSE DESCRIPTIONS.....	37
EDFN 7400 - Epistemologies/Ways of Knowing: Research Paradigms & Counter-Epistemologies	37
EDFN 7420 - Foundations of Education in Urban and Diverse Communities	37
LDFS 7712 - Seminar: Learning Theory and Learners.....	37
EDFN 7833 - Culture and Critical Theory.....	37
APPENDIX C: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS.....	38
Frequently Asked Questions: The Dissertation and Oral Defense	38
APPENDIX D: STUDENT FORMS.....	40
PhD Advising Form – Education & Human Development Concentrations.....	41
APPENDIX E: COMIRB	43
APPENDIX F: PHD DISSERTATION GUIDE	47
APPENDIX G: DECISION FLOW CHART	51
APPENDIX H: PROPOSAL AND DISSERTATION DEFENSE RUBRICS	52
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL EVALUATION RUBRIC CANDIDATE NAM	52
DISSERTATION DEFENSE EVALUATION RUBRIC	53
CANDIDATE NAM	53

PREFACE

Your successful experience in the School of Education and Human Development (SEHD) is important to us. This *SEHD PhD Handbook* is a tool to ensure you maintain academic progress according to SEHD and University of Colorado Denver (UCD) policies and procedures. Please take the necessary time to read this Handbook. In addition to this handbook, doctoral students should refer to the [Graduate School's website](#) for deadlines, forms, policies Graduate School resources and campus resources.

The student assumes full responsibility for meeting all basic requirements for the degree as well as the specific requirements outlined by his/her program.

The University of Colorado Denver and the School of Education and Human Development reserve the right to make changes in the regulations, courses, rules, fees, or other changes in this handbook without advance notice. See the SEHD website at <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SchoolOfEducation/Pages/home.aspx> and the CU Denver website at <http://www.ucdenver.edu/pages/ucdwelcomepage.aspx> for any updates. No verbal modifications to the contents of this Handbook are allowed. **All modifications must be in writing and approved by the Doctoral Faculty prior to inclusion in the Handbook.** The University of Colorado Denver is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). University of Colorado Denver's School of Education & Human Development is fully accredited by the Colorado Department of Education, the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, and the National Association of School Psychologists.

We are affiliated with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the American Education Research Association, the Council of Great City Schools and Colleges of Education (with Denver Public Schools), the Urban Educator Corps, the National Education Association, A+ Denver Citizens Group, the Colorado Association of School Boards, the Colorado Association of School Executives, the Colorado Council of Deans of Education, and the Colorado Education Association.

Nondiscrimination

The University of Colorado does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, veteran status, political affiliation, or political philosophy in admission and access to, and treatment and employment in, its educational programs and activities. The university takes action to increase ethnic, cultural, and gender diversity, to employ qualified disabled individuals, and to provide equal opportunity to all students and employees.

Qualification for the position and institutional need shall be the sole bases for hiring employees, and the criteria for retaining employees shall be related to performance evaluation, assessment of institutional need, fiscal constraints, and/or, in the case of exempt professionals, the rational exercise of administrative prerogative.

All students shall have the same fundamental rights to equal respect, due process, and judgment of them based solely on factors demonstrably related to performance and expectations as students. All students share equally the obligations to perform their duties and exercise judgments of others in accordance with the basic standards of fairness, equity, and inquiry that should always guide education.

History: Amended November 8, 2001; September 17, 2013.

Title IX Notice of Non-Discrimination

The University of Colorado Denver | Anschutz Medical Campus (“the University”) is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment. The University prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, pregnancy, creed, religion, sexual orientation, veteran status, gender identity, gender expression, political philosophy or political affiliation in admission and access to, and treatment and employment in, its educational programs and activities.

The University prohibition against any act of sexual misconduct or related retaliation applies to all students, faculty, staff, contractors, patients, volunteers, affiliated entities, and other third parties and applies to conduct that occurs on campus and off-campus, including on-line or electronic conduct as noted in the University policy. Violations may be subject to disciplinary action. The University will consider what appropriate potential actions should be taken.

The University employs trained staff members who have responsibility for Title IX compliance. The Title IX Coordinator oversees the development, implementation, and evaluation of Title IX policies, procedures, and training efforts and will refer all reports to a trained Title IX Investigator. The Office of Equity can be reached at

Phone: [303-315-2567](tel:303-315-2567)

Email: equity@ucdenver.edu

<https://equity.ucdenver.edu/>

Physical Location/Mailing:

Lawrence Street Center

1380 Lawrence Street, 12th floor

Denver, CO 80217

Campus Box 187

PHD QUICK MATRICULATION GUIDE

Submit all forms to Sandy.Mondragon@ucdenver.edu for processing. It is the student's responsibility to get their advisor's signature as requested on the forms prior to submitting to Sandy.

Forms are available via the Graduate School's website: <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>.

Year 1

Prior to Fall Semester

- Meet with your assigned faculty advisor prior to the start of fall semester to determine what courses to take in the fall and spring semesters. Please note that concentration areas and the PhD faculty are constantly improving the curriculum and required courses and elective opportunities may shift – work with your advisor to ensure that your program of study takes advantage of the most current course offerings.
- Make sure you've submitted a FAFSA if you will need financial aid.

Fall Semester

- With your faculty advisor, work toward creating a 3-person program committee (see page 22 of your student handbook for details).

Spring Semester

- If you want to take summer classes, meet with your faculty advisor prior to registration.
- Discuss course selection for the next academic year.
- At the end of the spring semester you will need your [1st Annual Review](#).

Year 2

Fall Semester

- Meet with your advisor and discuss courses to take next academic year.

Spring Semester

- At the end of the spring semester you will need your [2nd Annual Review](#).
- Meet with your advisor and discuss courses to take next academic year.

Year 3

Fall Semester

- Meet with your faculty advisor to discuss coursework for the upcoming academic year.
- Discuss dissertation timeline.

Spring Semester

- At the end of the spring semester you will need your [3rd Annual Review](#).

Comprehensive Exam

Depending on how many courses you've taken, sometime around year 3 you will be ready for your Comprehensive Exam.

- Discuss with your faculty advisor when you should take your Comprehensive Exam.
- Once you've selected a date in which you will submit your exam, you will need to complete and submit a [Request for Graduate Examination/Thesis Defense](#) form *at least 2 weeks prior* to your due date. AT THE SAME TIME, you will submit your [Application for Admission to Candidacy](#) paperwork. It is recommended you submit the forms to your advisor 3 weeks prior to the deadline to allow for signatures.
- Once you have successfully completed the required coursework and passed your comprehensive exam, you will begin registering for Dissertation credits.
 - Register for dissertation credits (DSEP 8994) using the [CU-Denver Special Processing Form](#) until you successfully defend your dissertation. *Submit the signed form to Academic Services for processing.* Once you have reached the 27 - credit hour requirement, you must take 1 dissertation credit per semester (including summer if you plan to defend or graduate) until you graduate. You MUST be registered in the semester you defend and/or graduate.

Dissertation Proposal

- With your advisor, complete and submit the [Request for PhD Proposal Defense](#) form along with a copy of the PhD proposal document to Scott.Bauer@ucdenver.edu at least 2 weeks prior to the defense meeting.
- Make sure all members of your committee have been approved by the Graduate School by checking the [Denver Campus Graduate Faculty Members and their Program Affiliation](#) website. If you don't see all of your committee members listed, please submit their vita to Sandy.Mondragon@ucdenver.edu.
- Keep registering for dissertation credits until you defend and graduate. You must have a minimum of 27 dissertation credits to graduate.

Dissertation Defense

- When you're ready to defend your FINAL Dissertation:
 - You must submit a [Request for Graduate Examination/Thesis Defense](#) *at least 2 weeks prior* to your PROPOSAL defense. Again, allow a 3-week window for obtaining signatures.
 - You MUST follow the [Graduation Deadlines](#) per the Graduate School.
 - Make sure you follow the [Style and Policy Manual for Theses and Dissertations](#) and the corresponding deadlines!
 - Your committee must complete the Statement of Approval of the Thesis/Dissertation*.
 - Complete the Biosketch*. (*download from Graduate School's website)
 - Complete the [Survey of Earned Doctorates](#).

Make sure you:

- Apply to graduate in your student portal by the deadline as listed on the [Academic Calendar](#).
- Submit your dissertation to ProQuest per deadlines.

WELCOME

The School of Education & Human Development at the University of Colorado Denver welcomes you to participate in the PhD program in Education and Human Development. This handbook provides students with guidelines to the doctoral program which are aligned with the Rules of the Graduate School, including detailed information on the following:

- Program overview;
- Expectations for PhD students;
- Expectations for doctoral faculty and faculty listing;
- Program requirements;
- Curriculum description;
- Program assessments;
- Academic policies and procedures;
- Guidelines for the dissertation process; and,
- Financial aid.

For further information, contact the School of Education & Human Development Academic Services office at 303-315.6308 or education@ucdenver.edu, or visit: <http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SchoolOfEducation/CurrentStudents/Resources/Pages/DoctoralStudiesResources.aspx>.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The PhD in Education and Human Development links an intensive research-focused course of study with a concentration area in order to prepare candidates to assume positions in institutions of higher education, government agencies, or research-based organizations. Each successful applicant will be paired with a faculty mentor with whom the student will engage in research and the development of expertise in scholarship in their concentration over time.

Program Goal

To prepare candidates to serve as educational scholars and researchers who will in turn prepare researchers and future scholars for institutions of higher education (IHEs) or organizations focused on research.

Student Outcomes

The following learning outcomes serve as a basis and guide for course and program development.

Graduates of the PhD in Education & Human Development program will be able to...

1. Apply theories of learning and development to understand fundamental questions involving education, government, communities, and/or families
2. Identify and analyze an issue related to equity
3. Apply a critical lens to interrogate existing research and theoretical perspectives
4. Critically apply theories, methods, and knowledge to address questions in their primary field
5. Demonstrate skills and knowledge at a level required for college and university teaching
6. Plan and conduct research of significance
7. Demonstrate skills in oral and written communication sufficient to publish and present work in their field or prepare grant proposals

EXPECTATIONS FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

- Students will maintain a strong commitment to intellectual curiosity and inquiry
- Students will be prepared and professional in courses, meetings, and interactions with SEHD faculty and staff and their doctoral student colleagues
- Students will practice critical reflection, explore multiple perspectives, and develop a tolerance for ambiguity
- Students will be self-directed—pursuing knowledge to gain expertise and using resources of the program to further their own skills
- Students will develop a command of the empirical research in their area, a deep level of expertise on a particular topic, and a research agenda
- Students will develop their academic writing, time management skills, academic repertoire, and their identity as independent, but collaborative scholars
- Students will recognize that earning a PhD is a huge commitment

EXPECTATIONS OF DOCTORAL FACULTY

- Faculty will guide and structure opportunities for learning for students
- Faculty will be available and provide constructive, honest, and timely feedback
- Faculty will demonstrate deep commitment to students, being clear about expectations, and guiding students' growth as scholars
- Faculty will work with students who have advanced to candidacy as junior colleagues
- Faculty will model practices of academia and faculty life, progressively engaging students in these practices as they advance through the program
- Faculty will create opportunities for student research, challenge students to meet high academic standards, and encourage students to disseminate their work
- Faculty will use student feedback and other data to continuously improve the program.
- Faculty will seek external funding in order to support students in the program
- Faculty will cooperate with the efforts of Academic Services in recruitment, orientation, and retention of students.

PROGRAM FACULTY

A list of faculty in the School of Education and Human Development and their respective research interests can be found on the SEHD website at <https://education.ucdenver.edu/about-us/faculty-directory>. Students can refer to this list as they consider individuals who may be appropriate to serve on their Program Committee or Dissertation Committee. Primary Advisors must be tenure-track faculty, due to their research role and responsibilities. Committee members can be tenure track, clinical track, or instructors. Teaching is the major role and responsibility for clinical faculty and instructors, who also often have great expertise and experience in their disciplines. It is useful for students and faculty to cultivate professional relationships and to develop understanding of one another's research and scholarship.

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Conditions of Admission to the Program

Students must attend to the following conditions of admission to the program. Students may not register for any of the four core courses prior to the fall of the year admitted; students may register for and take concentration area courses with the approval of their assigned faculty advisor. In addition to the policies and procedures of the School of Education and those within the PhD Doctoral Student Handbook, students are bound by the rules of the University of Colorado Denver Graduate School. This includes the policy that you have **eight years** from the semester in which you are admitted to successfully complete the degree requirements, including leaves of absence, which count against the eight years.

Plan of Study

Students complete a plan of study in their first term with their faculty advisor that includes at least 48 credits of coursework (including all required core courses) and 27 dissertation credits. Students will

submit their approved plan of study with their first Annual Review. Depending on a student's background experiences and prior coursework, additional courses may be required in order to adequately build a deep repertoire of content knowledge and skills. The student's faculty advisor and program committee are responsible for making this determination.

Research Apprenticeship

To support his/her induction into the university research and teaching culture, each PhD student is expected to complete a research apprenticeship under the guidance of a doctoral faculty member in the SEHD or outside of the SEHD with approval from the Associate Dean. This requirement must be completed by and assessed during the third annual review. ***Failure to complete this degree requirement by the third annual review will be considered a failure to progress and result in being placed on immediate academic probation or dismissal from the program.***

The required research apprenticeship can be fulfilled in a variety of ways. Under specific and extraordinary circumstances, exceptions or variations may be pursued. Exceptions require approval by the students' advisor and the Associate Dean who oversees doctoral programs. Students have the following options to fulfill the research apprenticeship requirement:

1. Full-time (20 hours per week, 32 weeks) during an academic year, supported by either a grant, contract or faculty award by the School of Education and Human Development. Students enrolled in this research assistantship form of apprenticeship will earn an hourly stipend (which will vary according to the source of funds) and may receive in-state tuition remission (amounts of tuition remission vary according to funding sources). Students supported in this option are expected to take a full load of coursework (a minimum of 5 credits per semester) concurrent with the assistantship. The student and faculty advisor are responsible for submitting for approval the applicable and necessary payroll and tuition scholarship forms (see Appendix F).
2. Part-time (10 hours per week, 64 weeks) across two academic years, supported by either a grant, contract or faculty award by the School of Education and Human Development. Students enrolled in this form of a research assistantship will earn an hourly stipend (which will vary according to the source of funds) and may receive in-state tuition remission (amounts of tuition remission vary according to funding sources). Students supported in this option are expected to take a minimum of 5 credits per semester concurrent with the assistantship. The student and faculty advisor are responsible for submitting for approval the applicable and necessary payroll and tuition scholarship forms (see Appendix F).

Engaging in one of these options for research apprenticeship not only demands meeting the time commitments but also a clear demonstration of your advancing knowledge and skills in the research process. A formal evaluation of your progress as a researcher will be made through the annual program review process. Students participating in assistantships supported through grants, contracts or faculty awards through the School of Education and Human Development may be held accountable also for the scope of work specified (as per source of funds) by/through the project in addition to the annual program review process.

Teaching Practicum or Equivalent Experience

Some students without teaching experience will have the option to teach an undergraduate or master's degree level course in or related to their concentration area prior to graduating in order to develop or refine their skills for higher education settings and produce a record of post-secondary teaching experience. [Specific concentration areas may have more detailed requirements related to the teaching practicum; discuss options with your advisor.] This opportunity can be supported in a

variety of ways over time. For example, a student may be invited to co-teach a section of a course with another instructor or take on the responsibility as instructor. A student may also serve as a Teaching Assistant in one or more courses. All students must provide evidence of experience with post-secondary teaching as part of their graduation requirements. Consult with your faculty advisor if you are interested in this option.

Assessment

Assessments are in place to mark students' continued progress in the program, provide data for faculty efforts to engage in continuous program improvement, and to address the SEHD's accreditation commitments. Students are required to complete each of the assessments outlined below. Failure to participate in and to successfully pass a program assessment is grounds for being placed on academic probation or dismissal from the program.

- [LiveText](http://sehdassessment.ucdenver.edu/): LiveText is a web-based portfolio platform linked to program assessments and required for all students in the School of Education & Human Development. Upon enrollment, you will be assigned a LiveText account. Details on how SEHD students access their LiveText subscription as well as important training workshops and other resources are available on the SEHD assessment website at <http://sehdassessment.ucdenver.edu/>. Students will use their LiveText accounts to upload assessments that show student progress through the PhD.
- Annual Reviews
- Research Apprenticeship
- Comprehensive Examination Review and Admission to Candidacy
- Evidence of Post-secondary teaching experience
- Dissertation Proposal Defense
- Dissertation Defense

Requirements for each protocol or process are described in the Assessment section.

CURRICULUM DESCRIPTION

This degree program consists of a minimum of 75 credit hours. Total credits may vary in order for a student's academic preparation to be fully developed for future career opportunities. The curriculum requirements are grouped by concentration areas into two broad groupings: Education and Human Development [Math Education; Science Education; Critical Studies in Education; Leadership for Educational Organizations; and Research, Assessment and Evaluation] and Child, Youth and Family Studies [Inclusive Early Childhood Education; Early Childhood Policy; and Family Science and Human Development]. The curriculum plan for Child, Youth and Family Studies areas is in development at time of printing this Handbook, and students in these areas of study should consult with their advisor to review the program plan they will follow.

Education and Human Development

Students complete 48 credit hours in three core areas: 1) foundations of equitable teaching and learning; 2) research; and, 3) a specified concentration area. The final 27 credits are completed through dissertation credits. Please note that concentration areas and the PhD faculty are constantly improving the curriculum and required courses and elective opportunities may shift – work with your advisor to ensure that your program of study takes advantage of the most current course offerings.

Core Content - 12 credits

Table 1. PhD Core Courses:

Course	Credits	Objective
EDFN 7420 Foundations of Education in Urban and Diverse Contexts	3	Provide background on the history and politics of formal and informal US and global education, including adult education
LDFS 7712 Learning Theory and Learners	3	Develop understanding of current theories of learning and development as well as historical precursors
EDFN 7400 Epistemologies: Ways of Knowing, Research Paradigms, & Counter-Epistemologies	3	Epistemologies addresses conceptions and approaches to ways of knowing including intellectual traditions and their history as well as epistemological counter-stories of marginalized and subaltern ways of knowing that expose the contingency and bias of dominant forms of knowing.
EDFN 7833: Culture and Critical Theory	3	Provides an introduction to critical inquiry. General topics include: the development and application of the concept of culture, the development and application of critical theory, critical race theory and critical pedagogy. Through the course, students are guided to explore critical theory work in their own field.

Research Methods – 18 credits

Students in the Educational Research Studies PhD program will be expected to develop a broad understanding of approaches to research prior to developing deeper skills in a particular methodology or approach.

Course	Credits	Objective
Introductory Course		
RSEM 7000 Doctoral Seminar in Research Methods	3	Understand research as methods for revealing and explaining change within complex social systems. Importance of attending to context, processes, and time frames. Evidence for causal claims. Examine and critique several examples of inquiry.
Intermediate Courses		
RSEM 7110: Intermediate Statistics	3	Understanding of sampling and inference, multiple regression, factorial ANOVA, ANCOVA
RSEM 6100: Methods of Qualitative Inquiry	3	Understanding qualitative methodology and rigor as a frame for various qualitative designs.
Advanced Courses		
RSEM 7150 Mixed Methods Research	3	Apply mixed methods to shared and individual problems of practice.
Elective – an in-depth study of research method, e.g. Advanced Quantitative or Advanced Qualitative Methods	3	Practice and in-depth work with a research method, depending on research goals and probable dissertation project of student
Elective - additional in-depth study of research methods such as discourse analysis, ethnography, or hierarchical linear modeling/SEM; advanced measurement; survey methods; evaluation research	3	Additional expertise in analytic methods or specific methods in-depth.

Concentration – 18 credit hours

Doctoral students will complete a series of six courses/experiences in a specified concentration area (See descriptions of Concentration Areas in Appendix D). Content domains that align to prospective positions in institutions of higher education will be the basis for concentration areas. A *concentration area* is defined as a series of courses/experiences that lead to increasing subject matter expertise. Concentration areas are designed to help students focus on a defined discipline or content area in preparation for professional roles as researchers and faculty members. The requirement for a student

to demonstrate teaching within the concentration area should be considered when building out a plan of study.

Students and their advisors will individually negotiate the courses/experiences that will constitute and meet the requisite concentration areas courses/experiences, based on the student’s previous preparation and professional experiences. A student may take no more than six credit hours of independent study to meet this requirement. Courses in other colleges or schools at CU Denver or in the CU system can be used to meet this requirement with prior approval of the advisor. Again, additional course credits may be required in order to deepen a student’s subject matter expertise.

Dissertation: 27 credits total

Students will complete 30 dissertation credits in accordance with the rules of the graduate school. No other form of academic credit, e.g., research apprenticeships, independent studies, can be used to meet this requirement. Please note that only a limited number of dissertation credits maybe taken before successfully defending the Comprehensive Examination – consult the Graduate School regulations in effect for specifics.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS

Student performance in the program will be assessed in several different ways, both formatively and summatively. Conventional individual course performance measures (including grades and artifacts) will constitute one form of assessment. In addition, students complete key assessments, outlined below. The first four assessments display mastery, application, and synthesis of knowledge and skills gained during the PhD student’s first three years. The dissertation will then serve as an opportunity to integrate these skills and knowledge gained during the course of the program with original research and analysis, and independent expertise in the area(s) of the student’s dissertation study. Each assessment and process is required; failure to participate in and successfully pass each assessment and assessment process is grounds for being placed on academic probation or dismissal from the program. Table 3 provides an overview of the required assessments and purpose as well as participants involved in each.

Table 3. PhD program assessment overview.

Assessment	Purpose	Participants
1 st Year Review	(Formative) To ensure progress in developing as a scholar is being made and to set goals for year two.	Student & Primary Advisor
2 nd Year Review	(Formative) To ensure progress in developing as a scholar is being made, to check in on goals from previous year, to set goals for year three.	Student & Primary Advisor
3 rd Year Review	(Formative) To check in on readiness to move towards the dissertation.	Student & Primary Advisor
The Comprehensive Examination Review & Admission to Candidacy	(Summative) To demonstrate readiness to move on to the dissertation.	Student & Program Committee
Research Apprenticeship	(Formative) To demonstrate readiness to move on to the dissertation	Student, Advisor and Program Committee

Teaching in IHEs	(Formative) To demonstrate readiness to take on the academic life of an IHE faculty member	Doctoral Candidate & Dissertation Committee
Dissertation Proposal and Defense	(Formative) To demonstrate a deep knowledge of relevant literature, a sound data collection/analysis plan, and a clear rationale for the dissertation study.	Doctoral Candidate & Dissertation Committee
Dissertation Defense	(Summative) To demonstrate scholarly skills worthy of the PhD.	Doctoral Candidate & Dissertation Committee

Students in the PhD program will upload materials for certain courses, each annual review, candidacy form, comprehensive examination review and their final dissertation document into LiveText.

The assessment rubrics for the Dissertation Proposal Defense and the Dissertation Defense are included in an appendix to this manual.

1st Year Annual Review

Students submit their plan of study in which the entire program and learning experiences are listed. Students also will provide papers they have produced during their first year in the program to their primary advisor for review. At least one of the papers needs to be a literature review to demonstrate a developing understanding of the existing literature. When the committee reviews the student's work, they will be looking for evidence that the student is:

- Making progress in scholarly writing and effectively engaging in scholarly discourse,
- Developing a strong sense of research in their field,
- Gaining knowledge about research methodology, and
- Deepening content knowledge and expertise.

During the review, the advisor will make recommendations to the student regarding strengths as a developing scholar and areas where the student could focus concentrated efforts to improve. Collectively the student and the advisor will agree upon attainable goals, how they will be demonstrated and the activities that will support achieving the goals to support the development of the student as a scholar during their 2nd year in the doctoral program. At the end of the review meeting the primary advisor will sign the form to indicate that the student's progress was discussed and approved. The student will upload the signed form to LiveText.

2nd Year Annual Review

Similar to the first - year review, doctoral students will present papers they have written to continue to demonstrate their progress in scholarly writing, their understanding of research in their field as well as their knowledge of research methodology. A particular focus of the 2nd year review will be the demonstration of how students have met the learning goals established in the 1st year review. Further, the doctoral student and primary advisor will collaboratively set additional goals and activities to support the scholarly development of the doctoral student in year three. The student will upload the signed form to LiveText.

3rd Year Annual Review

Similar to the second - year review, doctoral students will present papers they have written to continue to demonstrate their progress in scholarly writing, their understanding of research in their field as well as their knowledge of research methodology. A particular focus of the 3rd year review will be both the demonstration of how students have met the learning goals established in the 2nd year review as well as their ability to present a historiography or comprehensive statement of the problem

they are planning to investigate in their dissertation. The student will upload the signed form to LiveText.

Comprehensive Examination Review and Admission to Candidacy

As per the CU Denver Graduate School rules, after **completing or registering** for all Program-required, non-dissertation coursework and concurrent with applying for admission to candidacy, PhD students must take a comprehensive examination in their respective discipline. This examination will test a student's mastery of a broad field of knowledge and readiness to advance to the dissertation stage of the doctorate.

The comprehensive exam meeting is conducted by the Program Committee. A majority of the committee members, including the Chair of the examination meeting, must be members of the degree-granting program. The student's advisor may not chair the comprehensive examination meeting, but is normally one of the committee members attending. The student's Program Committee and the Chair of the comprehensive exam as well as the examination schedule must be approved by the Associate Dean before being submitted to the Graduate School for final approval and filing. The Graduate School must be notified on the appropriate forms at least two (2) weeks before the exam. These forms are included in the PhD Program Resources found at (<https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>).

The oral part of the comprehensive examination may be open to all members of the Doctoral program, if agreed to by the student and Program Committee. This examination must be completed no later than the end of the third (3rd) year for full-time students, unless indicated otherwise in Program-specific guidelines.

All members of the committee must be present for the examination, although a minority of members, but not the Chair nor the student, may participate by interactive video. In the event of an *emergency* that prevents *one* (1) faculty committee member from attending the exam, the exam may proceed with the faculty members who can attend and the student will schedule a separate meeting with the absent faculty member at an alternate time. The examination form must be signed by the committee members and returned to the doctoral staff advisor. The student must receive votes from the majority of the examination committee for one of the following outcomes: a) Pass; b) Conditional Pass; or c) Fail.

If a student receives a Conditional Pass, the examining committee will clearly define the requirements for the student to receive an unconditional passing grade and these requirements must be completed to the satisfaction of the examination committee within four (4) months. The Comprehensive Exam meeting Chair is responsible for monitoring the conditions and reporting their outcome to the Graduate School. Failure to satisfy these conditions will result in failure of the examination.

A student who fails the examination is subject to immediate dismissal from the Graduate School upon the recommendation of the Program and concurrence of the Dean. At the Program's discretion, a student who fails the examination may retake it once. The re-examination will be in the form designated by the committee and must be completed within twelve (12) months. The original examination form noting the failure is signed by the committee and returned to the Graduate School office. New examination forms will be generated when the examination is rescheduled. The student will be required to meet registration requirements and be registered during the term in which the repeated exam is taken.

The exam encompasses both written and oral components. The advisor and student will agree to a format and content that demonstrates 1) the student's ability to conduct original research, 2) the student's ability to synthesize relevant literature in her/his field; and 3) the student's emerging expertise regarding a problem or issue in education and ability to argue for the importance of a research study addressing that problem. The oral components of the comprehensive exam include a brief presentation by the student and an extensive question and answer period in which the committee members examine the student's knowledge. The written components may include course papers and reflections, the products of independent studies, and often a prospectus for a dissertation. A prospectus is less developed than a dissertation proposal, but does include a discussion of the problem and proposed study, a brief review of the relevant research, and a proposed methodology. The prospectus, together with serious reflection on past course products, provides a good basis for determining readiness to move into developing a dissertation proposal.

The oral component of the exam takes the form of an oral defense. During the oral defense, the committee will ask challenging questions and probe for deeper understandings and scholarly proficiencies. After the committee has asked a sufficient number of questions to determine whether the student should pass or not, the committee will ask the student, and anyone else who has attended the exam, to leave the room while the committee deliberates. The committee will decide if the student passes or needs to work on revisions of their work. If revisions are required, the guidelines and timeline for those revisions should be clearly laid out during the committee's deliberation at the end of the oral defense and later summarized in writing by the Chair. If necessary, the committee may require the student to take more courses, do more work, or completely re-do the comprehensive review at a later date. All students must complete the comprehensive review by the end of their fourth year in the PhD program.

Advancement to Candidacy. Students must apply for admission to candidacy for the doctoral degree at least two (2) weeks before taking the comprehensive examination. The Candidacy form is available on the Graduate School website <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>. The student's primary advisor and the Associate Dean must approve the completed application. The student cannot take the comprehensive examination if on probation, i.e., have a GPA less than 3.20 for all graduate courses taken, or before they have completed or registered for all non-thesis coursework required by the program.

Before being admitted to candidacy, doctoral students must complete at least two (2) semesters of enrollment at CU Denver, complete or register for all program-required, non-dissertation coursework, and pass the comprehensive examination.

Dissertation Proposal Defense

After a student passes the comprehensive exam, s/he will need to establish a Dissertation Advisory/Examination Committee, hereafter called the Dissertation Committee, and begin to work with that committee to develop her dissertation proposal. The Dissertation Committee is composed of the Dissertation Advisor and three other committee members, all of whom must be Graduate Faculty members. A majority of the committee members, including the Chair, must be members of the PhD EDHD program.

The PhD student's dissertation advisor may not chair the examination committee.

The proposal is generally a solid draft of the first three chapters of a dissertation: (a) A statement of the problem; (b) review of the literature and a conceptual/theoretical framework; and, (c) methods, along with an argument as to why and how the study will be a contribution to the field. However, the

Dissertation Committee shall decide with the doctoral candidate what the content of the proposal should be in order to best fit the planned research and methodology. The dissertation proposal might include a historiography, rationale, theoretical and conceptual framework, methodology, literature review, etc. The proposal should contain the research problem and question(s), plan for research, and a scholarly rationale for the study that situates the dissertation project in the larger context of the candidate's field. Once the candidate has written their proposal and both the candidate and the Dissertation Advisor feel that the proposal is ready to be defended, the proposal will be given to and read by the entire Dissertation Committee. With your advisor, complete and submit the [Request for PhD Proposal Defense](#) form along with a copy of the PhD proposal document to Scott.Bauer@ucdenver.edu at least 2 weeks prior to the defense meeting.

For the proposal defense, each member of the Dissertation Committee will come with questions, comments or suggestions to improve the candidate's work. After the candidate provides an approximately 20 minute presentation, the committee will discuss the proposal, ask questions, and decide together about next steps for the candidate. The committee may approve the proposal, request revisions, or reject the proposal. If a candidate's proposal is rejected, the Dissertation Committee and the Dissertation Advisor will work with the candidate to determine the next steps and path of action toward dissertation completion. Once a student has completed her/his proposal, a meeting of the Dissertation Committee should be held. The proposal must be approved unanimously by committee members, and the PhD Dissertation Proposal Approval Form (found at <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/student-resources/graduate/doctoral-studies>) must be signed and filed with the Doctoral Staff Advisor in Academic Services. The Dissertation Committee will complete and submit the SEHD PhD Program formative assessment rubric along with this form.

All PhD students who have advanced to candidacy must meet with their Dissertation Committee at least once every year, preferably more often. The Dissertation Committee shall evaluate the student's progress to ensure that s/he has made satisfactory progress since the previous meeting. If the committee decides that student's progress is unsatisfactory, they will forward a written report to the student and the Associate Dean suggesting the steps to be taken to rectify the situation. The approved dissertation proposal and signed form will be uploaded to LiveText by the student.

Dissertation Defense

Once the candidate and the Dissertation Advisor feel that the dissertation is complete and ready to be defended, the candidate will defend her dissertation. The main purposes of the defense are to allow the candidate to (a) convince the committee of her/ his robust understanding of the research processes and results, and how they contribute to the knowledge in the candidate's field; and (b) provide evidence that the dissertation is an original, authentic contribution made by the candidate. After the dissertation has been completed, a final examination on the dissertation and related topics is conducted in two parts: an oral presentation of the dissertation research that is open to the public followed by a question and an answer period moderated by the defense meeting Chair. After the question period, the candidate and any audience members are asked to leave the room. During their absence, the committee members deliberate, evaluating the quality of the dissertation and whether is a pass or a fail, any changes that need to be made, and next steps for the candidate. Please note: An advisor will not normally allow a dissertation not deemed ready to go to a defense. Concerns from the advisor or committee regarding readiness of the dissertation should be heeded, as a failed defense benefits no one.

When a near final draft of the dissertation has been approved by the advisor, the candidate and Dissertation Advisor request that one of the Dissertation Committee members serve as Chair of the Dissertation Defense meeting. The candidate must work with members of the Dissertation Committee to determine the date of the defense and the date when the committee members will receive a copy of the dissertation. Further, the candidate should work with his/her committee to determine how and in which format the committee members will receive the dissertation. The candidate and the committee need to plan for adequate time for each member of the dissertation committee to read the entire dissertation (at least 2 weeks prior to the day of defense, although a month would allow for requested changes prior to the defense) and check-in as a committee to ensure that the defense only moves forward if the committee agrees that the student is likely to successfully defend. **The dissertation must be defended by the end of the student's 8th year of the program and be a demonstration of the scholarly excellence of the candidate. Failure to meet this expectation can result in dismissal from the program.**

The Program Director will approve the student's Dissertation Exam Chair and the examination schedule before it is submitted to the Graduate School for final approval and filing. The Graduate School must be notified on the appropriate forms at least two (2) weeks before the exam. Forms are at (<https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>). **STUDENTS MUST FOLLOW THE GRADUATE SCHOOL'S DEADLINES POSTED AT <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>.** The Graduate School will send announcements of the examination to appropriate faculty members, and the signature form will be sent to the Program office to be placed in the student's file for use at the examination.

A majority of the committee members, including the Chair, must be members of the degree-granting program. **The student's Dissertation Advisor may not chair the defense.** The student must submit finalized draft copies of the thesis to the defense committee at least two (2) weeks before the examination date. Some committees may require an earlier deadline, and allowing time to get requested changes before the defense is optimal.

All members of the committee must be present for the examination, although a minority of members, but not the Chair or the student, may participate by interactive video. In the event of an *emergency* that prevents *one* (1) faculty committee member from attending the exam, the exam can proceed with the faculty members who can attend and the student will schedule a separate meeting with the absent faculty member at an alternate time. The examination form must be signed by the committee and returned to the Graduate School office. The student must receive votes from a strict majority of the examination committee for one of the following outcomes: a) Pass; b) Conditional Pass; or c) Fail. The Dissertation Committee will complete and submit the SEHD PhD Program formative assessment rubric to the Program Director after the defense meeting.

If a student receives a Conditional Pass, the examining committee will clearly define the requirements for the student to receive an unconditional passing grade and these requirements must be completed to the satisfaction of the examination committee within sixty (60) days of the defense. Under extenuating circumstances, the Associate Dean may petition the Graduate School for additional time. If a student fails the examination, s/he may not continue in the program.

A more thorough description of the dissertation process can be reviewed later in this handbook.

Student Exit and Follow up Surveys

Program assessment of the PhD curriculum and culminating experiences will also be accomplished through student exit and follow-up surveys. Within the SEHD, a formal system is currently in place to

conduct exit and follow-up surveys of program graduates, thereby allowing us to track student placement or advancement in professional jobs following degree completion, as well as the long-term success of graduates.

Program Review

Data from the program assessments (comprehensive exams, course outcomes, and other assessments as developed) are examined yearly by the doctoral faculty to determine if courses and experiences are addressing the goals and outcomes of the program. Ongoing curriculum, instruction and assessment refinements will be made based on that data. In addition, periodic program reviews are required and conducted by the campus-level office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. These indicators of program quality will be used to modify curriculum and program delivery as necessary. All efforts and rationale for changes will be fully documented in accreditation reports.

ACADEMIC PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

The rules of the Graduate School govern this PhD program. All of the processes and procedures within the PhD program are within the guidelines of the University of Colorado Denver Graduate School Rules. The rules can be found on the Graduate School's website at <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>. Students should review the graduate rules for additional information that governs their program.

Additional resources for students are located on the Graduate School's website at <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>.

Additionally, the SEHD Student Policies and Procedures Handbook provides information on school policies and can be found at <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/student-resources/graduate>.

Advising Policies and Procedures

PhD students have access to a variety of individuals and groups to provide support, guidance, and advising throughout their program. Meeting with advisors once a semester is recommended, excluding summer. Students should come prepared to the advising appointments, bringing any relevant forms and an unofficial transcript.

The Primary Advisor

When a student is admitted, a primary advisor is assigned with consideration of the areas of interest indicated in the student's application materials. The primary advisor is responsible for determining and monitoring the student's program plan of study in concert with the student's Program Committee. This includes working with the student to determine the plan of study, select electives, and submit necessary documentation for transfer credits or other coursework-related documentation. The primary advisor also guides the student in development of the student's professional goals. All faculty are available for career guidance. However, only the primary advisor should give the student academic program advice (along with program committee members) and approvals. It is the responsibility of the student to make appointments to meet with his or her faculty advisor and program committee *at least* once per academic year.

Students can request to change their primary advisor. These requests must be made by the student and approved in writing by the current primary advisor; the proposed new faculty advisor, the Associate Dean.

The Academic Services Doctoral Advisor

In addition to the primary advisor, doctoral students may wish to consult with the staff Doctoral Advisor. The Doctoral Advisor can assist students with necessary paperwork, policies, and processes. The Doctoral Advisor does not provide academic – course selection – advising. Rather, the Doctoral Advisor assists students with the administrative process of completing a doctoral degree.

Program Committee

During the first year, the doctoral student and his faculty advisor will collectively create a three-person program committee (including the advisor). Members of this committee must be members of the doctoral faculty. Attention should be paid to include varying perspectives and expertise in the committee including methodological expertise. Members of this committee will conduct the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year annual reviews as well as serve as the committee for the comprehensive exam. The student may or may not choose to have members of this committee serve on their Dissertation Committee.

Grade Requirements

To maintain satisfactory academic progress, advance to candidacy, and earn the PhD, students are required to maintain a minimum GPA of “B+” (3.20). Failure to maintain a 3.20 GPA will result in students being placed on academic probation, as defined below. Courses in which grades below “B-” (2.7) are received cannot be applied toward fulfillment of the requirements for any graduate (PhD or Master’s) degree, and consequently, the course must be retaken in order to achieve a B- or better grade. However, all grades received, including repeat courses, will appear on the student’s transcript and will be included in the GPA calculation, but only one course enrollment may be counted towards graduation credits. **Please note this GPA requirement is a SEHD PhD program policy and supersedes the GPA policy set by the Graduate School.**

An in-progress (IP) grade is given for thesis or dissertation hours until the final approved thesis/dissertation is submitted to the Graduate School office. Once the dissertation is completed and passed, a grade will be included in the student's cumulative GPA, replacing all IPs.

For other courses, the instructor will assign a letter grade, an Incomplete (I) in rare cases when a student has completed most of the coursework, but had a medical or similar emergency not allowing him to finish the course. A grade of "I" is automatically changed to an "F" after one (1) year unless a grade change is initiated by the instructor. However, no other grade changes are allowed by the Graduate School; i.e., students are not allowed to perform additional work for a course already completed in order to have their grades improved.

Incomplete Grade Policy

Students requesting a grade of Incomplete ('I'), should refer to the SEHD Course Completion Agreement for Incomplete available on the website at

https://education.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider16/student-resources/forms/incomplete-grade-application.pdf?sfvrsn=ba69bb8_12 for the full policy and form.

Please note that grades of I, W, NC, and F do NOT satisfy financial aid requirements.

Transfer Standards

Transfer students from other education programs will be considered under the same criteria as a de novo admission. They will need to meet all of the same requirements for regular admission.

Transfer Credits

Transfer credit is defined as any credit earned at another accredited institution either in the United States or abroad, or credits earned as a non-degree student within the UC system. Graduate courses taken while the student was enrolled in a graduate program anywhere in the UC system are considered resident, not transfer, and therefore fall outside the limits on transfer credits.

Students wishing to transfer course credit must complete the form found at <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources> and obtain signatures as indicated. Return the form with an official transcript to your faculty advisor. Please submit the required documentation as soon as possible once the course and grade are posted on the transcript. Conditions listed below must be fulfilled before request can be acted upon.

1. Official transcript showing courses recommended for transfer must accompany this request. To be official, a transcript must show the seal of the institution.
2. Appropriate courses used toward a master's degree may be used toward a doctoral degree.
3. Grades in the courses recommended for transfer must be no lower than "B minus" (B-).
4. Courses with "Pass/Fail" or "Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory" grades will not be transferred.
5. Institutions from which courses are recommended for transfer must be accredited.
6. Quarter hours will be converted to semester hours by multiplying the number of quarter hours by 2/3.
7. Student must have satisfactorily completed one semester in the Graduate School as a regular degree student before transfer of credit is recommended.
8. Student's grade-point average on all work taken must be no lower than 3.0.
9. The Rules of the Graduate School stipulate a maximum of 12 hours may be transferred. Up to 6 credits may be applied to core courses.
10. Courses taken more than 7 years prior to the date of graduation must be revalidated by examination.
11. Courses recommended for transfer must be equal in level to courses applicable toward the degree at this institution.
12. Grades for transferred classes are not calculated into the graduate grade point average.

Graduation Requirements

In order to graduate the student must:

- Complete all coursework with a minimum grade of at least B- for individual classes
- Maintain an overall 3.2 grade point average
- Successfully complete a Research and Teaching Apprenticeship
- Pass a Comprehensive Examination Review after the completion of all coursework
- Provide evidence of teaching in an institution of higher education (IHE)
- Satisfactorily complete and successfully defend a dissertation

Note: Students are expected to submit articles for publication and publish in their areas, present at conferences, and teach as they participate actively in the scholarly community. An overall record of active scholarly contribution and university teaching is expected.

Time Limit to Degree

Doctoral students, whether enrolled full time or part time, must complete all degree requirements within **eight** years of matriculation. Students who fail to complete the degree in this eight-year period are subject to termination from the Graduate School. For a student to continue beyond the time limit, the Program Director must petition the Dean of the Graduate School for an extension and include 1) reasons why the program faculty believes the student should be allowed to continue in the program and 2) an anticipated timeline for completion of the degree.

Leave of Absence

Students who need to leave CU Denver Graduate Programs for a period of time petition for a leave of absence of up to one (1) year. If approved by the Associate Dean and the Dean of the Graduate School, a copy of the Leave of Absence form is forwarded to the Registrar's Office. The original is retained in the student's file. Approved leaves of absence do not automatically extend the time limits for earning a degree, but they may be used as a reason to request an extension if needed. Requests for leaves of absence that exceed one (1) year will not be approved unless the Associate Dean provides the Dean with a compelling justification why such action should be approved. Students who are absent for longer than one (1) year will be considered to have withdrawn from the Program and will be required to reapply for admission, re-establish residency, and be considered with all other applicants during the next admission deadline. The Leave of Absence form can be found here: <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>.

Conflict Resolution Protocol

Teaching & learning are collaborative endeavors. Just as any close relationship requires excellent communication and problem-solving skills, so do professional relationships. **Every candidate will inevitably encounter conflict during their preparation and should expect to encounter conflict in their professional career.** Having the skills and the experience to successfully navigate conflict are an essential part of doctoral preparation. We coach students to apply "guiding principles" in a helpful "conflict resolution process" that starts with analyzing/defining the problem considering potential solutions and their effects and then deciding on a practical action. A blank flowchart is provided for you to copy and use when needed (**Appendix G**).

The **principles** underlying conflict resolution are:

1. We filter our experiences through our personal lenses. Your standards or norms may be different from the other person, resulting in your perception of a problem.
2. Those who are in the situation can usually best solve the problem, not someone outside of the situation. If at all possible, talk to the person that you perceive to be a part of the problem, rather than to others. If needed, first speak to the academic advisor who can coach you around language and ways to interact with the person.
3. Most problems are best solved when addressed as soon as possible. Problems that fester are harder to solve. Consider setting up a private meeting that works well for both of you.
4. Most people act and talk with good intentions. Try to understand what the other person's intentions might have been and/or assume that they may have been positive even if you didn't perceive them that way. Part of problem solving includes analyzing whether intentions matched the action perceived by the other person.

5. In approaching another person about a problem, it is usually helpful to be prepared to suggest *several* possible resolutions. In fact, your first idea may not always be the most satisfying to everyone involved.
6. We all have a tendency to assume that the other person involved in problem solving with us has not listened when they do not agree with us. Although this is possible, it is not necessarily the case. When you feel that you haven't been listened to, ask the other person to summarize what they have heard you say. You may find that the person has listened but simply doesn't agree with you.
7. Practice confidentiality! Resist the urge to share the issue with others not involved in the problem, including those in your university class or your peers. Please know, though, that university faculty and the academic advisor are helpful mentors and "sounding boards"... they are always willing to help you navigate conflict by coaching you with this protocol!
8. Avoid the tendency to make generalities regarding the situation (i.e., "everyone in our class feels this way"; "all of these students think and act alike").
9. When problems are well defined, resolutions follow more easily. To help define the problem consider the following process:
 - Suspend judgment.
 - Define the problem for yourself as clearly as you can at the point when you recognize that something is bothering you.
 - Consider who/what is contributing to the problem. Consider your role in this issue.
 - What is within your control and others' control regarding the problem? If the problem is outside of yours and others' control, practice acceptance.
 - What do you suppose the other person's interpretation of the problem is? Put yourself in the other person's shoes.
 - Now restate the problem. Are you ready to present the problem to those involved now?

Academic Probation/Discontinuance

The GPA of students enrolled in the PhD program must remain at 3.2 or above to maintain good standing in the program. Should a student's GPA fall below 3.2, the primary advisor will notify the student and he/she will be placed on academic probation. The student is then required to attain an overall GPA of 3.2 or above the following semester. If the student's GPA does not meet the 3.2 standard by the end of the second semester on probation, Associate Dean, will suspend or dismiss the student from the program. A student may petition the program leader for an extension of the probation period in the case of extenuating circumstances.

Students may be dismissed from the program if they fail to demonstrate adequate progress (including meeting timelines for degree completion), if they do not meet annual review criteria, fail the Comprehensive Exam or for violations of university and school ethical and professional standards of conduct.

Any student who is dismissed from the Graduate School following unsuccessful academic probation or failure to meet his or her program's guidelines for satisfactory academic progress may reapply for admission to the same or a different graduate program in the School of Education and Human Development after one (1) year. The student should consult with the Associate Dean before applying.

Student Academic Honor and Conduct Code, Academic Grievances, Misconduct and Appeals

Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of personal integrity and professional ethics as detailed in the Graduate School Academic Honor and Conduct Code

(<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/Graduate-School/Documents/pdf/HonorCode.pdf>).

Students who do not meet these standards of integrity and ethics, or who violate the honor code may be placed on disciplinary probation by the Dean upon the recommendation of the Academic Conduct and Appeals Committee (ACAC). Generally, procedures for matters involving academic misconduct should emphasize due process, which should include, at a minimum, notification to the student regarding the alleged violation, an opportunity for the student to gather information in order to properly respond to the allegation, and an impartial hearing to be conducted by the ACAC. The honor code, committee guidelines, and appeal process are on file in the Graduate School office and available in the Graduate School Student Handbook, as well as online at

https://www1.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/honorcode.pdf?sfvrsn=ca1d22b9_2

. The Schools or Colleges in which Graduate Programs are housed, or individual Graduate Programs themselves, may have additional policies and/or requirements for student conduct.

Academic Grievances

Students who feel that they have been treated unfairly or outside of normal programmatic/departmental policies, may file a grievance with the Graduate School in accordance with grievance procedures outlined in the Student Handbook and posted online

https://www1.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/academic-grievance.pdf?sfvrsn=a81c22b9_2 .

The designation academic grievance covers those problems related to academic issues. Such issues are distinguished from academic ethics cases and disciplinary cases for which separate procedures exist. Included within academic grievance cases are faculty, program, departmental, College or School (including Graduate School) policies affecting individual student prerogatives; deviations from stated grading procedures (excluding individual grade challenges); unfair treatment and related issues.

Academic Misconduct

The Academic Conduct and Appeals Committee (ACAC) has responsibility for reviewing and resolving cases of honor code misconduct or student academic grievances unless the School or College in which the Graduate Program resides has established its own policy [see Article I Section 3 (iii) b]. For those Schools and Colleges that have their own academic misconduct policies and procedures, and which meet the standards of due process, such Schools and Colleges will have the original jurisdiction in cases involving honor code misconduct or student academic grievances. For such Schools and Colleges the ACAC may act as an appellate review board for the final action taken by the School or College and will forward their recommendation to the Dean of the Graduate School.

THE DISSERTATION PROCESS

The dissertation represents an opportunity for students to demonstrate their ability to craft, implement and complete an original research study that meets the expectations for high quality research and writing that contributes new knowledge to their field. This work is a departure from course work and internships in that candidates lead this process from conception to completion with a faculty advisor and Dissertation Committee. When a doctoral student advances to candidacy and begins the

dissertation phase of doctoral work, the nature of learning changes to a form of academic apprenticeship with the faculty.

A dissertation based upon original investigation and showing mature scholarship and critical judgment, as well as familiarity with the tools and methods of research, must be written on a subject approved by the student's Dissertation Advisor and the Dissertation Committee. All research conducted for the PhD degree must meet all regulatory standards specified by federal, state, and local agencies regarding ethical research, animal use, human subjects, HIPAA and environmental safety. The dissertation is presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the PhD degree and must meet the formatting criteria outlined in the CU Denver "[Format Guide for Theses and Dissertations](#)" available on the Graduate School Website. The Graduate School conducts the final review of dissertations for proper formatting. The final, formally approved dissertation must be submitted to the Graduate School, with the appropriate supporting documentation, within sixty (60) days of the thesis defense.

Students are encouraged to review the dissertation resources found on the Graduate School's website at <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>. You are responsible for knowing the specific requirements and deadlines published each semester. In particular, students should know:

1. Deadlines for Doctoral Candidates
2. Forms associated with the dissertation
3. [Format Guide for Theses and Dissertations](#)
4. SEHD Doctoral Studies Resources located at: <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/student-resources/graduate/doctoral-studies>
5. How to schedule a room for your dissertation meetings and defense:

Send an email to sehdbhelp@ucdenver.edu with the following information:

- a. Date
 - b. Start AND end time
 - c. Number attending/expected (so we know how big of a room is needed)
 - d. Any equipment needs (projector, laptop, etc.)
6. Dissertation defense meetings are open to the public. Please send an email to sehdbhelp@ucdenver.edu with the following information:
 - a. Your name
 - b. Defense date and time
 - c. Room #
 - d. Dissertation Title
 - e. Committee members
 - f. Subject line: For the Impact

The Dissertation Advisor

The student invites a Dissertation Advisor to guide and supervise the dissertation process. The Dissertation Advisor may or may not have served as the student's primary faculty program advisor.

The Dissertation Advisor must hold a current tenured or tenure-track position in the School of Education & Human Development. The advisor serves a critical, long-term role, and selection should be given careful consideration. The advisor usually provides key recommendations and on-going professional support long after graduation.

The Dissertation Advisor should have expertise in the dissertation topic and therefore might not be the same person as a student's primary faculty advisor. It is not unusual or in any way negative to change advisors as students enter the dissertation phase. The student is responsible for obtaining the Dissertation Advisor's agreement to serve. Requests to change Dissertation Advisors can be made by the student and must be approved in writing by the current Dissertation Advisor; the proposed new Dissertation Advisor and the Associate Dean (see Faculty Advisor Change Request Form in Appendix F).

Students should maintain regular contact with their Dissertation Advisor. The advisor assigns grades of IP ("in progress") for dissertation hours and then changes those "IPs" to final grades when the dissertation is given final approval.

Dissertation (Advisory/Examination) Committee

Each student will establish a Dissertation Committee. After selecting a Dissertation Advisor, the student, in collaboration with his or her Dissertation Advisor, will choose a Dissertation Committee, subject to approval of the Associate Dean. The Dissertation Committee will serve an advisory function to the student and Dissertation Advisor and will also monitor the student's progress towards completing the dissertation.

Please follow the Graduate School's Rules for composition of your committee. Please see page 31 of the Graduate School Rules.

Members of the Dissertation Committee

The Dissertation Committee will include at least four graduate faculty:

- Dissertation Faculty Advisor, a tenure-track SEHD faculty member who is within the concentration area.
- Two faculty members within the SEHD whose area of expertise builds on the content or method or who bring an interdisciplinary lens to the research question. One of these members will serve as the dissertation defense Chair.
- A member from outside of the SEHD (who qualifies for graduate faculty status) with significant academic background/experiences related to the topic or research methodology.

Additional dissertation committee members might include other faculty from the concentration area or members of the community with special expertise. It is important to note, however, that the more members on the committee, the more challenging logistics become.

IMPORTANT: Committee members who are NOT members of the Graduate Faculty (check here to see if the person is a member of the graduate faculty https://gs.ucdenver.edu/tbl_gradfac_curr.php must be approved. A special faculty member cannot serve as the *Chair* of a PhD dissertation committee (although they can be a member) and cannot be the *primary* mentor or advisor of a PhD student. Students who wish to have a committee member who is not a member of the Graduate Faculty must submit the vita of the proposed member to the Doctoral Staff Advisor.

Role of Faculty Serving on Dissertation Committees

- Each faculty member should only agree to be on committees when s/he is able to provide the time and support necessary for the candidate during the dissertation process and through the defense.
- Each member of a dissertation committee will read the dissertation in its entirety before the defense and will confer with the other members of the committee to ensure a defense does not move forward without reasonable expectation of candidate success.
- Each member of a dissertation committee will commit to weighing in on a candidate's work and giving approval for the dissertation defense to take place at least 72 hours in advance of the scheduled time. If a dissertation committee member does not feel that the candidate is ready to pass the defense, this concern should be expressed to the Dissertation Advisor other committee members at least 72 hours prior to the scheduled defense so that the defense can be delayed until the candidate is ready to successfully defend.

Students cannot change their committee in the semester in which they defend unless a compelling reason beyond a committee member's control is approved by the Doctoral Executive Committee.

Dissertation Defense Chair

The role of the Dissertation Advisor changes at the defense. As the student proposes a topic, collects and analyzes data, and writes the dissertation, the Dissertation Advisor leads the process. At the defense, a different member of the committee chairs the meeting and leads the defense. When the Dissertation Advisor and the Dissertation Committee decide that the student is ready to defend his/her dissertation, the Chair is identified and the defense is scheduled.

A member of the Dissertation Committee must be asked and agree to serve as Chair of the defense meeting. The Chair role cannot be filled by the Dissertation Advisor. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that meetings are conducted in a professional and open manner such that the views and positions of all committee members are aired and considered. The Chair facilitates the meeting, the public and closed discussions and the final votes of the committee members. The Chair is also responsible for generating a draft document capturing feedback for the student by the committee, vetting the draft by the committee and then disseminating the final feedback document to the student and her/his Dissertation Advisor. Finally, the Chair is responsible for assuring that any required changes to the dissertation are made before approval of the dissertation is submitted.

Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB)

The Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB) administration provides office support for the five institutional review board (IRB) panels and processes. COMIRB Policies and Procedures are found at: <http://www.ucdenver.edu/research/comirb/Pages/COMIRB.aspx>.

Human Subject Review Forms

Students must submit and receive approval for human subject research before dissertation data is collected. A copy of the approved form should be filed with the Dissertation Advisor, the doctoral staff advisor, and the Program Director (Associate Dean) before data collection begins. Approval through human subjects review is mandatory and insures that study participants' identities

are protected. For additional information see the website for the Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board website: <http://www.ucdenver.edu/research/comirb/Pages/COMIRB.aspx>.

Research Misconduct

The University of Colorado policy on misconduct in research, scholarship, and creative activities can be found at <https://research.cuanschutz.edu/regulatory-compliance/home/research-integrity/research-misconduct>. (Students are covered under this policy if the work in question meets the definition of research. As such, most (but not all) course-related work is covered by student disciplinary/honor code policies, rather than by this policy. Student theses and dissertations are generally covered by this policy.)

The University of Colorado's definition of research misconduct includes a number of categories and carries with it firm and decisive consequences. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism involves portraying another person's intellectual property as one's own. The most obvious form of plagiarism is using another's words without using quotation marks and citing the source. More subtle forms may involve appropriating ideas, concepts, or data without credit and then changing the actual language so as to give the impression that the ideas are one's own, or providing a citation for one particular use, but then making extended future use of the original work without further citation.

Fabrication of Data

Fabrication involves making up data, notes, or other research information and reporting them. "Data" refers to whatever forms of evidence are relevant to publication of research in a particular discipline.

Falsification of Data

Falsification involves manipulation of the research process, or altering or misrepresenting data, so that reported results are not accurate.

Other Violations

- Failure to comply with established standards regarding author names on publications
- Material failure to comply with Federal requirements for protection of researchers, human subjects, or the public or for ensuring the welfare of laboratory animals
- Retaliation of any kind against a person who reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct and who has not acted in bad faith
- Other serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, reviewing, or reporting results from research

Helpful Links

[Federal Policy on Research Misconduct](#)

[Office of Research Integrity, Public Health Service](#) definition of plagiarism for federally-supported research

The Final Examination (Oral Defense of the Dissertation)

Throughout the dissertation process a student typically works with individual members of the Dissertation Committee. It is strongly recommended that prior to scheduling the final examination, the

committee meet as a whole and provide feedback to the student on a draft of the whole dissertation. Feedback from this session then serves to guide the final draft which is considered at the dissertation defense. **Feedback provided at this preliminary meeting should not be construed as final.** The committee will again have an opportunity to direct feedback and edits to the dissertation copy presented for the defense.

The final examination provides a student with an opportunity to demonstrate broad understanding of the substantive and methodological issues in the dissertation. The student should clarify expectations with her/his Dissertation Advisor and Chair ahead of time about the scope of questions that will be asked. Passing the final examination does not indicate that the dissertation is complete and has final approval. The examination usually results in recommended revisions to the dissertation, possibly including reanalysis of data or significant rewriting. Students should be prepared to make changes and schedule enough time to do so before they plan to graduate (two weeks is not enough).

Examination Procedures

The student's approved Dissertation Committee conducts the final examination. One member of the committee must be an appointed Graduate Faculty member from outside the School of Education & Human Development. The date and place of the examination must be announced to the Graduate School, via the PhD academic advisor, ahead of time and must be posted two weeks in advance. Please contact the academic advisor at least one month in advance for specific instructions on the "announcement" process. The oral examination is open to the public. A majority vote of the dissertation committee is required for the student to pass. Each member of the committee indicates a pass or fail vote on forms provided to the Chair by the Graduate School. The committee should agree on which members will supervise recommended changes in the dissertation. All committee members must sign the final dissertation. Final sign off occurs after successful completion of the final examination and final revisions of the dissertation.

The student must be registered during the semester of the final examination but can hand in the final dissertation during the semester following the defense without registering. For example, if a student passes the final examination in spring, the dissertation can be turned in during the summer without paying summer tuition. Students may not attend commencement until they have completed all requirements for graduation by the specified deadlines. Those graduating in spring may attend the May commencement. Those graduating in summer or fall may attend the December commencement.

Dissertation Formatting and Electronic Submission

The student is responsible for obtaining all of the current requirements for the dissertation format, requirements and deadlines for defense from the Graduate School at <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources/resources>.

The [Format Guide for Theses and Dissertations](https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/format-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=df0622b9_10) can be found at: https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/format-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=df0622b9_10. Students should refer to the [Format Guide for Theses and Dissertations](https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/format-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=df0622b9_10) for instructions on how to submit their dissertation electronically, as well as the required *Approval Form*.

FINANCIAL AID

Students attending the University of Colorado Denver may qualify for the following types of financial aid:

- Grants and Scholarships
- Federal Aid including Loans & Work-Study
- Assistantships including GRA/GTA

Types of Aid

Students typically receive two primary types of financial aid; federally funded aid and grant and scholarship funded aid. Students must complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid ([FAFSA](#)) to be considered for federal financial aid (federally funded student loans, grants, and work-study).

You are considered for college funded financial aid from The School of Education and Human Development (SEHD) at the time of admittance. You do not need to complete a separate application to be considered for SEHD aid. SEHD financial aid can include scholarships, grants, and graduate assistantships.

Scholarships are usually awarded and administered by the SEHD while loans and work-study are administered by the University of Colorado Denver [Financial Aid and Scholarships Office](#). Students may also receive grants and scholarships to attend the SEHD from external agencies and foundations. Additional financial resources can be found at <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/financial-aid>.

You may be eligible for employer tuition benefits through your company or organization (contact your Human Resources department for more information) or for [military benefits](#) if you, your spouse, or parent is currently serving in the military or is a veteran.

CU employees, spouses, or dependents may be eligible for a tuition waiver. Contact your campus HR department for more details and eligibility requirements.

Continuing students are notified of scholarship opportunities throughout the year via their student portal. (Be sure to contact the Office of [Financial Aid](#) for additional information).

PLEASE NOTE: All awards are made on an annual basis and are, therefore, NOT continuing. Do NOT assume your aid package will be continued each year.

Graduate Research Assistant

Graduate Research Assistants (GRA's) must be enrolled as a full-time, regularly enrolled, degree-seeking graduate student. The activities may include assisting with and performing research, writing up results of experiments, and presenting findings at conferences, which potentially may involve travel.

Graduate Part-Time Instructor

Doctoral students can be offered a Graduate Part-Time Teaching (GPTI) position to teach undergraduate or licensure courses only; they cannot be charged as the Instructor of Record for Master's level courses. GPTIs provide a complementary opportunity for doctoral students to be supported financially as they advance through their program. Teaching assignments can be offered in addition to, but not in lieu of, the required Research Apprenticeship requirement. Unlike teaching assistants (TAs) that are assigned to assist faculty who have courses with unusually large numbers of students, a GPTI assumes the role of Instructor of Record for a course. Doctoral students hired are designated as GPTIs and are not considered as 'faculty' of the SEHD. GPTIs are limited to teaching two courses per semester. Compensation for each course will be paid at the Lecturer rate. Doctoral students appointed as a GPTI will receive an offer letter explaining the expectations of the position. Faculty Advisors along with faculty from the program(s) in which the teaching will occur are responsible for outlining these primary roles and responsibilities. This is a temporary, part-time, non-benefitted student position.

Teaching Assistantships (TAs)

Graduate students may supervise and lead quiz sections, discussion sections, recitations or laboratory sections, serve as class assistants, or perform comparable activities. TAs must be enrolled full-time as a regular degree-seeking graduate student. Each TA must be under the guidance of the instructor of record and are not placed in overall charge of courses.

Graduate Assistant

Graduate Assistants (GA's) are regularly enrolled, degree-seeking graduate students who have assignments within the department, but are not directly involved in instruction. Opportunities may include administrative positions, working in computer labs, or other duties. Graduate assistants typically work for 20 hours per week. Assistantships will vary in their pay. Ask your faculty advisor or the grant's Principal Investigator for more details.

Scholarships

We encourage you to apply for scholarships. Some are need-based while others are not. To apply for these awards, please complete the online scholarship application available at [Scholarlynx](#). Be sure to read the scholarship criteria carefully before applying. If you have questions about the application process, please contact the Scholarship Resource Office at 303-352-3608.

Scholarship awards are determined by the School's Student Committee which is comprised of faculty. Award amounts may vary semester to semester. If you aren't awarded a scholarship the first time you apply, please reapply for any scholarship you are interested in if you continue to meet the criteria. Also, you can be awarded the same scholarship in more than one term, so keep applying even if you've already received an award in a previous term.

Learn more at

<http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/colleges/SchoolOfEducation/Aid/Scholarships/Pages/Scholarships.aspx> .

Sponsored Research Assistantships

A number of externally sponsored research and development projects are undertaken by School of Education & Human Development faculty. Depending on your interests and expertise, you may arrange to work on a special project, assisting in research, development, evaluation or training

activities. Pay will be similar to internally funded assistantships; however, some projects enjoy more latitude in student wages.

External Funding

There are a number of organizations that will fund doctoral students. You are encouraged to scour the internet for opportunities that fit with your work. Here are a few suggested website:

<http://www.aera.net/ProfessionalOpportunitiesFunding/FundingOpportunities/AERAGrantsProgram/DissertationGrants/tabid/12812/Default.aspx>

www.apa.org

<http://www.airweb.org/GrantsAndScholarships/Pages/GrantProgramOverview.aspx>

Travel Awards for Students Presenting at National Meetings

The Graduate School will provide up to \$500 to help defray the expenses incurred by a Doctoral student who attends a national meeting and presents his/her work. The \$500 can be used to help defray the costs of registration, travel, lodging, food, etc. Funds are distributed once travel is complete and receipts have been submitted for reimbursement. To apply, please go to

https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/denver-campus-travel-award-application.docx?sfvrsn=c0422b9_2.

APPENDIX A: CONCENTRATION AREAS

Currently, there are seven approved concentration areas in the Educational and Human Development Doctorate of Philosophy program.

Math Education

Students and faculty in this concentration area focus on teacher learning and professional development experiences. Specifically, projects investigate the ways that particular interventions used in professional development for mathematics teachers impacts their content knowledge and pedagogical practices in their classrooms. Work in this area is framed by a situative perspective of learning and incorporates mixed methods to answer questions around the ways particular interventions support teacher and student learning. Video data is prominent in both the design of professional development interventions as well as a major data source for analyses. Analytic methods vary based on the research question and grain size.

Science Education

The goal of this area is to prepare students to explore, understand, and think critically about the nature of science and science education from a largely research-oriented perspective. Students may elect to focus on environmental science education as an area of specialization within this concentration area through electives and discipline- specific research agendas.

Critical Studies in Education

This concentration area houses faculty who approach their research and teaching in education with a transdisciplinary and critical lens, especially with respects to race, gender, class, disability, sexuality, language, and culture. Faculty members ground their approach in social justice in education and promote the ideas of educational equity, transformative education, and educational activism in nontraditional ways. Particularly, how schooling, society, and policies are dialectical sites of oppression and liberation and the role of educators is that of intellectual activists to facilitate that liberation. Because an activist approach is necessary, this concentration area offers a monthly faculty and student meeting where students and faculty can collaboratively work on research, publications, conference presentations, and theory building. The faculty of Critical Studies in Education approach education in critical ways to ensure the futurity of a more transformational, liberatory, and humanizing educational system and society.

Leadership for Educational Organizations

This concentration serves as key area for those concerned about leadership in schools and a key focus for research by scholars in higher education. A crucial assumption the underlies this concentration area is that school leadership makes the difference in how schools succeed in improving learning outcomes for all students, but we are only beginning to scratch the surface in understanding why leadership is successful when it is, what the interactions are between effective leadership and effective teaching, and their collective impact on learning outcomes at all levels in schools.

Inclusive Early Childhood Education

The goal of this concentration area is to introduce students to the issues and practices in early childhood special education and to prepare students to provide leadership to improve outcomes for

children with disabilities. The purpose is to provide students with the necessary skills and knowledge of evidence-based practices to prepare them to meet state and national leadership needs within IHEs to address issues in Early Childhood Special Education/Early Childhood Education/early childhood special education (ECE/ECSE). Graduates will be prepared to: (1) conduct rigorous research related to culturally responsive, evidence-based practices, (2) translate research into practice, thus expanding the use of evidence-based practice in the field; (3) create, evaluate, and improve blended pre-service teacher education programs in ECE / ECSE, and (4) align ECE curriculum to current state standards for early learning.

Early Childhood Policy

The goal of this concentration is to prepare candidates to be leaders, policymakers, policy advisors and analysts, faculty members, and researchers who successfully shape, direct, implement, and evaluate early childhood services, infrastructure, and policy and contribute to the scholarly knowledge that undergirds the discipline. Graduates will enter a growing and dynamic field with burgeoning research about the critical years in children's brain development, learning, and health. This concentration holds institutional and system reform as its unit of change and equity in opportunity and outcomes as the purpose for change.

Research, Assessment, and Evaluation

The goal of this concentration area is to prepare students to design and carry out significant applied research on individual and organizational change in the field of education and human development. Through problem-based pedagogy and hands-on learning, students will be prepared to be collaborative applied researchers who work with community, university, and school partners. Students will learn advanced quantitative, advanced qualitative, and mixed methods research techniques. Course content includes mixed methods, advanced statistics, advanced qualitative data analysis, systems analysis, collaborative team research, and practicum experiences. Graduates of the program are prepared to work as faculty members, school district and organizational researchers, data analysts, and assessment coordinators.

Family Science and Human Development

The goal of this concentration is to prepare students to critically examine and understand family science within an ecological life span development lens. This program prepares students to work in academic careers as professors, researchers and scholars in Family Science and Human Development. Students are provided a rich curriculum that centers on theoretical and scholarly based knowledge in family science, human development and research inquiry. Another objective of this program is to integrate the importance of family diversity (which includes race, ethnicity, culture, class, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, ability, language) into the curriculum as it relates to social justice in family science and child, adolescent and adult development. Central to the Family Science and Human Development concentration is the conceptual framework of family and human ecological systems and how that impacts research, practice and policy with diverse families in the United States and at the global level.

APPENDIX B: CORE COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

EDFN 7400 - Epistemologies/Ways of Knowing: Research Paradigms & Counter-Epistemologies

Epistemology is concerned with conceptions of and approaches to ways of knowing including major western intellectual traditions as well as counter-epistemologies of marginalized and subaltern ways of knowing that expose the contingency and narrow perspectives of dominant forms of knowing. Epistemologies are examined in contrasting research paradigms as well as in basic philosophical and ethical questions about people and their relationships to the social and natural world. The topics of culture, race, indigeneity, and gender are introduced to raise questions about the limits of dominant forms of knowledge and to offer counter-epistemologies that shed light on unexamined assumptions about the relational, contextual, embodied, and political nature of ways of knowing. (offered every other year, even years, in the spring)

EDFN 7420 - Foundations of Education in Urban and Diverse Communities

This course focuses on the complex relationship between schools and the larger society of which they are a part. It emphasizes historical, political, and sociological perspectives as we explore the large questions about why we have public schools and examine the interplay of social systems in education (economic, political, social, health, legal). This course will analyze education policies and subsequent implementation as the intended and unintended consequences of many processes: ideological, social, judicial, scientific, political, and economic. (offered every other year, odd years, in the fall)

LDFS 7712 - Seminar: Learning Theory and Learners

Students apply major issues from learning theories and development to problems of practice related to educational leadership and innovation. (offered every year in the fall)

EDFN 7833 - Culture and Critical Theory

Provides an introduction to critical inquiry. General topics include: the development and of the concept of culture, the development and application of critical theory, critical race theory and critical pedagogy. Through the course, students are guided to explore critical theory work in their own field. (offered every other year, odd years, in the spring)

APPENDIX C: FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Does the program have school-wide prerequisites?

The program has no school-wide prerequisites. The Research, Assessment and Evaluation concentration does require proficiency in basic stats. Students in this concentration should consult with their Primary Advisor.

Specific courses in the doctoral program, however, may have prerequisites. For example, before enrolling in the doctoral inquiry courses, specific prerequisites ordinarily are completed in one's master's degree program. The program advisory committee decides whether or not to include the prerequisite course(s) in the official plan of study.

What are the processes and timelines for substituting or waiving courses?

You must receive written permission to substitute or waive a course before taking an alternative course. You should begin by talking with your primary advisor in the semester before the course is offered. Then, assuming the advisor agrees that grounds for waiving or substituting the course may exist, you should proceed to consult your primary advisor. The semester before is the absolute latest time to start this process; in general, it is better to begin earlier. Students should refer to the Doctoral Advisor for the appropriate paperwork. Students MUST utilize the Course Substitution and/or Waiver Form found at https://education.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider16/student-resources/forms/ssc-course-waiver-form.pdf?sfvrsn=31a79bb8_12.

Do courses for which students receive a C grade count towards a doctoral program?

Courses with grades of C+ or below cannot be applied toward requirements of the doctoral degree program. Students must maintain an overall 3.2 grade point average and receive a B- or better in all courses applied to the Ph.D. program. For repeated courses, only the higher of the grades will be considered in computing the grade point average.

How is a student's program of study determined?

Within the basic framework described herein, program plans of study are coordinated between a student and his/her primary advisor and submitted with the 1st Annual Review.

Can students change their advisor?

Yes. Students are assigned a primary advisor when they are first admitted to the program. Once they become better acquainted with the faculty, they may realize that a different person is more suitable to be their advisor. When a faculty member agrees to serve as the new advisor, the student must inform the previous advisor and the associate dean in writing (see PhD Advisor Change Request Form in Appendix F).

Frequently Asked Questions: The Dissertation and Oral Defense

What is the relationship between dissertations and the orals?

The dissertation is the final product that demonstrates a student's expertise in her or his emphasis area. It should show command both of the knowledge base (theory and research) related to the problem being studied and the scholarly methods necessary to conduct the study. The oral defense provides an opportunity for a student to demonstrate her/his broader understanding of the substantive and methodological issues involved in the study. The dissertation should be completed before the oral defense scheduled. Most orals do lead to changes in the dissertation itself.

Are orals only about the dissertation or can they be more general?

The oral defense is a final examination of the dissertation. Generally, it focuses on the substantive and methodological issues related to the dissertation. You are advised to clarify expectations with your committee in advance of the defense.

Can dissertation presentation and style vary in any way?

The Graduate School *Format Guide for Theses and Dissertations* provides information about form and procedure that should be followed. Although variations in dissertation style and presentation are possible, the nature of these variations will depend upon preferences of the dissertation advisor and the committee. Alternative formats may be proposed to the dissertation committee for approval by the Graduate School. The Manual can be found at https://www.ucdenver.edu/docs/librariesprovider138/denver-anschutz-graduate-school/resources/format-guide.pdf?sfvrsn=df0622b9_10.

What is the relationship between the oral examination committee and the dissertation committee?

In the School of Education & Human Development, a committee consisting of the student's Dissertation Advisor and three other members of the Graduate Faculty approve the dissertation proposal and work closely with the student throughout the process. The final approval of the dissertation, including any changes recommended in the oral examination, is granted by signature of the Chair and committee members.

Who decides if a dissertation committee is okay?

The student and Dissertation Advisor assemble the committee. The Dissertation Advisor and student must ensure that all members hold a graduate faculty appointment.

What guidelines govern the membership of the dissertation committee and the oral examination committee?

The Graduate School requires that each member of the committee be a member of the Graduate Faculty and that at least one member of the oral examination committee be from outside the School of Education & Human Development. Faculty from other institutions may be included, but these faculty must have UCD Graduate Faculty approval. All members should be able to contribute to the study in some productive way.

What are the School- and University-level processes, policies and procedures that must be checked related to dissertations?

The student selects a Dissertation Advisor with whom they form a committee. The faculty must be members of the Graduate Faculty and should have the substantive and/or methodological expertise to contribute to the quality of the study. If human subjects are involved, students must obtain permission from the Human Subjects Committee to conduct the study. (School districts and other organizations also usually require similar permissions.) Please refer to the Graduate School Rules for policies on committees.

What is a dissertation proposal?

A dissertation proposal is a working contract between the student and the members of the dissertation committee. It provides an assurance to the committee of the quality of conceptualization before the work proceeds, and it provides the student an assurance that the proposed research activities are acceptable in design. The presentation and style of proposals vary. The student and the committee determine the particular form to be used. Committee approval of the dissertation proposal is required prior to data collection.

APPENDIX D: STUDENT FORMS

Forms are available electronically from these websites:

Graduate School Forms: <https://graduateschool.ucdenver.edu/forms-resources>

General SEHD Forms: <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/student-resources/graduate>

SEHD Doctoral Studies Resource Page and Forms: <https://education.ucdenver.edu/academic-services/student-resources/graduate/doctoral-studies>

A plan of study is provided on the next two pages for your reference. It is also available electronically on the Doctoral Studies Resources page.

PhD Advising Form – Education & Human Development Concentrations

Program Requirements	Grade	When Offered
Core (12)		Sem/Yr.
EDFN 7420 (3)		Fall Odd Years
LDFS 7712 (3)		Fall Even Years
EDFN 7400 (3)		Spring Even Years
EDFN 7833 (3)		Spring Odd Years
Research (18)		Sem/Yr
RSEM 7000 (3)		FA
RSEM 7110 (3)		FA
RSEM 6100 (3)		SP
RSEM 7150 (3)		SP Odd
RSEM 7210 (3)		SP
Elective (3)		
Concentration (18)		Sem/Yr.
*Dissertation (27)		Sem/Yr.
DSEP 8994		

Annual Reviews

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

Proposal Defense

IRB

Dissertation Defense

Final Forms

Comprehensive Exam Advance to Candidacy
--

*You do not have to register for dissertation credits in summer unless you are defending your dissertation and/or graduating. You must have a minimum of 27 dissertation credits to graduate. If you reach 27 and are not finished, you will need to register for 1 credit each semester until graduation.

APPENDIX E: COMIRB

Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board

Institutional Guidelines

The COMIRB reviews research to ensure that the federal regulations for protecting human research subjects outlined in COMIRB policy, University of Colorado Denver policy, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations (45 CFR 46) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations (21 CFR Parts 50 & 56) as well as other requirements are met. The University of Colorado Denver (UCD) Federal wide Assurance (FWA # 00005070) awarded by the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) at DHHS, is a written pledge to follow federal guidelines for protecting human research subjects in accordance with the principles of the Belmont Report. The Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB) must review and approve your research before you can begin the study.

All trainees (includes students, residents, fellows, and other trainees) and mentors/advisors must read the Belmont Report and understand their ethical responsibilities in conducting human subject research that are outlined in this document.

How to submit to COMIRB – students should visit the COMIRB website for full instructions on COMIRB submission at www.ucdenver.edu/research/comirb. The following principles and policies apply and must be upheld by investigators conducting research approved by COMIRB:

1. **Conducting the Research.** You in conjunction with your named mentor/advisor are responsible for making sure that the research is conducted according to the COMIRB approved research protocol. As the Principal Investigator, you may delegate the authority to make decisions about the study but may *not* delegate the responsibility for proper conduct of the study. You are responsible for the actions of all your co-investigators and research staff involved with this research.
2. **Conflict of Interest.** The PI, investigators and research team must disclose any existing conflicts of interest and follow any management plan agreed to by all interested parties and approved by COMIRB. Any new conflicts of interest must be reported to the COI Officer and COMIRB within 30 days.
3. **Sufficient Resources.** Ensure that you have sufficient resources to conduct your study properly, including:
 - Access to a **population** that will allow you to recruit the required number of subjects
 - Sufficient **time** to conduct and complete your research
 - Adequate **facilities** for the type of research you are doing
 - A process to check that any staff assisting you fully **understand** the protocol and their duties in the research
 - Available **medical or psychological resources** that subjects may need if they suffer consequences from your research
4. **Subject Enrollment.** You may not recruit or enroll subjects prior to the COMIRB approval date or after the expiration date of COMIRB approval. All recruitment materials for any form of media must be approved by the COMIRB prior to their use. Only the stamped, COMIRB-approved format and

text of the recruitment materials may be utilized. If you need to recruit more subjects than was noted in your COMIRB approval letter, you must submit an amendment requesting an increase in the number of subjects and obtain COMIRB approval prior to enrolling additional subjects.

5. **Informed Consent.** You are responsible for obtaining and documenting effective informed consent using **only** copies of the stamped, COMIRB-approved consent documents, and for ensuring that no human subjects are involved in research prior to obtaining their informed consent. Please give all subjects copies of the signed informed consent documents. Keep the originals in your secured research files for at least five (5) years. When appropriate, you should place a copy of the signed informed consent document in the subject's medical record.
6. **Continuing Review.** The COMIRB must review and approve all COMIRB-approved research protocols at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk but not less than once per year. There is **no grace period**. Prior to the date on which the COMIRB approval of the research expires, the COMIRB Office will send you a reminder to submit a Continuing Review Application. Although the COMIRB sends reminders, **it is ultimately your responsibility to submit the continuing review report in a timely fashion to ensure a lapse in COMIRB approval does not occur**. If COMIRB approval of your research lapses, you must stop new subject enrollment, and contact COMIRB immediately. It is suggested that the continuing review be submitted approximately 45 days prior to expiration of COMIRB approval.
7. **Amendments and Changes.** If you wish to amend or change any aspect of your research (such as research design, interventions or procedures, number of subjects, subject population, informed consent document, instruments, surveys or recruiting material), you must submit the amendment to the COMIRB for review using the COMIRB Change Form. You **may not initiate** any amendments or changes to your research without first obtaining written COMIRB review and approval.
8. **Data Safety Monitoring.** All research involving more than minimal risk to subjects must have a data safety monitoring plan to ensure subject safety during the course of the research. You should have a plan for monitoring subject reactions and reporting any unanticipated problems or adverse events.
9. **Unanticipated Problems.** Any reportable events must be reported to the COMIRB within **five (5) days** of discovery of the incident as outlined in the COMIRB Policies and Procedures. Reportable events include:
 - An actual unforeseen harmful or unfavorable occurrence to participants or others that relates to the research protocol (injuries, psychological events).
 - Adverse events which in the opinion of the principal investigator are both unexpected and probably related to the intervention.
 - An unforeseen development that potentially increases the likelihood of harm to participants or others in the future.
 - Information that indicates a change to the risks or potential benefits of the research.For example:

A paper is published from another study that shows that the risks or potential benefits of your research may be different than initially presented to the COMIRB.

 - A problem involving data collection, data storage, privacy or confidentiality.

- Incarceration of a participant in a protocol not approved to enroll prisoners.
- Complaint of a participant when the complaint indicates unexpected risks or cannot be resolved by the research team.
- Any other problem that caused a risk to the participant or others

10. **Serious or Continued Non-Compliance.** You must also self-report any instances of serious or continuing non-compliance with the COMIRB's requirements for protecting human research subjects, as well. All reportable events should be submitted to the COMIRB using the Unanticipated Problem Form.

11. **Research Record Keeping.** You must keep originals of the following research-related records in a secure location for a minimum of five (5) years after study completion: the COMIRB approved research protocol and amendments; COMIRB-approved and signed (when required) informed consent documents; recruitment materials; continuing review reports; unanticipated event reports; and all correspondence from the COMIRB.

12. **Final Reports.** When you have completed or stopped work on your research (no further subject enrollment, interactions, interventions or data analysis), you must close the study with COMIRB by submitting a final continuing review form with a closure letter. Analysis of a stripped anonymous data set with no link to identifiers is not human subject research.

If you have any questions or need assistance, please contact the UCD Compliance Office at 303-724-1010.

Note: if you are using a test article under the jurisdiction of the FDA then additional responsibilities will also apply. Please check the COMIRB website for more information at: www.ucdenver.edu/research/comirb.

Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board

My signing below I acknowledge my responsibilities as a student Principal Investigator and agree to take on these responsibilities in collaboration with my mentor/advisor:

Name of Trainee: _____

Signature of Trainee: _____

Date of signature: _____

Name of Mentor/Advisor: _____

Signature of Mentor/Advisor: _____

Date of Signature: _____

Please submit the completed form to Academic Services.

APPENDIX F: PHD DISSERTATION GUIDE

The following are suggested guidelines. Components of the dissertation should be discussed in depth with the Dissertation Advisor and committee.

Chapter 1 Introduction	Comments
Criteria	
1.1 Problem statement	
1.2 Background/Context or significance of the study	
1.3 Conceptual/theoretical framework	
1.4 Operational definitions of variables	
1.5 Research questions stated in a clear and testable fashion	
1.6: Overview of methodology is clear and succinct	
1.7: Known limitations and/or de-limitations of the study are described clearly	

Chapter 2 Literature Review	Comments
Criteria	
2.1 Comprehensive review of the literature	
2.2 Clearly supports the arguments advanced in Chapter 1	
2.3 Logical flow of argument throughout	
2.4 References are embedded in the text and clearly incorporated with one another	
2.5 Citations—a) matched text/reference list, b) current citations	
2.6 Summary	

Chapter 3 Methods	Comments
Criteria	
3.1 Research design is appropriate and clearly stated	
3.2 Appropriate sampling scheme for the topic and methods	
3.2.1 An adequate amount of data was collected to answer the research questions	
3.3 Observers and investigators made their personal values, beliefs and hypotheses explicit	
3.4 Measurement procedures are described completely and accurately	
3.4.1 If measures or measurement procedures were developed specifically for the study, descriptions of procedures used are complete and clear	
3.4.2 If extant measures were used in the study, descriptions of the measures (including what they claim to measure and reliability and validity estimates) are complete and clear	
3.5 Reliability and validity of the data are clearly documented	
3.6 Clear data collection procedures (replication would be possible)	
3.7 Data analysis procedures are described completely and accurately	
3.8 Data analysis assumptions underlying the analysis were made clear	
3.9 Analysis procedure was appropriate for the hypotheses and data	
3.9.1 For qualitative studies, the data and the analysis were subjected to tests of "triangulation"	

and "coherence"	
3.10 For qualitative studies, the data were analyzed for alternative explanations and competing hypotheses tested	
3.10.1 Analysis presented in an understandable manner	

Chapter 4 Results	Comments
Criteria	
4.1 Conclusions were based on the data, the analysis, and the boundaries of both	
4.2 Findings presented according to the research questions/hypotheses posed	
4.3 Findings are grounded in the data and do not go beyond the data	
4.4 Any graphic presentations were designed to enhance understanding and not to mislead the reader, and are thoroughly explained in the text	

Chapter 5 (and 6/7/8) Discussion	Comments
Criteria	
5.1 Summary and interpretation, draws conclusions	
5.2 Points out similarities and differences between findings and previous research	
5.3 Results are connected to conceptual framework	
5.4 Possible or actual practical applications of the results are presented	
5.5 Limitations of study are clearly explained	
5.6 Implications for theory and future research are described	

Criteria	Comments		
	Below Standard	Meets Standard	Exceeds Standard
Writing	Some grammar and/or spelling problems. Logic of ideas doesn't flow smoothly from one idea to another. Lacks coherent organization.	No grammar or spelling errors. Arguments are logical. Organization is coherent without any 'common errors.'	No grammar or spelling errors. Logic flows smoothly. Organization is coherent and alignment across sections is tight. Voice is engaging, polished and professional.
6.1 Presentation			
6.2 Format: Follow the rules of the graduate school			

APPENDIX G: DECISION FLOW CHART

WORK THROUGH A PROBLEM USING THIS FLOWCHART

DEFINE PROBLEM HERE:	ANALYZE THE PROBLEM
	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

Use boxes below to list possible solutions:

POTENTIAL POSITIVE EFFECTS	SOLUTION #1	POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS
List for each solution: <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;">SOLUTION #1</div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 80px;"></div>	List for each solution: <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;">SOLUTION #2</div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 80px;"></div>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;">SOLUTION #3</div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 80px;"></div>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

Now choose the solution you think is best — circle it and make it happen.

ACTUAL POSITIVE EFFECTS	PRACTICAL ACTION	ACTUAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS
<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	<div style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;">PRACTICAL ACTION</div> <div style="background-color: #e0e0e0; height: 80px;"></div>	<hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>

FINAL EVALUATION: Was it a good or bad solution?

Source: Based on heuristic created by Frank T. Lyman Jr. and George Bey, 1985.

APPENDIX H: PROPOSAL AND DISSERTATION DEFENSE RUBRICS

Dissertation Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Candidate name: _____

Date: _____

Component	SLO	Fully met (3)	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Not met (0)
Research problem, questions and significance Score: _____	2	Thoroughly describes the research problem, precisely identifies research question(s) and describes their significance to equity and advancement of the field of inquiry and practice	Begins to develop a reasonable description of the research problem, identifies question(s) and describes significance to equity and advancement of the field of inquiry and practice, but one or more of these require elaboration or clarification	A statement of the research problem, question(s) and possible significance are presented but not well developed. Research question(s) may not be researchable.	Research problem, question(s) and significance are undeveloped or missing
Conceptual framework Score: _____	4	Clearly identifies or develops a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework is used to ground the study within what is already known and helps establish what the present study will contribute to the knowledge base and/or practice.	Begins to identify or develop a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework could usefully ground the study within what is already known and help establish the significance of the study, but these connections require elaboration.	The conceptual framework is evident but needs to be further grounded in the relevant knowledge base..	A conceptual framework grounded in the literature is undeveloped or missing
Review of relevant research Score: _____	3	Provides a substantial synthesis of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.	Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature	Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.	Provides little or no relevant scholarship.
Methodology Score: _____	6	Identifies and justifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques. Research plan is suitable to study purposes. Project is feasible.	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques to answer research question(s) but arguments for justification and suitability are not present or significant adjustments are required before proposal is feasible.	Many details of method are missing or vague, or the methods require modification to be appropriate for answering the research question(s).	The methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test questions / hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed and/or is not feasible.
Clarity, organization, grammar and references Score: _____	7	The manuscript is well structured with clear transitions and flow of thought. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. Manuscript properly cites references. Reference list matches citations	The manuscript is well structured but requires revision to provide clearer transitions and flow of thought. The writing is grammatically correct with only occasional errors, but some sections lack clarity. Manuscript properly cites references. Reference list matches citations with few omissions.	The manuscript requires substantial revision to provide effective structure, transitions and flow of thought. The manuscript contains frequent grammatical errors and/or many sections lack clarity. Citations and/or reference list need editing.	The manuscript is poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively. Formatting and/or references need considerable revision.
Oral presentation	7	Presentation provides a	Presentation describes the	Presentation provides an	Presentation provides only a

and response to questions Score: _____		thorough and clear overview of the proposed study. Candidate listens carefully, is open to critique, seeks to understand queries and responds fully to questions.	study but clarifying questions are necessary to fully understand the study. Candidate is responsive to questions, but is at times closed to critique or fails to seek understanding.	overview of the proposed study but lacks detail on important aspects. Candidate is unresponsive to some questions or fails to seek understanding on suggestions for improvement.	cursory overview of the proposed study or lacks significant details. Candidate is unresponsive to question and closed to critique or suggestions.
--	--	---	--	--	---

Dissertation Defense Evaluation Rubric

Candidate name: _____

Date: _____

Component	SLO	Fully met (3)	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Not met (0)
Dissertation overview Score: _____	2	Effectively develops a set of researchable, supportable and potentially impactful study questions / hypotheses. The document is well organized and maintains a tightly integrated focus throughout the manuscript.	Manuscript includes a set of researchable and supportable questions / hypotheses. The manuscript is largely organized and the focus of the manuscript is generally maintained.	Manuscript develops a set of questions / hypotheses, but lacks a clear organizational structure and cohesive focus; some sections are clearly organized and focused and others are not.	Questions / hypotheses are not researchable or justifiable. Focus of the manuscript is hard to follow; lacks organizational structure.
CF Score: _____	4	Clearly identifies or develops a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework is used to ground the study within what is already known and helps establish what the present study will contribute to the knowledge base and/or practice.	Begins to identify or develop a conceptual model that defines constructs studied and their purported relationships. Framework could usefully ground the study within what is already known and help establish the significance of the study, but these connections require elaboration.	The conceptual framework is evident but needs to be further grounded in the relevant knowledge base.	A conceptual framework grounded in the literature is undeveloped or missing
Review of relevant research Score: _____	3	Provides a substantial synthesis of literature from related fields. Places work within larger context.	Provides a meaningful summary of the literature. Shows understanding of relevant literature	Fails to cite important or relevant scholarship. Misinterprets research findings.	Provides little or no relevant scholarship.
Methodology Score: _____	6	Identifies and justifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques and describes fully how and why the method enacted differed from the method proposed. Research plan enacted was suitable to study purposes. Limitations of the method are clear.	Identifies appropriate methodologies and research techniques to answer research question(s) but arguments for justification and suitability are not adequately present. Description of how and why the method enacted was adjusted from the method proposed requires elaboration or clarification. Limitation are presented but require elaboration.	Many details of method and/or justification are missing or vague, as are descriptions of adjustments to the research plan since proposal and/or description of limitations.	The methodologies described are either not suited or poorly suited to test questions / hypotheses. The methodology is under-developed or required significant adjustments that are not presented or were not done.
Results section	6	The results clearly align with	The results discussed are	The results section is under-	Methods are inappropriate

Component	SLO	Fully met (3)	Met (2)	Partially Met (1)	Not met (0)
Score: _____		study questions and the research conducted. Evidence provided fully addresses the research question(s), is well integrated and discussed. Results are discussed thoroughly and accurately.	consistent with questions and the data analytic plan. Evidence is presented but relationships between evidence and questions is sometimes unclear or evidence is insufficient to address all research question(s).	developed or incomplete. Results are not always described accurately or certain analyses that were expected were not done or presented.	to test research question(s) or results are discussed incorrectly or inappropriately.
Discussion section Score: _____	4	Provides an integration of the findings within the extant literature. Clarifies how the findings and research questions / hypotheses advance the field. Accurately addresses strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study and implications for future research	Adequately integrates the findings within the extant literature. Addresses how the findings and research questions / hypotheses advance the field. Attends to issues of strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study.	The integration of the findings within the extant literature is superficial or incomplete. Poorly justifies the strengths, weaknesses, and limitations of the current study.	No integration of the findings within the extant literature. Fails to attend to design strengths and weaknesses.
Clarity, organization, grammar and references Score: _____	7	The manuscript is well structured with clear transitions and flow of thought. Sentences and paragraphs are grammatically correct. Uses subheadings appropriately. Manuscript complies with formatting requirements of the Graduate School and properly cites references. Reference list matches citations	The manuscript is well structured but requires revision to provide clearer transitions and flow of thought. The writing is grammatically correct with only occasional errors, but some sections lack clarity. Manuscript complies with formatting requirements of the Graduate School and properly cites references. Reference list matches citations with few omissions.	The manuscript requires substantial revision to provide effective structure, transitions and flow of thought. The manuscript contains frequent grammatical errors and/or many sections lack clarity. Manuscript needs some updating to comply with formatting requirements of the Graduate School. Citations and/or reference list need editing.	The manuscript is poorly written and confusing. Ideas are not communicated effectively. Formatting and/or references need considerable revision.
Oral presentation and response to questions Score: _____	7	Presentation provides a thorough and clear overview of the proposed study. Candidate listens carefully, is open to critique, seeks to understand queries and responds fully to questions.	Presentation describes the study but clarifying questions are necessary to fully understand the study. Candidate is responsive to questions, but is at times closed to critique or fails to seek understanding.	Presentation provides an overview of the proposed study but lacks detail on important aspects. Candidate is unresponsive to some questions or fails to seek understanding on suggestions for improvement.	Presentation provides only a cursory overview of the proposed study or lacks significant details. Candidate is unresponsive to question and closed to critique or suggestions.