Doctoral Program in Secondary Science Education

University of Alabama
Department of Curriculum and Instruction - Secondary Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
College of Education, The University of Alabama
Box 870232, Tuscaloosa AL 35487-0232

Doctoral Program Course of Study

The graduate science education at the University of Alabama is developed around recommendations and guidelines of professional educational and research associations. In addition to the requirements for scholarly competence and practical expertise in science and science education these guidelines recommend competence and leadership skills in curriculum and instruction at the secondary level, in educational research; use of technology in professional work, teaching, and learning; and ability to articulate and participate in professional development of teachers and administrators at all education levels, K-16.

The difference between doctoral programs is one of emphasis. In the EdD program the emphasis is on leadership in teaching, professional development, instructional materials development, and school change at the local and state level. The emphasis in the PhD program adds to these competencies the scholarly areas of educational theory, research, and teacher education at the regional and national levels.

To begin the doctoral program it is assumed that, following an appropriate baccalaureate program with emphasis in science, the student has taken basic courses at the master’s degree level including science education methods (CSE 586 and CSE 565) and Improving Science Teaching through New Technologies (CSE 576), and at least 12 hours of graduate science courses. Additionally most courses taken during an EdS science education program can be applied in a doctoral program in science education.

Two tracks to the doctoral program
1) MA degree plus a minimum of 60+ hours of courses with additional dissertation hours.
2) EdS degree plus an minimum of 30+ hours of courses with additional dissertation hours.

Conceptual Framework of the College of Education

The vision of the College of Education (COE) at The University of Alabama is to develop effective, ethical, and reflective professionals who advance the theme of the COE: Unites, Acts, and Leads (UA Leads). By engaging in theoretically informed and intellectually advanced effective practice our graduates will

UNITE with the larger community to collaboratively nurture cultural competence, empathy, and a vision of equity and justice for all learners;

ACT to develop the full potential of all learners to be excellent professionals in their field; and

LEAD through continuous research-based critical inquiry of policy and reflective practice to enable transformative change in our diverse local and global communities.
Doctoral Program Advising Sheet

This advising sheet is meant to be a general guide and timeline for students. After 30 hours are completed, it is up to the student to make sure all requirements are completed in the timeframes established by the Department and Graduate School.

Before Completing 30 Hours:

- Meet with temporary advisor to discuss (1) research and post-doctoral career interests, (2) Program of Study (POS), (3) Residency requirements and plans, (3) POS chair and committee members, and their roles, (4) graduate research and teaching assistantships, (5) COE/UA scholarships and fellowships (application deadlines typically January 31), and (6) Graduate Student Leadership Council
- Complete CIE 693: Doctoral Seminar as soon as possible (only offered in the fall semester)
- Discuss doctoral core/major and major courses
- Explain the research requirement (15-21 hours) and courses (all should take BER 665)
- Before 30 hours are completed, POS must be filled out, signed by committee, and sent to department chair *(NOTE: If a student transfers in graduate credits, this form may need to be filled out their 1st semester in the program)*
- Other issues to discuss: researching, writing, and presenting with faculty members; membership in state and national professional organizations

Between 30 and 75 Hours:

- Continue regular advising with POS chair in order to complete program requirements
- If residency has not yet been completed, plan for the two full-time semesters on UA campus
- Discuss research interests and research hour options
- Make sure that Educational Foundations (BEF) requirement has been met (see list of approved courses and talk to POS chair)
- Discuss opportunity to enroll in Independent Study course with POS chair
- With POS chair discuss doctoral committee members (and how members can be added or removed)
- Once doctoral committee has been established, discuss comprehensive examination with the doctoral committee chair
- Complete the comprehensive examination *(NOTE: the examination should be completed at least nine months before the degree is to be awarded)*
- Discuss dissertation topic(s) and appropriate research methods with doctoral committee chair (and committee members, if necessary)
- Work with doctoral committee chair to write the dissertation proposal (Chapters 1-3)
- *Additional Note: Students may not enroll in CSE 699 until the comprehensive examination has been passed*
- Arrange a date for the proposal defense with committee
After passing doctoral comprehensive examination/defending the proposal:

- Fill out and submit the Application to Candidacy Form (students do this)
- Complete IRB forms before collecting data (NOTE: students will need to pass the online IRB module)
- Complete additional coursework if/as deemed necessary by doctoral committee
- Continue working with doctoral committee chair on the dissertation
- Arrange a date for the dissertation defense (NOTE: many faculty are off-campus during the summer; please plan accordingly)
- Work on final revisions with doctoral committee chair (NOTE: this revision process can take up to 6 months, depending on the type of research completed and a student's writing ability—please plan accordingly)
- Defend dissertation (plan time for some revision after the defense)
- Apply to graduate (this MUST be done during the first week of the semester in which student plans to graduate)
- Defend dissertation (copies of the final version must be sent to the graduate school at least 6 weeks prior to the end of the semester in which student plans to graduate)
- Fill out and submit the dissertation title card
- For up to date information, see Graduate School for a timeline with forms that must be completed

NOTE: The Graduate School converts ALL to ETDs since Spring 2009, therefore students will no longer turn in their dissertation at graduate school, but will submit electronically.
Doctoral Advising UPDATE of Milestones and Timeline

This checklist is designed to be a general update guide and timeline for students and advisors. It is up to the student to ensure all requirements are completed in the timeframes established by the Department and Graduate School. Submit this form to the Committee Chair at the beginning of each semester or more often.

Provide date below when each milestone is met

Date for this UPDATE of milestones? ___________________ Name ___________________

Before Completing 30 Hours:

_______ Date screened and accepted into the C&I Doctoral Program
_______ Meet several times with committee chair in planning Doctoral Course of Study form
_______ Complete FTF CIE 693: Doctoral Seminar (offered fall semester only)
_______ Establish program planning committee (to help fill out program of study)
_______ Discuss doctoral core and major areas with advisor and/or program planning committee
_______ Program of Study (POS) must be filled out, committee approved, signed, and sent to department chair
_______ Residency application completed and turned in
_______ Other or comment

Between 30 and 75 Hours:

_______ Residency completed (according to “traditional” or “alternative” guidelines)
_______ Educational research (BER) courses have been completed (if not how many completed? and needed?)
_______ Foundations of Professional Studies (BEF/BEP etc.) courses have been completed (if not how many completed? and needed?)
_______ With chair, discuss potential dissertation topics. List two possible directions.
_______ Comprehensive examination discussed with committee chair
_______ Comprehensive examination taken and passed
_______ Based on dissertation topic, doctoral dissertation committee is formed (program committee members do not have to serve as the dissertation committee)
_______ Meet (several times) each semester with committee chair to discuss progress

After passing doctoral comprehensive examination:

_______ Meet (several times) each semester with committee chair to discuss progress
_______ Dissertation prospectus written (Chapters 1-3) and Prospectus meeting with committee held (optional)
_______ Dissertation proposal written (Chapters 1-3)
_______ Proposal defense date selected
_______ Proposal manuscript must be sent to committee at least 2 weeks prior to the Proposal meeting
_______ Proposal passed by committee at meeting
_______ Application to Candidacy Form submitted
_______ IRB forms approved
_______ Dissertation defense arranged with committee (try to make this at least 6 weeks before due date)
_______ Dissertation defense announcement sent to appropriate C&I secretary
_______ Apply to graduate (MUST be done during first week of the semester in which student graduates)
_______ Dissertation manuscript must be sent to committee at least 2 weeks prior to the Defense
_______ Dissertation defended at oral defense meeting
_______ Completion of Oral Defense Acceptance form
_______ The final dissertation version must be uploaded to the graduate school by due date (at least 6 weeks prior to the end of the semester) in which candidate plans to graduate
_______ Other or comments

For up to date information, see the Graduate School website for a timeline and forms that must be completed (http://graduate.ua.edu/academics/doctoral.html#checklist).
NOTE: RESIDENCY COVER PAGE MUST ACCOMPANY PROGRAM OF STUDY

The University of Alabama

Program of Study

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D. Degree)
Department of Secondary, Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning

College of Education

Name: ___________________________________________ Student#: _______________________
Area: ___________________________________________ Program: _______________________
Previous Degree(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Field: ___________________________________________
Minor Field: ___________________________________________
Date Admitted to Graduate School: _______________________

Program Planning should____ Should not____ include additional Class A____ Class AA____ Certification

__________________________________________
Student’s Signature

Note: Appropriate prior Alabama certification at Class B or A level is a necessary prerequisite for additional certification at the Class A or Class AA Level.

Program conforms to state approved certification requirements: _______________________

Assistant Dean for Student Services
Date

COURSES COMPLETED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE#</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CR. HR.</th>
<th>COURSE#</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CR. HR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major Field (Minimum of 24 semester hours):
(CSE/CIE/CRI)

COURSES TO BE COMPLETED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE#</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CR. HR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minor Field (Minimum of 24 semester hours):
(relevant to content/discipline/subject specific/teaching field relevant toward scholarly development and professional goals)

NOTES:
1. List on back courses from the above program or previous graduate work which meet doctoral, research, and foundations of professional studies requirements.
2. Use asterisk (*) on front and back of form to indicate graduate credit transferred from other institutions.
3. No courses can be listed twice.
NOTE: RESIDENCY COVER PAGE MUST ACCOMPANY PROGRAM OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Concepts (3 semester hours)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Concepts (3 semester hours)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Research Courses, including research methods (9 semester hours)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES FROM GRADUATE PROGRAM MEETING FOUNDATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES REQUIREMENTS (12 semester Hours)</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must include three semester hour graduate-level course in the history and/or philosophy of education and an additional nine semester graduate hours from the state approved list of Foundations of Education courses or course work outside the College of Education in disciplines which are foundational to the student major.</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNATURES

Doctoral program planning committees require a minimum of five members, including a representative for each doctoral minor. One committee must be from the outside Department in which the student is enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Committee Chairperson</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Committee Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Committee Member</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Committee Member from Minor Field</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Committee Member from outside department</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This program of study meets all Graduate School and College of Education requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADUATE SCHOOL PH.D. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

*Minimum of 48 semester hours of course credit (not to include dissertation research credit).
*Minimum of 24 semester hours of dissertation research credit.
*Time limits: 6 years before admission; 7 years after admission.
*Transfer rule: up to one-half of course credit (not to include dissertation research credit).

Distribution: Committee Chairperson Committee Members
Graduate School (102 Rose) Department Head
Assistant Dean of Student Services (104 Carmichael) Student
Associate Dean (201 Carmichael)

Revised 9-21-06
NOTE: RESIDENCY COVER PAGE MUST ACCOMPANY PROGRAM OF STUDY

The University of Alabama

Program of Study
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (Ed.D. Degree)
Department of Secondary Curriculum,
Teaching & Learning

College of Education

Name: ____________________________ Student#: ____________________________
Area: ____________________________ Program: ____________________________
Previous Degree(s): ____________________________ Title: ____________________________
Institution: ____________________________ Date completed: ____________________________

Title: ____________________________ Institution: ____________________________ Date completed: ____________________________

Area of Specialization: ____________________________
Date Admitted to Graduate School: ____________________________

Program Planning should Include additional Class A Class AA Certification

__________________________ ____________________________
Student’s Signature Date

Note: Appropriate prior Alabama certification at Class B or A level is a necessary prerequisite for additional certification at the Class A or Class AA Level.

Program conforms to state approved certification requirements: ____________________________

Assistant Dean for Student Services ____________________________ Date ____________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES COMPLETED</th>
<th>COURSES TO BE COMPLETED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURSE#</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Field (Specialization: Minimum of 27 hours):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CSE/CF/CRD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subject Field (Minimum of 24 semester hours):

NOTES:
1. List on back courses from the above program or previous graduate work which meet doctoral, research, and foundations of professional studies requirements.
2. Use asterisk (*) on front and back of forms to indicate graduate credit transferred from other institutions.
3. No courses can be listed twice.
NOTICE: RESIDENCY COVER PAGE MUST ACCOMPANY PROGRAM OF STUDY

COURSES FROM GRADUATE PROGRAM MEETING DOCTORAL REQUIREMENTS IN RESEARCH

Minimum of 12 semester hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Concepts (3 semester hours)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative Concepts (6 semester hours)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Research Courses, including research methods (6 semester hours)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COURSES FROM GRADUATE PROGRAM MEETING FOUNDATIONS OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES REQUIREMENTS (12 semester hours) – Must include three semester hour graduate-level course in the history and/or philosophy of education and an additional nine semester graduate hours from the state approved list of Foundations of Education courses or course work outside the College of Education in disciplines which are foundational to the students major.

SIGNATURES

Doctoral program planning committees require a minimum of five members, including a representative for each doctoral minor. One committee must be from the outside Department in which the student is enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Chairperson</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Member</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Member</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Member</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Member</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Committee Member from Minor</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This program of study meets all Graduate School and College of Education requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GRADUATE SCHOOL ED.D. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

*Minimum of 69 semester hours of course credit (not to include dissertation research credit).
*Minimum of 12 semester hours of dissertation research credit.
*Time limits: 6 years before admission, 7 years after admission.
*Transfer rule: up to one-half of course credit (not to include dissertation research credit).

Distribution: Committee Chairperson
Graduate School (102 Rosec)
Assistant Dean of Student Services (104 Carnichael)
Associate Dean (201 Carnichael)

Committee Members
Department Head
Student

Revised 8-01-03
Degree (check one)  Program (check one)  Residency (check one)  
☐ Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)  ☐ Elementary Education  ☐ Traditional Residency  
☐ Doctor of Education (Ed.D)  ☐ Secondary, Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning  ☐ Alternative Doctoral Residency

For PhD Or EdD Students

Traditional Residency: (a) one spring semester as a full-time doctoral student plus the following fall semester as a full-time doctoral student, or (b) a summer (consisting of both summer terms as a full-time doctoral student), plus the immediately preceding spring or immediately following fall semester as a full-time doctoral student.

For EdD Students

Alternative Doctoral Residency:

A: University of Alabama, students will enroll in 18 hours of graduate level coursework across three consecutive semesters.

The 18 hours of coursework must include at least 9 hours of approved coursework on the main campus in Tuscaloosa and 3 hours of coursework in CIE 693: Doctoral Seminar / Workshop. Students in the ADR program must register for 1 hour of coursework in CIE 693 each of the 3 semesters. Students enrolled in CIE 693 will work with their advisor each semester and receive a Pass / Fail grade.

B: Gadsden Residency, students will enroll in 24 hours of graduate level coursework across 24 consecutive months at the Gadsden Center.

- Time limits: All requirements for the doctoral degree must be completed within the seven-year period following admission to the doctoral program. Previous graduate credit may be applied to the doctoral degree if the credit was earned during the six-year period prior to admission to the doctoral program.

- Transfer of credit: up to one-half of course credit (not to include dissertation research hours)

- Residency: The minimum period in which the doctoral degree can be earned is 3 full academic years of graduate study. The student must spend an academic year in continuous residence as a full-time student on-campus in the Graduate School of The University of Alabama (or, if specifically approved by the faculty concerned, one full summer consisting of two terms, preceded by or followed by one regular semester). This requirement can be satisfied only by enrolling in coursework; dissertation or thesis research cannot be used. GTAs or GRAs whose work assignment is more than 3 hours per semester should expect to spend more time than the minimum period in residence.
RESIDENCY: Identify the semesters in which you will fulfill the residency requirement, and list the courses you plan to take each of those semesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residency (Check One)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Traditional Residency (Ph.D. or Ed.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Alternative Doctoral Residency - Tuscaloosa (Ed.D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Alternative Doctoral Residency - Gadsden (Ed.D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Curriculum and Instruction
### Draft of Projected Doctoral Core Courses
#### Fall 2014 - Fall 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 14</th>
<th>Spring 15</th>
<th>Summer 15</th>
<th>Fall 15</th>
<th>Spring 16</th>
<th>Summer 16</th>
<th>Fall 16</th>
<th>Spring 17</th>
<th>Summer 17</th>
<th>Fall 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIE 645</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning Communities (Goldston)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIE 650</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
<td>Sociocultural Perspectives on Education (Spector)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVISED November 17, 2015
**MEMORANDUM**

Date: ________________

Subject: ( ) Appointment/Change of Doctoral Ed.D./Ph.D. Program Advisory Committee  
( ) Change of Doctoral Ed.D./Ph.D. Program Advisory Committee  
( ) Appointment/Change of Doctoral Ed.D./Ph.D. Dissertation Committee  
( ) Change of Doctoral Ed.D./Ph.D. Dissertation Committee

**POLICY:** The Ed.D. program advisory committee consists of a minimum of three members, one of whom is from outside the Area of the College in which the student is majoring. The Ph.D. program advisory committee consists of a minimum of five members, and includes one member from outside the Area of the College in which the student is majoring and two members each representing one of the minor areas of study. Ed.D. and Ph.D. dissertation committees consist of a minimum of five members, one of whom is from outside the Area of the College in which the student is majoring.

To: Dr. Peter Hlebowitsh  
College of Education  
Initial* 

From: ___________________________ Department Chair  
______________________________ Department  
______________________________ Department Chair  

Student: __________________________ CWID # __________________________  

Address: ____________________________________________

**COMMITTEE:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Initial*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson: (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Members: (2) |   |
| (3) |   |
| (4) | [Represents Minor, if Ph.D. Program Committee] |
| (5) | [Represents Minor, if Ph.D. Program Committee] |
| (6) |   |

Add: ____________________________  
Delete: __________________________

*Initial indicates approval and/or agreement to serve on Committee.

**Distribution:**  
Dean, Graduate School (870118)**  
Committee Chairperson and Members  
Dean of College (201 Carmichael)  
Department Head  
Student and Student File  
College of Education Student Services

**Copy only for Appointment or Change of Dissertation Committee**  
Revised 7/16/04
Application for Major Doctoral Examination  
Secondary Education  

Complete and submit this form at least 3 weeks in advance of the time you intend to take your exam. After you obtain the necessary signatures, turn this form into Secondary Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning; Box 870232; Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0232.

Name: ____________________________________________  
Address: ____________________________________________  
Phone: ____________________________________________  
CWID#: ____________________________________________  
Email: ____________________________________________  

If you are applying to take your Major exam, list the doctoral core courses you have completed and those in which you are currently enrolled.

_________________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________________  

You must satisfy these requirements to be eligible to take the doctoral comprehensive exams.

__1. All coursework must be completed in your major area.  
__2. 80% of all coursework must be completed.  
__3. A program of study must have been completed and be on file in the program office.  
__4. Your Doctoral Committee Advisory form must be completed and on file in the program office.

The questions and responses must be returned within ten (10) days. FAILURE TO TURN IN RESPONSES TO ANY QUESTION BY 4:00 PM ON THE DUE DATE WILL RESULT IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE ON THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION.

Date to receive exam ____________ Date to return exam ____________  

Student Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________  

Program Planning committee Chair  
(or Co-Chair, where applicable)  

Date ___________________________  

Program Planning committee  
(or Co-Chair, where applicable)  

Date ___________________________  

Department Chair ___________________________ Date ___________________________  

Please list the members of your Program Advisory committee:  

_________________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________________________  

Revised February, 2009
APPENDIX J
APPLICATION FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY
(Must be approved prior to registration for the course.)

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION - UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

Date: __________________________ Term: __________________________

Name: __________________________

Address: __________________________

City/State/Zip: __________________________

SS#: __________________________ Email: __________________________

Telephone #s (H) __________________________ (W) __________________________

I am a/an (graduate/undergraduate) student majoring in __________________________.
I am working toward the __________________________/________________________
degree/certification.

I hereby make application to enroll in course (prefix and #) __________________________
(full title)
to be taught during the __________________________ term, 20___. It is my intention to complete this
course via "independent study." A syllabus for the didactic version (if such exists*) of this
course is attached. It is my understanding that I will accomplish those objectives indicated
(highlighted) on the syllabus or those listed below using the following method(s): (Explain
fully how you and the instructor will meet the objectives while not attending class. Attach extra
pages, if necessary.)

I agree to the above: __________________________________________

Student Signature

Instructor of the independent study

Instructor of the didactic course

Department Chair __________________________________________ Date

*Under normal circumstances, didactic courses are not offered via independent study.

Rev. 1/28/04
## Course Paper Rubric for Outcome Assessment (Year 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Methodology (35%)</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies methods in appropriate, logical, and creative ways; describes why he/she is using a particular method, what it does, and how it fits with the question; clear logic of inquiry. Properly and carefully selects and cites seminal and relevant sources.</td>
<td>Shows competence in research design; methods fit the problem; follows the accepted norms for samples, measures, and analyses. Properly cites relevant sources.</td>
<td>Shows developing, but basic competence in research design. Logic of inquiry may be underdeveloped in one area. Properly cites relevant sources.</td>
<td>Uses wrong, poor, or fatally underdeveloped methods to answer question. Logic of inquiry isn’t clear or compelling. May have neglected to properly cite relevant sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Theory (35%) | Review of the relevant theories that bear directly on the topic of the paper. Sophisticated knowledge of and ability to use relevant theories and discriminate between rival theories. Creatively and insightfully compares and cites competing theories. | Shows competence in using theory to explain problems, hypotheses, or empirical data. Properly cites seminal and relevant sources. | Shows developing but basic competence in appropriating theory for his/her topic. Theory may be not be critically scrutinized or cogently articulated, but it shows a burgeoning competence in the explanatory power of theory. Cites relevant sources. | Student’s work doesn’t have a guiding theory; theory is misunderstood or fatally underdeveloped; or it overlooks a significant body of theory. |

| Writing/Thinking (19%) | Formulates ideas: clearly and precisely; with insight and creativity; in a comprehensive fashion. Well-focused and well-organized. Writing flows and student provides transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that make reading pleasurable and easy. | Formulates ideas clearly with a burgeoning sense of precision in language choices. Is comprehensive, well organized, and provides appropriate cohesive ties so that the reader doesn’t have to work too hard. | Ideas are formulated with burgeoning clarity and a developing sense of standards for scholarly writing and thinking. At this point, the reader may have to supply missing information or may have to make inferences that would represent serious flaws later in the program. | Extensive work is needed to write/think in a scholarly manner. The paper may lack clarity, organization, focus, flow, and/or cohesion. |

| Technical Criteria (11%) | Nearly perfect in the following areas: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone. | Few mistakes in technical areas. | Some work is needed in one or two technical areas. | Extensive work is needed in several technical areas. |

This rubric pulls from three sources:
3) Gonzaga University’s rubrics for outcomes assessments.
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION GUIDELINES

Grading
The Secondary faculty who are members of the student's doctoral planning committee will read and grade the exam.

Results
When all questions receive a grade of "pass," the comprehensive exam is considered to be passed. Students may retake the exam if all questions are not passed. Any student failing one or more questions will be required to retake only the part of the exam that was not passed.

Students may not retake any portion of the exam until the next regularly scheduled exam (which would be the next academic semester). Students have only one chance to retake any part of the exam. Students will receive a letter approximately four (4) weeks after completion (excluding summer exams and/or holiday periods), indicating the results of the exam.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Make a cover sheet for your response to each question

2. Responses must be typed or word-processed, using APA publication style, 6th edition. Good quality printers must be used. Responses to each part of a question are recommended to not exceed ten (10) pages, and four (4) copies of each response must be submitted.

3. References must be clearly cited and included in a reference list with one list per response. Your responses should include references, so cite your references carefully and thoroughly.

4. Number your pages in each response.

5. Do not lift material directly from texts, articles, or other material. The purpose of the exam is to measure your understanding of the concepts. Lifting material from other sources constitutes academic misconduct.

6. Assistance from another individual also constitutes academic misconduct. Do not communicate with anyone else about the exam; talk, for clarification purposes only, with the faculty member who wrote the question.

7. The University of Alabama Academic Misconduct Policy will be followed by Curriculum and Instruction in the event of suspected academic misconduct.
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION
COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION PROCEDURES

GOALS
The goals of the comprehensive examinations are to (a) give students an opportunity to reflect on and integrate the knowledge and skills they have acquired from the program in the context of a useful educational activity, and (b) give the faculty the opportunity to evaluate students' ability to show sufficient breadth and depth of knowledge and skills in their fields.

ELIGIBILITY
Students are eligible to take the examination when (a) all coursework in the major has been completed; and (b) at least 80% of total coursework has been completed. Students must make application indicating their desire to take the examination within the first 4 weeks of the semester; first week in the summer term. Applications are available in the Program Office located in 201 Graves Hall. (Note: Applications can be transmitted electronically via email when students provide an account address.)

GUIDELINES
Students will be provided with questions that are to be completed independently. The questions and responses must be returned within ten (10) days. Each question will include appropriate subsections to ensure that all areas of study are assessed. It is anticipated that responses will be of better quality and more comprehensive given the time allotted. Faculty members from Secondary Education will write the questions and can assist students by clarifying any details about the questions. NO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE CAN BE OBTAINED FROM FACULTY MEMBERS OR ANY OTHER INDIVIDUALS.

Students are required to give numerous and appropriate references to the sources they use and to include a reference section in their papers. Plagiarism on the exam will be considered academic misconduct, resulting in automatic failure and possible termination from the program. Students who are unclear about what constitutes plagiarism or the improper or the improper paraphrasing of others' work are advised to ask for guidelines from program faculty. Students wishing additional clarification on a question can approach the faculty member who wrote the question. An optional oral exam may be required at the discretion of the student's exam committee.

The written responses for each question should be comprehensive. Response to each part of a question is not to exceed ten (10) typed, double spaced pages with one-inch margins.

FAILURE TO TURN IN RESPONSES TO ANY QUESTION BY 4:00 PM ON THE DUE DATE WILL RESULT IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE ON THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Committee Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **EdD/PhD Comprehensive Exam Rubric for Outcome Assessment**
A score of 8/16 is passing, providing no Unacceptables (1) were earned. | |
| | **Outstanding (4)** | **Very Good (3)** | **Acceptable (2)** | **Unacceptable (1)** |
| **Research Methodology** | Well done; original, novel, carefully and comprehensively documented, lays out every step; indicates why the method was used; used appropriately; makes and justifies judgments about the methods; identifies limitations and potential weaknesses; flows naturally from theory; integrates the theory. | Applies methods in appropriate, logical, and creative ways; describes why he/she is using a particular method, what it does, and how it fits with the question; clear logic of inquiry. Properly and carefully selects and cites seminal and relevant sources. | Shows competence in research design; methods fit the problem; follows the accepted norms for samples, measures, and analyses. Properly cites relevant sources. | Shows developing, but basic competence in research design. Logic of inquiry may be underdeveloped in one area. Properly cites relevant sources. |
| **Theory/Content** | Comprehensive, creative, original, simple, elegant, tidy; logically consistent and internally coherent; has clever arguments; aligns well with the question/topic; provides sophisticated explanatory power over question at hand; artfully compares and cites competing theories/bodies of content and weaves them into an expanded theoretical orientation. | Review of the relevant theories that bear directly on the topic of the paper. Sophisticated knowledge of and ability to use relevant theories and discriminate between rival theories. Creatively and insightfully compares and cites competing theories. | Shows competence in using theory to explain problems, hypotheses, or empirical data. Properly cites seminal and relevant sources. | Shows developing but basic competence in appropriating theory for his/her topic. Theory may be not be critically scrutinized or cogently articulated, but it shows a burgeoning competence in the explanatory power of theory. Cites relevant sources. |
| **Writing/Thinking** | Formulates ideas: clearly, precisely, comprehensively; with insight and creativity; organization elegantly supports the focused content; writing moves the reader along effortlessly by providing transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that unify the work. Thinking is agile, novel, and generative. | Formulates ideas: clearly and precisely; with insight and creativity; in a comprehensive fashion. Well-focused and well-organized. Writing flows and student provides transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that make reading pleasurable and easy. | Formulates ideas clearly with a burgeoning sense of precision in language choices. Is comprehensive, well organized, and provides appropriate cohesive ties so that the reader doesn’t have to work too hard. | Ideas aren’t formulated clearly and lack a sense of standards for scholarly writing and thinking. At this point, the reader may have to supply missing information or may have to make inferences that represent serious flaws in writing/thinking. |
| **Technical Criteria** | Perfection in technical areas of: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone. | Minor mistakes in a single area: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone. | Few mistakes in one or more technical areas. | Some work is needed in one or two technical areas. |

This rubric pulls from three sources:
3) Gonzaga University’s rubrics for outcomes assessments.
TO THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

We, the undersigned, report that as a committee we have examined

STUDENT NAME: _______________________________  CWID: __________

upon the work completed in the subjects assigned, namely:

MAJOR: _______________________________________

and find that the student’s attainments____are such____are not such that the student be recommended for the

DEGREE: _______________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

I dissent from the foregoing report:

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

_____________________________________________

Date of Exam: ____________________________
PROSPECTUS and PROPOSAL ACCEPTANCE FORM
Curriculum and Instruction

To: Graduate School
    Box 870118
    Tuscaloosa, AL 3548700118

We, the undersigned, have reviewed the dissertation prospectus or proposal (circle one) for:

_________________________________________________________________________ and

_________________________________________________________________________

We recommend that she/he proceed with the study of the proposed dissertation.

Chairperson/Co-Chairperson:

_________________________________________________________________________ Date: _______________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Committee Members:

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

Printed Name

cc: Graduate School; Student File; Advisor; Student
Revised 6/25/13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>Interesting, comprehensive, coherent, engaging, surprising; includes a well-articulated and argued problem formulation and contribution to knowledge; introduces the literature review; provides a rationale for the conceptual, methodological, and/or theoretical orientation.</td>
<td>Well written but less eloquent; poses a clear research problem and questions; describes significance; provides a roadmap of what is to come in the dissertation.</td>
<td>Workmanlike; reasonably clear and focused; has a marginal hook but is not exciting; conveys what the research is about; shows understanding of the topic; provides an inkling of the theoretical and methodological approach; may leave something out but does not say anything absolutely wrong.</td>
<td>Not grounded or scholarly; tone is wrong; takes inappropriate and unsupported stances; goes off on incomprehensible tangents; does not clearly relate to the chapters that come after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates a grounded understanding of the literature; provides reasons for looking at the literature differently; draws on literature in a convincing and supple way; analyzes and synthesizes a broad body of material and makes meaningful distinctions without being exhaustive; knows what needs to be cited and what does not; analyses are organized around themes; succinct; indicates the significance of the research; ties it all together synthetically.</td>
<td>Provides a meaningful analysis of the literature; includes both classic and recent citations; not a laundry list of “Smith said this” and “Jones said that”; demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the literature; takes a body of material and leads it toward particular direction; brings various intellectual resources to bear on the topic; builds a case for the research and for the hypotheses.</td>
<td>Is more summary and chronology than analysis and synthesis; lacks integration and thematic understanding; regurgitates information, but doesn't lean it in a particular direction; may not always be clear why some literature is being cited and other literature is not; tends to be tedious rather than engaging.</td>
<td>Omits work that has done the same work that the student is doing; has not looked at commonly understood bodies of relevant literature; cites articles that are out of date or are not peer-reviewed; misinterprets the literature; misquotes major theorists; shows lack of understanding of the literature and where this research fits in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Well done; original, novel, carefully and comprehensively documented, lays out every step; indicates why the method was used; used appropriately; makes and justifies judgments about the methods; identifies limitations and potential weaknesses; flows naturally from theory; integrates the theory; gathers own data; adds a new twist or application to existing methods; uses the best techniques; develops innovative new methods that contribute to theory of methodology.</td>
<td>Applies methods in appropriate, logical, and creative ways; describes why he/she is using a particular method, what it does, and how it fits with the question; clear logic of inquiry. Properly and carefully selects and cites seminal and relevant sources.</td>
<td>Shows competence in research design; methods fit the problem; follows the accepted norms for samples, measures, and analyses. Properly cites relevant sources.</td>
<td>Shows developing, but basic competence in research design. Logic of inquiry may be underdeveloped in one area; uses inappropriate methods; data may not be handled carefully or systematically; properly cites relevant sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing/Thinking (15%)</td>
<td>Formulates ideas: clearly, precisely, comprehensively; with insight and creativity; organization elegantly supports the focused content; writing moves the reader along effortlessly by providing transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that unify the work. Thinking is agile, novel, and generative.</td>
<td>Formulates ideas: clearly and precisely; with insight and creativity; in a comprehensive fashion. Well-focused and well-organized. Writing flows and student provides transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that make reading pleasurable and easy.</td>
<td>Formulates ideas clearly with a burgeoning sense of precision in language choices. Is comprehensive, well organized, and provides appropriate cohesive ties so that the reader doesn’t have to work too hard.</td>
<td>Ideas aren't formulated clearly and lack a sense of standards for scholarly writing and thinking. At this point, the reader may have to supply missing information or may have to make inferences that represent serious flaws in writing/thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Technical Criteria (10%) | Perfection is technical areas of: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone. | Minor mistakes a single area: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone. | Few mistakes in one or more technical areas. | Some work is needed in one or two technical areas. |

This rubric pulls from three sources:
3) Gonzaga University’s rubrics for outcomes assessments.
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA GRADUATE SCHOOL

ADMISSION TO CANDIDACY FOR DOCTORAL DEGREE

PART I: Applicant Information

Full Name: ___________________________ CWID: __________

(Last) (First) (Middle)

E-mail: _______________________________

Mailing Address: ____________________________

Dates of Passing Qualifying/Major/Preliminary Examinations: Written: ___________ Oral: ___________

Major Subject: ________________________________

Dissertation Subject: ________________________________

I hereby petition the Dean of the Graduate School for admission to candidacy for the degree of Doctor of

___ Philosophy
___ Nursing Practice
___ Education
___ Musical Arts

I hold the following degrees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Granted by</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Candidate ___________________________ Date ___________

PART II: Approval

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE: We, the undersigned, certify that the above named candidate has passed his/her qualifying/major/preliminary examination for the degree of Doctor of ___ Education ___ Philosophy ___ Nursing Practice ___ Musical Arts. We approve the Dissertation Subject. We recommend the applicant to the Graduate Dean for admission to candidacy for the degree.

Chairperson ___________________________ We, the undersigned, record our dissenting vote:

______________________________

Approval by Graduate Dean ___________________________ Date of Approval ___________________________

Dean of College ___________________________ Date of Approval ___________________________

This form must be signed by ALL committee members AND your College Dean.

***Also, please attach a current copy of your approved program of study.***
TO THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

We, the undersigned, report that as a committee we have examined

STUDENT NAME: ________________________________  CWID: __________

upon the work completed in the subjects assigned, namely:

MAJOR: ____________________________________________

and find that the student’s attainments are such are not such that the student be recommended for the

DEGREE: __________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

I dissent from the foregoing report:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Date of Defense: __________________________

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA GRADUATE SCHOOL

Doctoral Final Defense Form
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction (10%)</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting, comprehensive, coherent, engaging, surprising; includes a well-articulated and argued problem formulation and contribution to knowledge; introduces the literature review; provides a rationale for the conceptual, methodological, and/or theoretical orientation.</td>
<td>Well written but less eloquent; poses a clear research problem and questions; describes significance; provides a roadmap of what is to come in the dissertation.</td>
<td>Workmanlike; reasonably clear and focused; has a marginal hook but is not exciting; conveys what the research is about; shows understanding of the topic; provides an inkling of the theoretical and methodological approach; may leave something out but does not say anything absolutely wrong.</td>
<td>Not grounded or scholarly; tone is wrong; takes inappropriate and unsupported stances; goes off on incomprehensible tangents; does not clearly relate to the chapters that come after.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Literature Review (20%) | Demonstrates a grounded understanding of the literature; provides reasons for looking at the literature differently; draws on literature in a convincing and supple way; analyzes and synthesizes a broad body of material and makes meaningful distinctions without being exhaustive; knows what needs to be cited and what does not; analyses are organized around themes; succinct; indicates the significance of the research; ties it all together synthetically. Has no trouble answering committee questions about the literature that grounds the study. | Provides a meaningful analysis of the literature; includes both classic and recent citations; not a laundry list of “Smith said this” and “Jones said that”; demonstrates a nuanced understanding of the literature; takes a body of material and leans it toward particular direction; brings various intellectual resources to bear on the topic; builds a case for the research and for the hypotheses. May have minor nuances in the literature review that committee members bring to the students’ attention. | Is more summary and chronology than analysis and synthesis; lacks integration and thematic understanding; regurgitates information, but doesn’t lean it in a particular direction; may not always be clear why some literature is being cited and other literature is not; tends to be tedious rather than engaging. Answers committee members’ questions while acknowledging that more care might have been taken in the literature review. | Omits work that has done the same work that the student is doing; has not looked at commonly understood bodies of relevant literature; cites articles that are out of date or are not peer-reviewed; misinterprets the literature; misquotes major theorists; shows lack of understanding of the literature and where this research fits in the field. Doesn’t or can’t answer committee members questions convincingly. |

<p>| Method (20%) | Well done; original, novel, carefully and comprehensively documented, lays out every step; indicates why the method was used; used appropriately; makes and justifies judgments about the methods; identifies limitations and potential weaknesses; flows naturally from theory; integrates the theory; gathers own data; adds | Applies methods in appropriate, logical, and creative ways; describes why he/she is using a particular method, what it does, and how it fits with the question; clear logic of inquiry. Properly and carefully selects | Shows competence in research design; methods fit the problem; follows the accepted norms for samples, measures, and analyses. Properly cites relevant sources. Is able to articulate careful answers to committee questions | Shows developing, but basic competence in research design. Logic of inquiry may be underdeveloped in one area; uses inappropriate methods; data may not are be handled carefully or systematically; |
| Findings/Results (20%) | Well executed; robust, complete, meaningful, interesting, surprising; adds to knowledge; has high quality data; understands the data set inside and out, including shortcomings and limitations of the data; analysis is multidimensional, interesting, and important; analyses map back to questions; tells a story; pays attention to detail; communicates analyses clearly. Handles questions about findings/results from committee with elegance, thoughtfulness, and care. | Well executed, but not robust; appropriate; shows good understanding of data; attempts to link theory and methods; goes beyond the basic data set and makes a convincing case; may leave some data analysis opportunities open. Handles questions about findings/results from committee members with agility. | Meets the standard of thoroughness or comprehensiveness; has done the minimum necessary to pass. Is able to articulate careful answers to committee questions about findings/results. | Not well executed; shows lack of understanding of data or doesn’t have the data needed to answer the research questions. Has difficulty articulating answers to questions about findings/results. |
| Discussion (20%) | Deep, accurate, creative, enthusiastic; goes beyond summarizing the findings; draws things together; goes back to the introduction; states the hypotheses and answers each one provides an in-depth account of the findings; develops a novel framework or explanation for unanticipated results or results that have internal contradictions; goes back to the literature and discusses the differences between the student’s findings and other people’s findings; discusses big surprises and the strengths and limitations of the current design or research; puts the study in a larger context; says what it means for the rest of the field; identifies future directions; speculates on why and how the field might need to change; moves the field forward | Less of the same; does not close the circle; may not come back to the beginning and address the problem. | Summarizes the results; provides an interpretation of the findings; references to the literature simply state that the findings are consistent with other people’s findings; has a rote discussion of strengths and limitations; provides some very general directions for future research that do not provide structure for the next study; makes wild speculations that have little to do with the topic. | Shows lack of understanding and careful thought; the discussion and conclusion do not adequately reflect the journey; a disconnect between data and conclusions; restates the results without providing any interpretation; misinterprets the results; interprets the results beyond what the data allow; generalizes too broadly. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing/Thinking (5%)</th>
<th>Formulates ideas: clearly, precisely, comprehensively; with insight and creativity; organization elegantly supports the focused content; writing moves the reader along effortlessly by providing transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that unify the work. Thinking is agile, novel, and generative.</th>
<th>Formulates ideas clearly and precisely; with insight and creativity; in a comprehensive fashion. Well-focused and well-organized. Writing flows and student provides transitions, summaries, and other cohesive ties that make reading pleasurable and easy.</th>
<th>Formulates ideas clearly with a burgeoning sense of precision in language choices. Is comprehensive, well organized, and provides appropriate cohesive ties so that the reader doesn’t have to work too hard.</th>
<th>Ideas aren’t formulated clearly and lack a sense of standards for scholarly writing and thinking. At this point, the reader may have to supply missing information or may have to make inferences that represent serious flaws in writing/thinking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Criteria (5%)</td>
<td>Perfection is technical areas of: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone.</td>
<td>Minor mistakes in a single area: grammar, punctuation, spelling, APA format (citations, headings, subheadings, tables, figures, etc.), and scholarly tone.</td>
<td>Few mistakes in one or more technical areas; mistakes do not interfere with understanding the dissertation.</td>
<td>Some work is needed in one or two technical areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This rubric pulls from three sources:
3) Gonzaga University’s rubrics for outcomes assessments.
Committee Acceptance Form for Electronic Thesis or Dissertation

This form serves as the official record of manuscript approval by the student’s advisory committee and is submitted to the Graduate School with the final manuscript paperwork. It is not included in the electronic publication (ETD). The form must have original signatures of the advisory committee chair and all members. A dissenting member should put the word “dissent” between the Name and Signature lines when signing below.

Name of Candidate (print) ________________________ CWID (print) __________

Degree Level (e.g., Ph.D.) __________ Date of Defense ________________

Degree Program (e.g., Higher Education Administration) ____________________________

Manuscript Title ______________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

The undersigned confirm that we have reviewed this document and examined the student regarding its content. We agree that this document conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation in scope and quality and that the attainments of this student are such that we recommend the conferral of degree.

Thesis or Dissertation Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (print)</th>
<th>(Chair)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of Department Chair or Graduate Program Director ________________

Review and Acceptance of the ETD: I have reviewed the final electronic version (PDF) of the above-mentioned document and determined that it is an accurate representation of the content of the document reviewed and accepted by the committee and that its form and style are ready for publication.

(Signature of Student) __________________________ (Print Name and Date) __________

(Signature of Thesis or Dissertation Committee Chair) ____________________ (Print Name and Date) __________

The student must mail or deliver the completed form to the Graduate School, 102 Rose Administration Building.

Graduate School Administrator __________________ Date Signed __________

Graduate Dean __________________________ Date Signed __________