Special Education and Disability Policy
Ph. D. Handbook

May 17, 2018

Department of Counseling and Special Education

Doctor of Philosophy in Special Education and Disability Policy

Procedural Information and Guidelines

Table of Contents

Appendix A: First Year Review Process; Student Evaluation Forms
Appendix B: Comprehensive Examination Policy
Appendix C: Writing Rubric; Course Sequences; Portfolio Tasks
Appendix D: Prospectus/Dissertation Progress Form
Appendix E: Sample Internship Options
Appendix F: Program of Study Form
Appendix G: Doctoral Student Speaker Evaluation Form

The purpose of this document is to help guide students through the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy program. While most major points are outlined in this document, the Department of Counseling and Special Education reserves the right to change and update information and requirements. It is the responsibility of all doctoral students to keep abreast of program requirements and changes in the program.

Philosophy

The Doctor of Philosophy program in Special Education and Disability Policy is designed to prepare researchers who are ready to assume leadership positions at Universities, Research Centers, State Departments of Education, and/or other educational or government institutions. The program is designed to provide a solid research foundation, a broad perspective for theoretical analysis of research in the field, and structured opportunities to develop expertise in research, teaching, and policy/service.

The conceptual framework for the Ph.D. program is PRACTICE (Practice, Research, and Academic Coursework in Teaching, Implementation, and Community Engagement). The PRACTICE conceptual framework is in alignment with the mission of Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), the School of Education, and the Department of Counseling and Special Education (CNSE). Grounded in core knowledge through focused coursework and an emphasis on both "learning" and "doing", doctoral students are mentored by experienced faculty who are engaged in school-based research and dissemination via research internships, preservice and inservice educator development via teaching internships, and the large-scale transfer of learning and development of 21st century skills via policy or service internships. The PRACTICE framework directly addresses the growing need for new teacher educators and researchers who can prepare the next generation of teachers and researchers for the current and anticipated needs of students in diverse environments. With a focus on 21st century competencies, this conceptual framework emphasizes knowledge creation and sustainable transfer in authentic environments, systematic mentoring and apprenticeships, and leadership development within community research, personnel development and dissemination initiatives.

The course requirements for doctoral degree may vary from student to student based on individual career goals. The student's doctoral advisory committee has the responsibility for recommending individual courses of study for each doctoral student. A minimum of 59 credits beyond the master's degree is required for the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy. A student's advisory committee may recommend additional coursework to provide further expertise in special education content, research methodology, or theoretical knowledge needed to meet individual career goals.

Admission

The Department of Counseling and Special Education is committed to fostering a graduate student body that reflects the diversity within special education and within the country.

We want to further develop a higher education community whose work will contribute to the advancement and betterment of individuals with disabilities along with their teachers and family members. To identify such persons capable of transforming and improving the needs within special education, a number of criteria will be used. Students applying for admission to the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy must:

1.   Meet the School of Education and Graduate School criteria for admission (check your entry year in the Graduate Catalog).
2.   Supply a written statement of professional goals including:
    a)   professional goals and specialized interest areas.
    b)   skills and/or characteristics which will facilitate the applicant's pursuit of the goals cited.
    c)   potential faculty with whom the candidate would like to work and why.
3.   Participate in a personal interview by SEDP faculty. Although an in person interview with the candidate is highly preferred, a phone interview with the candidate is acceptable. Applicants should be prepared to answer questions similar to the following:
    ●   What was the nature of your academic preparation and interests during your baccalaureate/master's program?
    ●   What factors influenced your decision to pursue special education as a career?
    ●   What factors influenced your decision to pursue a doctoral degree?
    ●   What type of job do you expect to apply for upon program completion?
    ●   Tell us about your experiences working with children and youth with disabilities.
    ●   What is a major change you believe will occur in the special education profession in the next decade?
    ●   What do you believe your strengths are when it comes to being a doctoral student? What skills would you need to work on?
    ●   What else do you wish to have the selection committee know about you?
4.   Provide a minimum of three letters of recommendation from individuals in a position to evaluate an applicant's *graduate study potential* and/or research experience. Applicants should consider the references from prior faculty instructors or advisors, or from those who understand the requirements of a doctoral program (and specifically, the program here at VCU) either by having participated as a student themselves, or as an instructor in a course at the advanced graduate level. Letters that address your commitment to students with disabilities, your classroom teaching ability, or other personal or professional skills unrelated to doctoral-level work and research are not helpful for the admissions committee.
5.   Submit official transcripts of graduate work completed. These transcripts will be evaluated by department faculty and prerequisite and/or co-requisite coursework may be required. Applicants should have completed graduate-level coursework in research methods (e.g., EDUS 660 here at VCU) and statistics (e.g., STAT 508 here at VCU). In addition, applicants who have not completed a master's degree in special education may be required to take additional coursework to familiarize themselves with the content they may need to conduct research and/or teach courses in the field.
6.   Submit the results of verbal and quantitative components of the GRE. Applicants *must also complete* the optional analytic writing test.

Doctoral Program Overview

Upon admission, our student's main responsibility will be to complete initial course work while reflecting on career goals, research ideas, and selecting a doctoral advisory committee. During this period, students will be interacting and collaborating with professors in the department through coursework and other professional activities. These interactions are opportunities for multiple experiences to work alongside professors in the areas of teaching, research, and service, and guide students as they begin their own work. These co-curricular experiences are as important as the coursework necessary to complete your degree, as they serve as the evidence that you are ready for the next stage in your professional career.

Competencies: Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy

Students in the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy program demonstrate their preparation to become tenure-track faculty members, researchers, and leaders in the field through major assignments in courses, as well as in completing activities for their professional portfolio. They follow procedures are commonly used in universities for annual evaluation of faculty, by updating their professional vita and compiling examples of their work. These professional portfolios will be evaluated on an annual basis by the student's Advisory Committee and other program faculty as appropriate. The list of required portfolio artifacts can be found in Appendix C. In general, they demonstrate competencies in the following areas:

I. Analytical and Writing Skills
     -Demonstrate general and applied knowledge of the different conceptual approaches to practices and research including global knowledge of different approaches
     -Demonstrate a knowledge of the history and background of each approach to the field of special education and disability policy
     -Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze research using different conceptual frameworks
     -Demonstrate the ability to write a policy analysis that describes the impact of national policy at the national, state, local and individual levels.
     -Demonstrate the ability to critically analyze research literature
     -Write a succinct, coherent, well-conceived synthesis of the literature

II. Content Knowledge
     -Demonstrate knowledge of critical issues and trends in special education and disability policy through oral and written skills
     -Demonstrate knowledge of leaders in special education & disability policy
     -Demonstrate knowledge of the components of various disability policies at the national, state, local, and individual agency/organizational levels.
     -Demonstrate knowledge of the various accreditation bodies in the field of education, and particularly special education: be able to describe their role in development of a

personnel development program at the university level

-Demonstrate knowledge of the components of a proposal for grant-funding for research, professional development, and policy research/demonstration projects. Learn the sources of funding in the field of special education.

-Demonstrate an understanding of the major research methodologies in the field, and in particular, of single subject resource methodology.

III. Professional Skills

-Develop professional skills including self-reflection of teaching and research skills

-Demonstrate the ability to teach at the university level, including the ability to assess student progress

-Demonstrate the ability to provide constructive feedback to students using the program clinical evaluation instrument

-Demonstrate the ability to accept and integrate constructive criticism into scholarly products and activities.

-Demonstrate the ability to create, implement, and evaluate an inservice training program based on the needs of teachers and including evidence-based practices

-Develop an area of expertise that serves as a foundation for teaching, research, and policy advocacy

-Demonstrate the ability to disseminate information in the field through professional presentations, written manuscripts, and electronic means

-Demonstrate the ability to work as a member of a research team

-Participate in activities that are of service to the field, the community and/or the university

-Develop a detailed CV

Required Coursework: Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy

The following is the required coursework in the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy:

EDUS 608:   Statistics for Social Research (3 cr.)
EDUS 702:   Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship I (3 cr.)
EDUS 703:   Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship II (3 cr.)
EDUS 710:   Educational Research Design (3 cr.)
EDUS 711:   Qualitative Methods and Analysis (3 cr.)

SEDP 705: Seminar on Disability Policy (3 cr.).
This doctoral-level seminar provides an overview of policy development at the national and state levels including issues that affect disability policy and program management. Topics will focus on understanding policies in the areas of employment, education, health care, community living and finances.   In particular, students will focus on current policy reform efforts in employment, education and health care. Class members will be required to contribute constructively to class

discussion, research the key issues surrounding the policy reform efforts in their assigned area, and present their findings and analyses to the class.

SEDP 706: Personnel Development in Special Education (3 cr.).
The purpose of the course is to provide doctoral students with an understanding of the key issues in personnel development in special education, as well as conceptual frameworks for teacher development.

SEDP 707: Critical Issues in Special Education (3 cr.).
This seminar is designed to provide doctoral students with an opportunity to explore, analyze, discuss, and write about a wide range of critical and/or controversial issues and trends in the field of Special Education within the broader context of Education, Applied Psychology, contemporary society, and historical trends.

SEDP 708: Grant Writing in Special Education and Other Social Sciences (3 cr.).
Examines conceptual, empirical, and practical issues in the preparation of grant proposals and in the conduct of interdisciplinary research in the social sciences that focuses on education and related issues in youth development, with a specific emphasis on youth with disabilities; develops students' practical skills in: establishing interdisciplinary research teams; interdisciplinary research design and grant proposal development; matching research questions to funding agencies and their priorities; working with community agencies and relevant stakeholders to secure their involvement in the research process; writing research or training grant proposals.

SEDP 709: Literature Reviews in Special Education and Other Social Sciences (3 cr.).
Provides in-depth, advanced instruction in the conducting of systematic literature reviews; instruction in how to create and refine a research question; instruction in defining and refining search terms; instruction in critically analyzing identified literature; and instruction in the writing and structure of a literature review.

EDUS 899: Dissertation Research.
Students who have passed their comprehensive exam and are actively engaged in their dissertation research should enroll in EDUS 899, in the section that lists the SEDP program coordinator as the instructor of record. Students work with their dissertation committee chair on the various components of proposing and conducting the study, with guidance from the other members of their dissertation committee. At a minimum, students should meet with their full committee to provide them with an update on their progress at least once per semester. This is particularly important for those who are not holding a formal prospectus hearing and/or final defense meeting during that semester. In addition, students who are enrolled in dissertation credits are encouraged to attend department and/or School of Education meetings, colloquia, and/or research support group meetings to minimize isolation from the program. See the Graduate School and Ph.D. in Education program policies for additional information about the requirements for the dissertation and roles and responsibilities for committee members.

Electives

Students will need to take at least 9 credits of electives, at least 3 credits of which are a research elective. A research elective is required of all students and should be chosen based on proposed methodology needed to complete the dissertation study. In addition, all students are required to take at least one 3 credit course outside of the School of Education. This course should help provide a broader perspective of the influences on educational policy and research beyond the field of education. A research elective course taken outside of the School of Education could meet both of these requirements.

In addition to these elective requirements, a student's advisory committee may recommend and/or require additional coursework to help a student meet his or her individual career goals. There are a number of possible electives, many of which are listed on the Ph.D. in Education program Blackboard site. This is not an exhaustive list as new courses are added each year. Students should consult with their advisor and advisory committee to help make decisions about coursework.

This is a three-year, 59 credit-hour program for full-time students that begins in the Fall semester and will end in the summer of the third year for those students who move through their dissertation study in a focused manner. Students will participate in three internships that provide an opportunity for them to work with department faculty on research, teaching, and policy/administration work designed to provide an opportunity for them to demonstrate competencies necessary for work as university faculty. The proposed program of study for the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy is tabled below (see Appendix C for both part-time and full-time course sequences):

Foundations Classes

Foundations of Education/Proseminar	**EDUS 702**	**3 cr**
Foundations of Education II	**EDUS 703**	**3 cr**

Major Classes

Critical Issues in Special Education	**SEDP 707**	**3 cr**
Grant Writing	**SEDP 708**	**3 cr**
Personnel Development	**SEDP 706**	**3 cr**
Policy Seminar	**SEDP 705**	**3 cr**
Literature Review	**SEDP 709**	**3 cr**

Research Classes

Intermediate Statistics	**EDUS 608**	**3 cr**
Research Methods in Education	**EDUS 710**	**3 cr**
Qualitative Research Methods	**EDUS 711**	**3 cr**
Single Subject Research Methods	**SEDP 711**	**3 cr**
Research Elective		**3 cr**

Internships (replaces Externship and some co-curricular activity requirements)

Teaching Internship	**SEDP 772**	**3 cr**
Research Internship	**SEDP 771**	**3 cr**
Policy/Service Internship	**SEDP 773**	**2 cr**

Cognate: (to be chosen in consultation with your advisor/advising committee)　　　**6 cr.**

Dissertation

Dissertation Research (minimum)	**SEDP 899**	**9 cr.**

TOTAL CREDITS　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　**59 cr.**

Typical Course Sequence

Doctoral students enroll in either a full-time or part-time basis, following the Graduate School (http://www.pubapps.vcu.edu/bulletins/graduate/?uid=10045&iid=30076) and School of Education (http://www.soe.vcu.edu/academics-programs/doctoral-studies/ph-d-in-education/current-students/courses-and-credits/) guidelines for continual enrollment. Typically full-time students enroll in 9 credits in the Fall and Spring semesters and 3 credits in the summer while part-time students enroll in 6 credits in the Fall and Spring semesters and 3 credits in the summer. There is some flexibility for part-time students, but students are advised to discuss any deviation from the prescribed sequence, as courses are offered typically only once per academic year. The recommended course sequences for full- and part-time students in both programs are outlined in Appendix D.

Doctoral Advisory Committee

After being admitted to the doctoral program, an advisor will be assigned to help students plan the first semester of courses, assist in obtaining financial assistance (if applicable), and begin the process of choosing a doctoral advisory committee. This advisory committee should be formed as soon as possible after the student has begun doctoral work and in general no later than the end of the second semester of equivalent full-time study, prior to the First Year Review process.

Advisory Committee Membership

The advisory committee for a candidate for the doctoral degree shall consist of no fewer than three members selected from the graduate faculty. At least two members, including the chairperson, will be from the Department of Counseling and Special Education. A co-chairperson may also be appointed if appropriate.

Selection of Advisor and Committee Members

1.   An interim advisor will be assigned to all incoming doctoral students. This temporary assignment enables students to register for their first semester of study and to learn the procedures that will lead to the completion of their Ph.D. program. This temporary advisor is chosen as the faculty member with expertise that is in line with the research goals of the incoming student as described in the personal statement of the application and/or to provide balance in advising across faculty members. In most cases, that temporary advisor will remain as the student's advisor and chair of the advisory committee. However, there may be instances where a change may need to be made and in those instances, it should occur as quickly as possible so that the other members of the committee can be identified prior to the First Year Review. Together, the student and advisor should consider a number of factors when developing a doctoral supervisory committee, including students':
(a)   program emphasis with respect to the area of interest chosen (e.g., high or low incidence disabilities, administration, early childhood, transition)
(b)   long-range interests, objectives, and goals
(c)   specific research interests

2.   Once a doctoral advisor has been chosen, students in conjunction with their advisor, will:
(a)   develop their proposed course of study
(b)   identify and request appropriate faculty to serve as advisory committee members

Duties & Responsibilities

Duties of the advisory committee follow:
(a)   To inform the student of all regulations governing the degree sought. **It should be noted, however, that this does not absolve the student from the responsibility of informing himself/herself concerning these regulations.**
(b)   To meet during the First Year Review meeting to review the qualifications of the student, Qualifying Exam results, and other First Year Review materials to develop a Final Program of study.
(c)   To provide ongoing support and consultation (as needed) to assist the student in completing program requirements and extra-curricular activities.
(d)   To conduct the comprehensive examination.
(e)   To meet to discuss and approve the proposed dissertation project and the plans for carrying it out.
(f)   To assist with identifying the membership of the student's dissertation committee (which may include members who were also part of the Advisory Committee). Once the dissertation committee is formed and approved through the Graduate Studies Office, the dissertation committee serves as the Advisory Committee.
(g)   In addition, for students enrolled in the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy program, the Advisory Committee will conduct the annual review process.

The forms for the Preliminary and Final Program of Study can be found at
http://www.soe.vcu.edu/academics_programs/ph-d-in-education-special-education-and-

disability-leadership/

The first year review of doctoral students is designed to assess the student's strengths, motivation, professionalism, and potential for achieving an in-depth knowledge of special education issues and a high level of competence in professional writing and speaking. The goal of this review is to assist students in making wise career decisions and to recommend specific courses or experiences, if any, that the student should undertake if he or she continues in our special education doctoral program. In addition, at the First Year Review the student, in consultation with their advisory committee, may request a change in advisor to better reflect their substantive interests as s/he moves forward in the program.

In the PhD in Special Education Program, students will participate in annual reviews, designed to review progress in coursework as well as in internship experiences and other work with faculty. A portfolio review process will be used. Before the first year review, students share a sample of their writing (from a class taken during that first year), a writing rubric completed by a faculty member, an updated personal statement (describing long range goals for their career after the Ph.D. program), their CV, and access to the ePortfolio. In addition, faculty will review the results of the qualifying exam and faculty evaluation of the student's performance in courses. The first year doctoral student shares the writing sample with the members of his/her advising committee as well as his/her career goals during the first year review meeting and the committee: (a) discusses student progress in the program (including any remediation or action needed based on course grades and/or qualifying exam results), and; (b) identifies elective courses, internship experiences, and/or activities for the student's coming year to help him/her make progress toward career goals.

See Appendix A for procedures.

Comprehensive Examination:Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy

The doctoral advisory committee is responsible for determining the readiness of a student to be admitted into candidacy for the doctoral degree. In making this judgment, the committee considers a student's readiness to conduct research independently, ability to analyze research critically, mastery of the literature in major and minor areas, ability to integrate information, and clarity of written and oral expression. Successful completion of the comprehensive examination is required prior to decisions about candidacy.

The comprehensive examination has three parts: (1) a major area paper, (2) a portfolio of competencies, and (3) an oral examination. Students demonstrate in-depth understanding of a research topic in the major area paper and mastery of content related to their area of expertise across multiple competencies in the portfolio assessment. The oral examination includes a presentation of the major area paper and covers information from the portfolio as well as any other information the doctoral advisory committee members identify as applicable to the student's studies.

Students need to pass all three components of the comprehensive examination, successfully defend their prospectus, and complete instruction in IRB prior advancement to

candidacy. The advancement to candidacy form is completed after the prospectus defense.

In conducting the comprehensive examination, the doctoral advisory committee shall adhere to the Graduate School policy.

(1) Major Area Paper

For the major area paper, doctoral students conduct a substantive, integrative review of the literature in a specific content area related to the education of students with disabilities. The paper topic is determined by the student and chair in consultation with the doctoral advisory committee. The paper shall be of manuscript length (typically 25-30 pages) in APA style, be suitable for submission for publication in one of the journals of the field, and satisfy the chair and doctoral advisory committee that the student has the analytic skills necessary to conduct dissertation research. Students must (a) demonstrate the ability to create a conceptual framework and to organize the paper in a way that convinces the reader that researching the topic is critical to the field of special education and disability policy; (b) conduct an extensive, critical review of the literature; and (c) identify implications for future research and/or practice.

Students complete the major area paper as the culminating assignment in Directed Readings, with support from their committee and the instructor of Directed Readings. During the semester of Directed Readings, students are required to meet with their advising committee as a group a minimum of one time and are required during that semester to meet with their advisor at least two other times. Students must complete their major area paper during that semester or have a valid reason for receiving an incomplete grade for the course. Incomplete grades must be submitted with a plan for completion of required work (to program coordinator) and according to graduate school rules, must be completed in the subsequent semester.

Although doctoral students receive guidance from their chair and committee members in selecting a topic, organizing the paper, and revising the paper, they also function independently, as the major area paper is a key determinant of their readiness to design and implement dissertation research.

The major area paper shall be evaluated by the Advisory Committee members, the chair, and, at the chair's discretion, faculty reviewers not serving on the committee. The SEDP Writing Competencies Rubric (used throughout the program to provide feedback on formal writing assignments; see Appendix C) will be used for evaluating the paper, and the chair shall communicate the evaluation criteria to the student. The rubric includes criteria commonly used in the review process for most educational journals (e.g., significance of the topic, inclusion of key research, depth of coverage, integration of ideas, appropriateness of conclusions, and written composition). The chair will determine (with the student) when the major area paper is ready for review by the doctoral advisory committee, but no later than the end of the semester after the student enrolls in and completes SEDP 709. Once the major area paper is ready from committee review, the student will provide a copy of the paper to all committee members (in addition to the portfolio, see below). The committee members will have no less than 15 working days to evaluate the major area paper and portfolio components. Scoring rubrics of the student's major area paper must be submitted to the committee chairperson. The doctoral advisory committee must determine that the major area paper is acceptable (based on the rubric) before the student will be given permission to schedule the oral portion (see below) of the examination.

(2) Portfolio Assessment

Throughout the program students will collect a variety of products representing a number of competencies (see Portfolio Components form). The portfolio will provide documentation of each of these competency areas, and the student will use the Portfolio Components form to document successful completion of competencies (see Evaluation column) via faculty member signatures. In addition, when the student submits his/her major area paper to his/her committee, s/he will also submit the full portfolio with documentation for each competence area. This product may be submitted via hard or electronic copy, and it must be clearly organized in the order outlined on the Portfolio Components form. The student's committee will review the Portfolio and their review will be considered in the overall comprehensive exam evaluation.

(3) Oral Examination

Once the major area paper and portfolio have been submitted to the committee, the student will schedule the oral defense, keeping in mind that committee members will have no less than 15 working days to evaluate the major area paper and portfolio components. At this defense the student shall prepare a presentation, not to exceed 30 minutes, that describes the findings of the major area paper and outlines areas for future research based upon the critical review of the literature. After the presentation committee members may ask questions of the student, including not only information from the major area paper but also information from components of the Portfolio, coursework or other areas pertinent to the student's area of expertise. The oral examination, in sum, shall last no more than 90 minutes.

Evaluation of the Comprehensive Examination

Following the oral examination, the committee will meet without the student present, and the committee will make a decision on whether the student has achieved candidacy. The committee members will use the Comprehensive Exam Evaluation Form - Individual (see attached) to individually assess the student across three areas: Major Area Paper, Portfolio, and Oral Examination, as well as a comprehensive evaluation of the student's competence in the areas of Policy, Personnel Development and Research. In addition, the Writing Rubric will be used to provide feedback to the student for the Major Area paper. Following the completion of the individual evaluations, the committee will reach consensus on a rating for each area in addition to the overall evaluation. The Chair will complete the Comprehensive Exam Evaluation Form- Committee (see attached), which will serve as a summary across all areas of the Comprehensive Exam. After the committee comes to a consensus on the decision, the student will be asked back into the room and the decision will be shared. Students who do not pass their comprehensive exam may have one additional attempt before being terminated from the program; this attempt will need to be scheduled within one semester of the initial oral defense.

See Appendix C procedures.

Internships

Students enrolled in the Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy program are required to take a series of three internships for credit as part of their programs of study. These internships provide an opportunity for students to spend concentrated time working on required portfolio tasks in the areas of research, teaching and policy/service. It does not replace completely the requirement that students also engage in other co-curricular activities with their advisors, advising committee members, faculty across the university as it is unlikely that students will be able to accomplish all required portfolio tasks in an area during the internship semesters.

Pre-requisite Coursework

Students should complete required coursework before beginning a specific internship experience. Students planning to take the policy internship should have taken SEDP 705 as a pre-requisite; students planning to do the teaching internship should have completed SEDP 706 and have participated as a guest lecture in SEDP 501 or other similar introductory course in the M.Ed. Program), and students enrolling in the research internship should have passed the qualifying exam and taken SEDP 708 either as a prerequisite or concurrently.

Coordination with Advisor and/or Advisory Committee

Although students will be working on portfolio tasks/activities under the direction of a department faculty instructor, those specific activities should be chosen in consultation with one's advisor and/or advisory committee in the semester prior to enrolling in the specific internship. An application process will be followed to help internship faculty plan for the coming semester, including finding appropriate placements and activities that best meet individual student needs for expanding skills and experiences that support their continued professional preparation.

The Dissertation

Selecting a Dissertation Committee

After the student has been awarded Continuing Doctoral Status, and by the time the student has completed 27 credit hours in the program, the student should meet with his or her advisor to begin the process of selecting a dissertation committee. The committee must be selected and names submitted for approval to the Director of the Ph.D. in Education by the end of the semester in which the student completes SEDP 709. All members are expected to have an interest in and knowledge of the student's proposed dissertation topic. Dissertation committee members may be, but are not required to be, members of the student's advisory committee.

Within the above stated time frame, the student and his or her advisor begin the process

of selecting a dissertation chair. Dissertation committees must have a minimum of four members. Three of the members, including the chair, must be graduate faculty from the School of Education. The fourth member must be a Virginia Commonwealth University graduate faculty member from outside the School of Education. A fifth member may be added at the discretion of the dissertation chair and the student. This member must also be from outside the School of Education and may be from outside the University. There is no expectation that the advisor will chair the student's dissertation committee.

After the student and his or her advisor have agreed on the dissertation chair, the dissertation chair and the student develop a list of other proposed dissertation committee members. The student contacts those nominees to determine their interest and willingness to serve. If any person declines to serve, the student and the dissertation chair select a replacement. This procedure is followed until a committee has been selected.

No person may serve on a dissertation committee if such service would create the appearance of conflict of interest. For example, a student who teaches in a college or university may not have a faculty member in the same school or department serve on the committee; a student from an agency or commercial organization may not have his or her supervisor serve on the committee. A written request is then sent to the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program for final approval of committee members. The Director of the Ph.D. in Education program will review the credentials of proposed members and will approve the candidates submitted, or may, at his or her discretion, reject candidates who appear to have a conflict of interest.

Normally, barring resignations, members of a dissertation committee continue to serve until the candidate's research is completed and approved. However, in rare cases it may be necessary to make adjustments in committee membership. If a dissertation committee member is unable to continue to serve, the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program is notified and requests that the dissertation chair select a replacement. The chair and the candidate choose a replacement and submit the name to the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program. In such cases, the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program has responsibility for reconstituting the dissertation committee.

Selecting A Dissertation Topic

After the dissertation committee has been established, the dissertation chair and the student, in consultation, agree on a suitable dissertation topic. The student then meets individually with the other members of the committee to discuss the dissertation topic, obtain their suggestions and, ultimately, their approval. When all have agreed that the proposed topic is a suitable one, and the student has successfully completed all course work and the comprehensive examination, the student proceeds to develop a prospectus.

The Prospectus

The Prospectus is a plan the candidate develops to serve as a guide in completing his or

her dissertation research. It is expected that the plan should be concise, well-articulated, well written and represent the candidate's best thinking and inquiry on a researchable topic. The *American Psychological Association (APA) Manual 6th edition* is the style of choice for dissertations.

It is the candidate's responsibility to develop the prospectus. The candidate, however, is expected to consult regularly with the dissertation chair and with committee members. When the candidate keeps the members of the dissertation committee informed of progress in the development of the prospectus, later problems are usually minimized.

Since the prospectus is a detailed plan of the candidate's dissertation, it reflects the dissertation format. The body of the prospectus is composed of three major parts, roughly equivalent to the first three chapters of the final dissertation, as well as some other features typical of a major scholarly work. The relative length and depth of each section may vary somewhat, but it is expected that each section will be included in the prospectus.

The first part, titled **Introduction,** includes the statement of the problem and its significance, the rationale for the study, a summary of the literature review and methodology, and a listing of specific research questions. In essence, the **Introduction** should provide a brief overview and understanding of what will be studied, why it is of importance, and how it will be accomplished. The second part of the prospectus, called the **Review of Literature,** describes and documents the theoretical, historical, experiential, and/or experimental background of the proposed study. The review should be carefully organized to clarify the various conceptual and interdisciplinary roots from which the proposed study has emerged and illuminate the way in which the study will expand upon, rather than duplicate, past knowledge. Thus, it includes a thorough review of the empirical literature relevant to the dissertation question, although it may not provide the exhaustive review of supportive and related areas that will be found in the final dissertation. In addition, this part usually includes a subsection listing the terms and definitions that are critical to the study. The third part, termed **Methodology,** presents the detailed procedures that will be followed in conducting the research and, therefore, is written in the future tense. Dependent upon the specific methodology to be employed in the study, such components as the population, instrumentation, procedures, research design, data analysis steps, and other information needed to understand the study should be included and described in detail. In most instances, the limitations of the study are also delineated in this part of the prospectus. Although the content of these first three parts has been carefully developed to provide both a clear overview of and detailed plan for conducting the dissertation study, placement of two specific components may vary. Depending upon the area of inquiry and the nature of the study, the definition of terms may be placed in the first or second part and the limitations and/or delimitations of the study may be located in the first or third part of the prospectus. In such situations, clear guidance should be sought from the doctoral Committee.

In addition to the three basic parts of the written prospectus, a **Title Page** and **Table of Contents** should precede the **Introduction.** A bibliography, which lists all sources cited, but no additional supporting references, follows the **Methodology** part of the prospectus. Appendices

should also be used as appropriate, to include any documents, such as letters, permissions, data gathering instruments, or other exhibits that will be used in conducting the dissertation research.

The Prospectus Review

When, in the opinion of the dissertation chair, the prospectus is ready for critical review, a meeting of the dissertation committee is scheduled. A written request to schedule a date and time for a prospectus review is submitted by the chair to the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program. Every effort will be made to meet the request, but because of other scheduling considerations another date and time acceptable to the committee and the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program may need to be arranged.

The request must be submitted at least 14 calendar days prior to the first acceptable date listed in the request. The Director of the Ph.D. in Education program schedules the prospectus meeting, which is two hours in length, publishes the candidate's name, date, place, time, title of the prospectus, and name of the chair, and invites members of the University community. The candidate's family members are not invited to attend the review.

It is the candidate's responsibility to provide a completed copy of the prospectus for each member of the dissertation committee and to file one copy in the Office of Doctoral Studies, at least 14 calendar days prior to the prospectus meeting. The prospectus review will not be announced until the prospectus is filed in the Office of Doctoral Studies.

Upon completion of the prospectus review, the candidate is excused from the meeting room and the committee makes its decision. A minimum of three positive votes is required for approval. Following are procedural outcomes for the dissertation prospectus.

Approved

Approval by the committee indicates that the prospectus is in its final, approved form. The document adheres to appropriate APA standards, including reflecting high quality professional writing with little to no grammatical errors, and the research design is appropriate for the proposed study. Upon approval of the prospectus the student will enter candidacy and may begin the approved study, including appropriate human subjects protection procedures, if necessary.

Approved with minor revisions

Approval with minor revisions by the committee indicates that the prospectus is approved contingent upon minor revisions indicated by the committee. These revisions may include minor APA and grammatical edits and/or minor revisions to the research plan. Due to the limited revisions necessary to achieve approval of the prospectus, the committee may agree that the Dissertation Chair can ensure that the final document addresses identified revisions without the re-convening of the full committee. Revisions to the Chair are due within one month of the original meeting date and should be shared via a track-change version with all committee members.

Major revisions needed

        Major revisions needed indicate that the committee feels the prospectus needs significant work prior to being approved. These revisions may include some combination of significant APA errors, grammatical and writing errors, or flaws in the research design. The student will have up to one semester from the date of the original meeting to make revisions to the prospectus, under the guidance of the Chair and the committee. Upon resubmission of the revised prospectus, the student should submit to all committee members (a) a letter outlining the responses to the revisions recommended by the committee, and (b) a track-change version of the revised prospectus that indicates revisions made. At this point a prospectus meeting may be scheduled.

Not approved

        If the prospectus is not approved by the committee, the student will have one semester from the date of the original meeting to submit a new prospectus to the committee. If, after either (a) a new prospectus not being submitted within one semester of the original meeting date, or (b) a second not approved prospectus, the student will be dismissed from the program.

        If the prospectus is approved, the dissertation committee signs the **Prospectus Review Report** and forwards it to the Office of Doctoral Studies. If the prospectus is approved with minor revisions, the dissertation committee may sign the **Prospectus Review Report,** noting the specific changes to be made, and the chair forwards it to the Office of Doctoral Studies. If the prospectus needs major revisions, the student will have up to one semester to make changes to the prospectus and schedule another prospectus defense. The student should submit a letter outlining the responses to the revisions and a track-change version of the prospectus indicating revisions. If the prospectus is not approved, the student will have one semester to submit a new prospectus and will have one more opportunity to achieve an approved prospectus.

        Regardless of the decision, all members of the committee sign the **Prospectus Review Report** signifying the committee's action. It is the responsibility of the dissertation chair to communicate the decision to the candidate for implementing any changes requested by the committee. The approved **Prospectus Review Report** then becomes a part of the candidate's permanent file.

        Students must submit the appropriate materials to the Virginia Commonwealth University Institutional Review Board (IRB), following the approval of the prospectus, with the assistance of the dissertation chair and via the office of the Associate Dean for Student Affairs. While the dissertation chair is the principal investigator for all dissertation research studies, it is the students' responsibility to ensure that IRB approval has been obtained before beginning any data collection activities and that a copy of the approval letter has been submitted to the Office of Doctoral Studies. Students using secondary data must contact and receive formal approval from IRB before the use of any data.

The Dissertation Format

Although the dissertation follows the format already utilized for the approved prospectus, minor revisions must be made as the prospectus parts are developed into dissertation chapters. Two additional major components and some new specific pages must also be prepared and included in the final dissertation. The three prospectus parts become the first three chapters of the dissertation and additional chapters titled "IV. **Findings"** and "V. **Conclusions and Recommendations"** complete the written record of the candidate's study.

For the dissertation, the **Introduction,** as presented in the prospectus, requires the addition of a brief summary of the findings and conclusions. Often the **Review of Literature** also has to be expanded to include greater information about areas that support or relate to the dissertation question under study. The part on **Methodology** in the prospectus must be revised from future to past tense. Any changes in the procedures or difficulties which developed in carrying out the methodology are also reported.

The quantitative and/or qualitative results of the study, where appropriate, are reported in the **Findings** chapter. In addition to data describing the actual population used in the research, both tables and explanatory clarification of the actual data collected in the course of the study are presented in the first section of the chapter. Narrative analysis of the data and any trends observed are discussed in a final section of the same chapter.

The **Conclusions, Limitations and Recommendations** chapter utilizes the data already reported and relates those findings to the specific research problem and questions delineated in the Introduction and each subsequent chapter. Therefore, the chapter must be carefully crafted to reflect the actual content of the preceding four chapters, as well as to provide logical extensions of that content. The recommendations, which are highly dependent upon the nature of the dissertation problem, attempt to put the dissertation research into practical terms. Thus, the recommendations that emerge, in part, form the basis for further research as well as implications for practice and policy.

The Dissertation Defense

Upon completion of the dissertation research, the dissertation chair schedules a dissertation defense by submitting a written request to the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program along with a list of acceptable dates from the University calendar. This request must be submitted at least 14 calendar days prior to the first acceptable date listed on the request. The Director of the Ph.D. in Education program schedules the two-hour defense, publishes the candidate's name, date, place, time, title of dissertation, name of chair, and invites members of the University community. The candidate's family members are not invited to attend this meeting. The final dates for the oral defense are the third Friday in April, the fourth Friday in July, and the first Friday in December for May, August, and December graduation respectively. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide a completed copy of the dissertation for each member of the dissertation committee and to file one copy in the Office of Doctoral Studies, at least 14 calendar days prior to the date of the scheduled defense. The dissertation defense will not be announced until the dissertation is filed in the Office of Doctoral Studies and reviewed by the Director of the Ph.D. in Education program.

19

Approval of the Dissertation

Following the oral examination of the candidate by members of the dissertation committee, the candidate is excused from the meeting room and the committee makes its decision. The committee may decide to approve the dissertation as written, or request the candidate to make specific major or minor changes. A minimum of three positive votes is required for approval. The committee members signify their approval of the dissertation by signing the **Dissertation Approval Certificate** and the **Dissertation Oral Report** form. It is the candidate's responsibility to meet any further University requirements for filing the approved dissertation.

If major changes (defined as conceptual, factual, or interpretive changes) are needed, a second dissertation defense is scheduled, at which time the dissertation committee reviews and acts on the revisions. If the recommended changes are minor ones, (spelling, typographical or syntactical), the committee may empower the dissertation chair to act on its behalf in supervising the corrections. In this case, the candidate is expected to make the required changes within a week (5 working days) and resubmit the corrected copy to the dissertation chair for approval. The final approved dissertation must be at submitted to Cabell Library for binding within two weeks (10 working days) after the defense date.

Responsibilities

The Candidate

The dissertation is the candidate's research, but it is also the candidate's responsibility to seek out and respond to guidance and feedback from the dissertation chair and each committee member. At the same time, the candidate should recognize that faculty workloads vary during the year, so that contacting a committee member, scheduling an appointment, critiquing a written draft, and similar activities may unavoidably require extra time in some instances. Maintaining contact, however, will facilitate the good communication that helps make the dissertation development process a rewarding experience for all. Early in the dissertation process, the student should meet with the chair to establish a realistic timeline for completing the dissertation.

Responsibilities of the Candidate

1. Selects a dissertation chair, with guidance from his or her advisor.
2. Nominates committee members with guidance from the dissertation chair.
3. Establishes attainable research goals, with the approval of the dissertation chair and committee members.
4. Prepares formal written materials in an accurate and scholarly form by:
    a) following the *American Psychological Association (APA) Manual 6th Edition* for both prospectus and dissertation.
    b) assuring that prior to submission for formal review or defense, the form, grammar, and editing of the written prospectus and dissertation are accurate.

5. Meets required deadlines for submission of written materials by:
    a) distributing copies of the completed prospectus to the dissertation chair, each committee member, and the Office of Doctoral Studies, at least 14 calendar days prior to the date of the prospectus review.
    b) distributing copies of the completed dissertation to the dissertation chair, each committee member, and the Office of Doctoral Studies, at least 14 calendar days prior to the date of the dissertation defense.

6. Meets with the committee each semester to provide an update on progress (see **Appendix D for Form**).

7. Presents a written outline or summary of the proposed research for review and approval to each of the committee members. In either format, the candidate should be sure to delineate clearly the proposed problem statement, research questions, and methodology.

8. Develops a formal written prospectus that includes an introduction, a review of literature that includes all major studies relevant to the specific research questions, and the methodology to be used.

9. Submits application to the Exempt Research Committee or the Institutional Review Board.

10. Receives formal committee approval of the prospectus before beginning data collection.

11. Understands that when the prospectus is approved by the dissertation committee at the prospectus review, it becomes an agreed upon plan between the candidate and committee. Any changes in the approved prospectus must be discussed with and approved in writing by the committee.

12. Consults with and is guided by the dissertation chair and committee members throughout the research process. Although the specific interaction between the candidate and committee may vary, the candidate is expected to make appointments and, when requested, submit written drafts at least 7 calendar days prior to meeting with the dissertation chair or committee members.

13. Understands and is prepared to defend the research methods and data analyses used in the dissertation.

14. Brings three original Dissertation Approval Signature sheets to the dissertation defense.

15. Assumes responsibility with the dissertation chair for the final proofreading of the dissertation.

16. Contacts the Office of Doctoral Studies to complete exit forms and submits the prescribed number of final copies of the approved dissertation to Cabell Library for binding and microfilming.

The Dissertation Chair

Serving as a dissertation chair constitutes a major responsibility to the candidate, the School of Education, the Ph.D. Program. For the dissertation chair, the dissertation process requires extended involvement with both the candidate and committee members. It is time-consuming and, at times, demanding. At the same time it provides an intellectual challenge unlike any other University responsibility. Through successful guidance of a completed dissertation, the chair not only contributes to the expansion of knowledge in a given field, but also becomes an integral part of that contribution as the dissertation becomes a basis for future research.

Responsibilities of the Dissertation Chair

1. Guides the candidate in:
    a) developing a scholarly, researchable question.
    b) preparing the written outline or summary of the problem statement, research question, and methodology.
    c) selecting and utilizing instrumentation and statistical analyses congruent with the methodology and research design.
2. Establishes times when he or she will be available to guide the candidate with prospectus and dissertation drafts.
3. Establishes, with the candidate, attainable research goals and a reasonable time frame for completing the steps in the dissertation process.
4. Clarifies for the candidate and committee members the role of the candidate, chair, vice-chair (where appropriate), and committee; and suggests ways in which each can contribute most effectively to the dissertation development process.
5. Advises the candidate when materials are at an appropriate level of completeness to share with committee members, as well as when to communicate progress or problems.
6. Assists the candidate in preparing the application for the VCU Institutional Review Board or the Exempt Research Committee. For IRB purposes, the chair is the principal investigator for the research and is required to complete one of the basic courses in the collaborative IRB training initiative (CITI) human subjects protection education.
7. Guides the candidate in developing content and format, as well as in using appropriate grammar and style; and assures that the final document is without error and suitable for publication.
8. Supervises the preparation of and approves both the prospectus and the dissertation prior to the formal review, and the defense.
9. Schedules the candidate's prospectus review and dissertation defense through the Office of Doctoral Studies.
10. Maintains a climate that facilitates constructive discussion during the prospectus review.
11. Submits a grade of Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Fail for dissertation credit during each semester in which the candidate is enrolled in **EDUS 899: Dissertation Research.**
12. Maintains a climate conducive to a fair review of the candidate's dissertation research during the dissertation defense.

Dissertation Committee Members

      The expertise of each committee member is essential to the development of the candidate's dissertation research, and as such, will be reflected in the quality of the final product. The contributions and support of each committee member helps assure that the candidate will complete a quality dissertation.

Responsibilities of Committee Members

1. Assist the candidate by:
    a) critiquing all written materials submitted by the candidate.

      b) conferring in the selection of instrumentation and statistical analyses congruent with the research design.

      c) providing content, methodological, and/or statistical expertise related to the research problem under study.

2. Presents concerns and suggestions to the dissertation chair and candidate during the prospectus development process.

3. Recommends additional committee meetings to the dissertation chair when needed.

4. Participates in the prospectus review and dissertation defense.

DOCTORAL PROGRAM CHECKLIST

There are many points to follow from admission to graduation. Use this checklist as a basic guide to help you through the process. In addition, you must use the information in your graduate catalog http://www.pubapps.vcu.edu/bulletins/graduate/ , School of Education Doctoral Program Handbook http://www.soe.vcu.edu/files/2013/07/Ph.D._in_Education_Program_Handbook_48hour_Spring-2012.pdf and this document to keep you informed as to the requirements needed at each step in the doctoral degree adventure.

_____	1.	**Admission to the program**
_____	2.	**Selection of a Doctoral Advisory Committee**
_____	3.	**Qualifying Exam and First Year Review**
_____	4.	**Program of Studies Approval**
_____	5.	**Completion of Coursework**
_____	6.	**Completion of Internships**
_____	7.	**Completion of Portfolio tasks**
_____	8.	**Comprehensive Examination**
_____	9.	**Dissertation committee & proposal approval**
_____	10.	**Dissertation defense & Graduation**

Appendix A

Department of Counseling and Special Education

Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy

First Year Review Process

The first year review process provides multiple points of evaluation for feedback. They include the qualifying exam, academic performance evaluation, graduate assistantship and/or internship performance evaluation, evaluation of a writing sample, and a first-year committee meeting. At the end of the process, the committee a) approves the student moving forward in completing the coursework; b) recommends remediation in one or more areas; or c) recommends dismissal from the program.

Qualifying Exam

Upon completion of the first 12-18 hours of required coursework, the doctoral student will sit for a written exam consisting of four questions based on foundations of education/special education coursework, and educational research and statistics coursework. A combination of instructors from those courses will grade each question, assign a grade of pass/fail to each area of foundations and research, the results then accessed by the first-year committee advisor. The student must pass all four questions to be considered for approval to move forward, or must agree to complete recommended remedial activity(ies) if a failing score was assigned to any question. It is unlikely that taking the exam over again will show a deeper understanding of the material, therefore remediation is the typical course of action. A study guide can be acquired from the Office of Graduate Studies.

Academic Performance Evaluation

The Office of Doctoral Studies will send the appropriate form to students with a suggestion that they request an academic performance evaluation from three instructors. The SEDP requires that *all* SEDP courses be evaluated, and that *all* instructors, regardless of what department originates the course, be invited to evaluate the student. Academic performance is measured across such dimensions as in-class performance, content mastery, scholarship (knowledge from literature, writing, oral communication), commitment, etc. A sample of the evaluation form is in Appendix A.

Graduate Assistantship and/or Internship Evaluation

Students who have a graduate teaching or research assistantship (as well as students who complete an internship) are required to submit a completed evaluation (see form below) to their advisory committee during annual review meetings. This form should be completed by the assistantship or internship supervisor and returned to the advisor. The student should provide the

supervisor with an envelope that may be sealed to allow for an appropriate evaluation.

Evaluation of a Writing Sample

Students must provide the committee with a sample of their writing, specifically, a paper or project that was submitted for a grade during the first year (foundations or concentration); the paper must utilize APA style complete with citations and a reference list. A writing rubric is used to evaluate the sample and to serve as a guide for feedback to the student. The purpose of providing a substantive writing sample is to inform the faculty of the potential need for support. By identifying specific areas in need of improvement, faculty advisors can provide early and targeted strategies to ensure optimal writing during the prospectus and dissertation phases of the program.

In addition to a course-related writing sample, students are requested to update their personal statements from their application packet. This ensures that the committee is up to date with the direction the student intends to take for the dissertation.

First-year Committee Meeting

The first-year review process culminates in a meeting of a student and three members of the SEDP faculty, selected by the student and the advisor, and who typically have professional interests in common with the doctoral student. Each committee member will have had the opportunity to review the exam results, academic performance evaluations, and the writing sample. The student will come to the meeting prepared to discuss the updated personal statement and a direction for research. Committee members will ask the student to defend the selection of the writing sample – to reflecting on what was learned, and why the paper is representative of the student's work. At this time, the committee provides feedback on the submitted materials and discusses the outcomes of the exam including any remedial activities that must be completed as a contingency for full approval to move forward in the program.

At the end of the meeting, the student is excused and the committee decides on the final recommendations. Each student is informed of his or her status and any recommendations for remediation within one week after the meeting.

Virginia Commonwealth University
Department of Counseling and Special Education
Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy
Doctoral Student Evaluation Form – Academic Performance

Student_____**Semester/Year**_____

Advisor_____**Reviewer**_____

Directions: The ratings provided on this form are intended to guide doctoral students and the Department of Counseling and Special Education in evaluating academic performance. Please rate students in your course on the basis of their actual performance, observations, and/or reports of performance. For each item, check the box under the number that best describes the student's performance using the following scale.

1-Unsatisfactory	3-Satisfactory	N/O Not Observed
2-Needs Improvement	4-Outstanding	

Academic Performance	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**N/O**
1. Performance during class meetings					
2. Mastery of material					
3. Effort					
4. Commitment to excellence					
5. Writing skills					
6. Oral communication skills					
7. Research skills					
8. Knowledge of professional literature					
9. Openness to feedback					
10. Meets deadlines					
11. Comparison to course peers					
12. Overall rating					

Please elaborate on the doctoral student's performance on any items that you rated 1 or 2 so that we may have a more complete understanding of any area of weakness. Please return the completed form to the advisor, in the Department of Counseling and Special Education within one week of receipt. Direct any comments or questions on this evaluation to her. Thank you.

Virginia Commonwealth University
Department of Counseling and Special Education
Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy
Doctoral Student Evaluation Form – Graduate Assistantship/Internship Performance

Student   **Semester/Year**

Advisor

Reviewer

Directions: The ratings provided on this form are intended to guide doctoral students and the Department of Counseling and Special Education in evaluating professional performance in either a graduate assistantship (research or teaching) or internship. Please rate the student on the basis of their performance of duties associated with the primary responsibilities you supervised. For each item, check the box under the number that best describes the student's performance using the following scale.

      1 = UNACCEPTABLE: Based on the student's performance this semester, this student is not prepared for successfully completing work at the next level. Student is not independent; student requires tremendous assistance from GA supervisor, and even with assistance, student does not produce quality products.

      2 = MINIMALLY ACCEPTABLE: Based on the student's performance this semester, this student is minimally prepared for successfully completing work at the next level. Student is minimally independent; student requires excessive assistance from GA supervisor, and even with assistance, student only sometimes produces quality products.

      3 = ADEQUATE: Based on the student's performance this semester, this student is satisfactorily prepared for successfully completing work at the next level. Student is independent; student requires an appropriate amount of assistance from GA supervisor, and with assistance, student produces quality products.

      4 = EXCEPTIONAL: Based on the student's performance this semester, this student is well prepared for successfully completing work at the next level. Student is very independent; student requires little assistance from their advisor, GA supervisor, and/or instructors, and with or without assistance, student almost always produces quality products.

      N/O = No Opportunity to Observe: The nature of your interaction with the student did not permit an assessment of this particular area.

Performance	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**N/O**
1. Performance during meetings					
2. Mastery of material					
3. Effort					
5. Writing skills					
6. Oral communication skills					
7. Responsiveness to communications					
8. Research skills					
9. Openness to feedback					
10. Meets deadlines					
11. Attention to detail					
12. Overall rating					

Please elaborate on the student's performance on any items that you rated 1 or 2 so that we may have a more complete understanding of any area of challenge; you may use the back of this form for comments. Please return the completed form to the advisor, in the Department of Counseling and Special Education within one week of receipt.

Appendix B

The Comprehensive Examination

Preamble

The doctoral advisory committee is responsible for determining the readiness of a student to be admitted into candidacy for the doctoral degree. In making this judgment, the committee considers a student's readiness to conduct research independently, ability to analyze research critically, mastery of the literature in major and minor areas, ability to integrate information, and clarity of written and oral expression. Successful completion of the comprehensive examination is required prior to decisions about candidacy.

The comprehensive examination has two parts: a major area paper and an oral examination. Students demonstrate in-depth understanding of a research topic in the major area paper and mastery of the content related to their area of expertise. The oral examination includes a presentation of the major area paper as well as any other information the doctoral advisory committee members identify as applicable to the student's studies.

Students need to pass all components of the comprehensive examination, successfully defend their prospectus, and complete instruction in IRB prior advancement to candidacy. The advancement to candidacy form is completed after the prospectus defense.

In conducting the comprehensive examination, the doctoral advisory committee shall adhere to the Graduate School policy.

Major Area Paper

For the major area paper, doctoral students conduct a substantive, integrative review of the literature in a specific content area related to the education of students with disabilities. The paper topic is determined by the student and chair in consultation with the doctoral advisory committee. The paper shall be of manuscript length (typically 25-30 pages) in APA style, be suitable for submission for publication in one of the journals of the field, and satisfy the chair and doctoral advisory committee that the student has the analytic skills necessary to conduct dissertation research. Students must (a) demonstrate the ability to create a conceptual framework and to organize the paper in a way that convinces the reader that researching the topic is critical to the field of special education and disability policy; (b) conduct an extensive, critical review of the literature; and (c) suggest implications for future research..

Students complete the major area paper as the culminating assignment in Directed Readings, with support from their committee and the instructor of Directed Readings. During the semester of Directed Readings, students are required to meet with their advising committee as a group a minimum of one time and are required during that semester to meet with their advisor at least two other times. Students must complete their major area paper during that semester or have a valid reason for receiving an incomplete grade for the course. Incomplete grades must be submitted with a plan for completion of required work (to track coordinator) and according to graduate school rules, must be completed in the subsequent semester.

Most students will then complete the other two components of the comprehensive exam

during the semester after completing Directed Readings. Full-time students may be able to do all three components in one semester if approved by their advisory committee. Students who do not pass their comprehensive exam may have one additional attempt before being terminated from the program.

Although doctoral students receive guidance from their chair and committee members in selecting a topic, organizing the paper, and revising the paper, they also function independently, as the major area paper is a key determinant of their (a) ability to comprehensively synthesize a body of research, and (b) readiness to design and implement dissertation research.

The major area paper shall be evaluated by the Advisory Committee members, the chair, and, at the chair's discretion, faculty reviewers not serving on the committee. The SEDP Writing Competencies Rubric (used throughout the program to provide feedback on formal writing assignments; see Appendix C) will be used for evaluating the paper, and the chair shall communicate the evaluation criteria to the student. The rubric includes criteria commonly used in the review process for most educational journals (e.g., significance of the topic, inclusion of key research, depth of coverage, integration of ideas, appropriateness of conclusions, and written composition). The chair will determine (with the student) when the major area paper is ready for review by the doctoral advisory committee, but no later than the end of the semester after the student enrolls in and completes SEDP 709. Once the major area paper is ready from committee review, the student will provide a copy of the paper to all committee members. The committee members will have no less than 15 working days to evaluate the major area paper. Scoring rubrics of the student's major area paper must be submitted to the committee chairperson. The doctoral advisory committee must determine that the major area paper is acceptable (based on the rubric) before the student will be given permission to schedule the written portion of the examination.

Oral Examination

The oral portion of the Comprehensive Examination has two parts. The first is a colloquium at which students present their major area paper to the doctoral advisory committee. The colloquium should include a presentation of the paper and time for questions and discussion.

All portions of the meeting will be closed to the public.

The doctoral advisory committee will determine at the end of the oral examination if the student has performed successfully on the oral portion of the examination. Once the student has successfully completed all components of the comprehensive examination, they will receive a pass.

Students should schedule two hours for the oral exam, to be divided about equally between the colloquium and question-and-answer sessions.

Timeline

- Student meets with doctoral committee chair and members (in a group or individually) to discuss overall areas of interest for the major area paper.
- Student works with doctoral committee chair and other committee members (as

appropriate) to develop the major area paper during the semester in which he/she is enrolled in Directed Readings. The doctoral committee chair and other members serve in an advisory role to assist the student in this process. The role of the instructor for directed readings is as technical and process guide while the committee provides guidance on the topic. Students are required to meet with their committee at least twice during the semester of directed readings. Grading for Directed Readings will include attendance in class meetings, participation in a minimum of two meetings with advisory committee members, and completion of the major area paper.

- Once the chair approves the major area paper, but no later than the end of the semester following SEDP 709, the student provides each committee member a copy of the major area paper. At this time, the student is given permission to schedule the written portion of the examination one month from this date. Additionally, the student is provided the 5 questions to begin studying for the written portion of the examination.
- Doctoral advisory committee members provide feedback to the committee chair within 3 weeks of receiving the major area paper. If the doctoral committee members believe the major area paper is acceptable, the student is granted permission to complete the written portion of the examination as scheduled. Additionally, the student is given permission to schedule the oral portion of the examination to occur no earlier than 2 weeks **after** the scheduled time of the written portion of the examination.

APPENDIX C

1)   **Writing Rubric**

2)   **Course Sequence**

3)   **Portfolio Tasks**

Special Education and Disability Policy Writing Competencies Rubric

Student name _____   Date

_____

Faculty_____

	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Follow rules of grammar and APA as applied to professional writing	Spelling is correct	A few spelling errors	Spelling errors throughout
	Uses active v. passive voice throughout writing	Uses active v. passive voice in the large majority of writing	Passive voice used consistently
	Always uses punctuation correctly	Punctuation use is correct for most of writing; some problems noted	Poor punctuation
	Always uses correct subject-verb agreement	Subject-verb agreement appropriate in most instances	Poor subject-verb agreement on multiple occasions
	Uses topic sentence to structure paragraph	Most paragraphs flow from a topic sentence. Some fragmentation of paragraphs noted	Paragraphs don't have central topic
	Ensures use of parallel parts of speech when writing in series	Most series include parallel parts of speech	Consistent lack of parallel parts of speech in series
	Appropriate transitions between paragraphs, ideas, and sections	Transitions evident and clear, most of time	Poor transitions between paragraphs, ideas and sections throughout
Create logical and meaningful conceptual framework	Provides clear theoretical and empirical support for conceptual framework of topic	Provides theoretical and empirical support, but linkages and ideas are not particularly clear	Does not provide theoretical and empirical support, or provides incorrect support
	Ideas flow in a logical manner that demonstrates use of tools (concept mapping, outline, etc.) to organize writing	In general the flow of the manuscript is appropriate, although minor problems exist	Manuscript does not flow logically
	Uses advanced organizer in writing to frame manuscript for reader	Creates advanced organizer, but manuscript does not clearly follow the advance organizer	Does not create/use advanced organizer
	Manuscript flows from clear purpose/research questions (see below)	Manuscript does not flow clearly from purpose or research questions, and/or purpose or research questions	Does not state purpose or research questions

		not well clarified	

Develop research questions and purpose statements	Provides clear and measurable research questions	Provides research questions, but the questions need to be refined for clarity and measurability	Does not provide research questions
	Clearly defines purpose of manuscript	Provides purpose of manuscript, but the purpose needs more clarity	Purpose is unclear or does not provide a purpose of the manuscript
Write solid and meaningful literature review	Conducts a thorough search of the literature, included search strategies such as database, ancestry, and hand searches, as appropriate for topic	Employs appropriate search strategies, although one or more strategies were limited in scope (e.g., of date range, databases, terms used in database searches)	Does not employ all appropriate search strategies and/or search strategies involved errors and/or serious limitations
	Uses a coding scheme to organize extraction of information from articles; selection of coding variables facilitates addressing research question(s)/purpose	Uses a coding scheme to organize extraction of information from articles, but the information extracted occasionally lacks detail or breadth	Does not use a coding scheme to organize extraction of information from articles and/or the information extracted lacks detail and breadth to the degree that address of the research question(s)/purpose is compromised
	Representation of literature is precise and succinct; summaries contain adequate detail	Representation of literature is precise and succinct, although some summaries are partially incomplete and/or unclear	Representation of literature is imprecise and convoluted; summaries are incomplete and/or unclear
	Evaluates the quality of evidence provided by individual studies and the body of literature; evaluations are accurate and well justified and described	Accurately evaluates the quality of evidence provided by individual studies and the body of literature; although some evaluations' justifications and/or descriptions need further development	Does not accurately evaluate the quality of evidence provided by individual studies and the body of literature; evaluations' justifications and/or descriptions need further development or are missing
	Synthesizes findings from individual studies/the body of literature succinctly and coherently; uses synthesis results to answer the research question(s)/address the purpose	Synthesizes findings and uses synthesis results to answer the research question(s)/address the purpose, although the description of insights from the synthesis needs revision for greater clarity, succinctness, and relevance to research question(s)/purpose	Does not completely or adequately synthesize findings from individual studies/the body of literature and/or does not completely or adequately use synthesis results to answer the research question(s)/address the purpose

	Identifies implications of results of the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation for educational practice relevant to the research question(s)/purpose; exercises appropriate caution against overstepping data in the drawing of conclusions	Identifies major implications of results of the analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation for educational practice, but, in occasional instances, incompletely or unclearly describes implications, or omits implications relevant to the research question(s)/purpose and/or minorly oversteps data in the drawing of conclusions	Omits major implications of results of the analysis, synthesis, and/or evaluation for educational practice related to the research question(s)/purpose and/or majorly oversteps data in the drawing of conclusions
	Identifies implications of results of the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation for future research and conceptual framework; presents viable rationale for future research; describes warranted future research projects and/or questions	Identifies major implications for future research, presents viable rationales for future research, and describes warranted future research, but, in occasional instances, incompletely or unclearly describes implications, rationales, or future research projects or questions	Does not identify major implications for future research, present viable rationales for future research, and/or describe warranted future research; or, in many instances, incompletely or unclearly describes implications, rationales, or future research projects or questions
Select appropriate research methodology	Clearly identifies and operationally defines variables of focus in the paper	Identifies and defines variables of focus in the paper, although the identification and definitions are not completely clear and/or limited in objectivity	Does not clearly and objectively identify and define variables of focus in the paper
	Appropriately selects, clearly describes, and adequately justifies use of a research design addressing the research question(s), variables, and data (e.g., for literature reviews: narrative or systematic review, or meta-analysis)	Selects, describes, and justifies a research design addressing the research question(s) and data, but, in minor ways, the description is limited in clarity or completeness and/or the justification is limited in clarity or logic	Does not select a research design addressing the research question(s) and data, the description is unclear, incomplete, or missing, and/or the justification is unclear, not logical, or missing
	Appropriately selects, clearly describes, and adequately justifies use of measure(s), coding, or information extraction technique fitting for the research question(s), variables, and data	Selects, describes, and justifies measure(s), coding, or information extraction technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, but, in minor ways, the description is limited in clarity or completeness and/or the	Does not select a measurement, coding, or information extraction technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, the description is unclear, incomplete, or missing, and/or the justification is unclear, not

		justifi-cation is limited in clarity or logic	logical, or missing
	Appropriately selects, clearly describes, and adequately justifies use of an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s), variables, and data	Selects, describes, and justifies an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, but, in minor ways, the description is limited in clarity or completeness and/or the justification is limited in clarity or logic	Does not select an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, the description is unclear, incomplete, or missing, and/or the justification is unclear, not logical, or missing
Reliability and validity of data	Accurately provides the reliability and validity information about the measure(s) if available. Clearly describes the techniques used to ensure reliability and validity of the data to be collected. Cites references when applicable as evidence to support your techniques.	Briefly provides the reliability and validity information about the measure (s) if available. Briefly describes the techniques used to ensure reliability and validity of the data to be collected. Cites references inconsistently.	Does not provide any information about the reliability or validity of the data. Does not describe any techniques used to ensure the reliability or validity of the data.
Data analysis techniques	Appropriately selects, clearly describes, and adequately justifies use of an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s), variables, and data.	Selects, describes, and justifies an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, with limited clarity or completeness.	Does not select an analysis technique fitting for the research question(s) and data, the description is unclear, incomplete, or missing.
Analyze and present data appropriately	Appropriate analyses conducted; all data appropriate to analyses provided; Tables and Figures adhere to APA	Appropriate analyses conducted; most data appropriate to analyses provided; Tables and Figures adhere to APA with some exceptions	Analyses not appropriate; appropriate data not provided or incomplete; APA not followed
Limitations and Implications	Clearly highlights limitations of research, including but not limited to sample, generalizability, data, etc. Implications for research, practice and policy are clear and accurate.	Limitations of research are indicated, but key limitation(s) omitted. Implications for research, practice and policy are provided but need more detail.	Limitations of research not provided or inadequately described. Implications for research, practice and policy are either not evident or not clear and accurate.
Narrative format, figures and tables	Correctly uses APA level headings throughout paper to punctuate paper divisions	Uses an unconventional, but consistent hierarchy of headings throughout paper to punctuate paper divisions	Does not use headings as fitting for paper divisions and/or hierarchy of headings used is inconsistent
	Includes all APA-standard details in	Includes most APA-standard details	Does not include APA-standard

	presentations of findings (e.g., statistics, *df*, *p*-values); summaries of findings are precise	in presentations of findings, but omits some non-central details (e.g., *df*) and/or summaries contain some minor imprecision	details in presentations of findings, and provides unclear and imprecise summaries of findings
	Appropriately cites articles in the text; includes adequate breadth of citations and the APA-standard information and punctuation	Cites articles in most appropriate locations in the text, but in some cases, citations are absent, limited in breadth, or missing APA-standard information or punctuation	Article citations are missing from numerous locations in the text and/or contain limited breadth or are missing APA-standard information or punctuation
	All citations included in the reference section contain the APA-standard information and punctuation	Most citations included in the reference section contain the APA-standard information and punctuation; errors are inconsistent and infrequent	Errors of omission and punctuation in citations included in the reference section are consistent and frequent
	Uses parallel parts of speech and phrasing within table columns and figures	Most table columns and figures include parallel parts of speech and phrasing	Consistent lack of parallel parts of speech in series
	Follows all APA rules for constructing tables and figures, including those pertaining to titles, spacing, and use and definition of symbols	Follows most APA rules for constructing tables and figure, with only occasional errors related to titles, spacing, use and definition of symbols, etc	Tables and figures contain multiple and consistent errors of formatting

Table 1. Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy, Part-time option

Year	Fall	Spring	Summer
I	SEDP 707 STAT 608	EDUS 702 EDUS 710	EDUS 703 Qualifying Exam
II	SEDP 705 SEDP 708 First year Review	SEDP 706 EDUS 711	Policy internship
III	Teaching Internship SEDP 711 Second Year Review	Research Internship SEDP 709	Elective
IV	Elective	Elective Comprehensive Exam	SEDP 899
V	SEDP 899	SEDP 899	SEDP 899

Table 2. Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy, Full-time option

Year	Fall	Spring	Summer
I	SEDP 707 STAT 608 SEDP 705	EDUS 702 EDUS 710 SEDP 706	EDUS 703 Qualifying Exam
II	SEDP 708 SEDP 711 Elective First year Review	EDUS 711 Research Internship SEDP 709	Policy internship
III	Elective Teaching Internship Second year review	Elective Comprehensive Exam	SEDP 899
IV	SEDP 899	SEDP 899	SEDP 899

VCU School of Education
Special Education and Disability Policy Ph.D. Program
Portfolio Components

Student Name: _____   **Faculty Advisor:** _____

Advising Committee Members: _____

Review Dates: **First Year Review:** _____
                    Second Year Review: _____
                    Third/Final Review:_____

Other Review Dates:_____

First Year Review

Competency Area	Program Task/Documentation	Verification Procedures	Evaluation
1. First year review folder	Include all documents from First Year Review process	Advisory committee	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

Teaching Activity

Competency Area	Program Task/Documentation	Verification Procedures	Evaluation
1. Course Development and Delivery	Prepare & present at least two class sessions in graduate level courses. a. written outline or presentation document b. participant evaluations Teach or co-teach a graduate level course; teaching narrative documenting goals,	Faculty member observes class sessions. e.g., SEDP 501 Teaching Internship	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

	strategies, evaluative feedback (student, mentor), and reflection.		
2. Supervision or Mentorship	Supervise a student who is completing practicum or externship in area of specialization for one semester using the supervision protocol for the program. Mentor M.Ed. or Doctoral Student during the beginning of their program. a. Provide leadership and guidance with regards to program expectations. b. Introduce student to faculty and peers with similar agenda interests. c. Mentor and evaluate M.Ed. student's research poster	Overall supervision and feedback provided by practicum faculty and cooperating supervisor. Minutes from mentoring sessions and goals for work evaluated by the advisor.	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

Research & Scholarly Activity

Competency Area	Program Task/Documentation	Verification Procedures	Evaluation
1. Professional Presentation	Plan and present at least two different professional research presentations at national conferences in area of specialization a. Presentation proposal b. Presentation outline or slides c. Handouts	Planning materials approved in advance by faculty advisor. Presentations observed by faculty supervisor or designee.	Date: _____ Eval.sign:_____ _ Comments:
2. Professional writing	Submit three samples of scholarly writing, such as: a) manuscripts submitted for publication, b) research proposals, c) published articles/studies; and/or d) other professional writing	Student reviews evaluated by faculty. Policy Internship	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

3. Research	Design and conduct (alone or as part of a research group) at least one research study prior to dissertation by assuming major responsibility for planning, executing, and writing up the study.	Manuscript evaluated by faculty. Research Internship	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:
4. Grant-contract proposal application	Write a grant proposal/contract application for funding a personnel preparation, research, or service project.	Guidelines from targeted funding agency should be followed. SEDP 706 SEDP 708	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

Service & Professional Development

Competency Area	Program Task/Documentation	Verification Procedures	Evaluation
1. Service to the profession with a community-engaged focus	Partner with local P-12 schools or other educational entity to expand community engagement, scholarship, and service learning. For example: a. attend one local event/meeting on critical community initiative/program/service b. establish partnership with 1 local school to provide inservice support c. establish relationship with local T/TAC for list of references and resources for technical assistance	Planning materials approved in advance by faculty advisor. Inservice and training materials submitted to advisor and evaluated. Policy Internship	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:
2. Service to the professional community	Become an active member in professional organization(s). Leadership roles in organizations and evidence of active engagement particularly valued.	Documentation of membership and other activities with organization(s) reviewed by	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

		faculty. Policy Internship	

3. Service to the Department, School or University	Participate in service at one of these levels, such as:
	  a. Student member of faculty search committee
	  b. Student member of promotion and tenure committee
	  c. Student member of School committee
		Documentation of active participation reviewed by faculty.	Date: _____
			Eval.
			sign:_____
			Comments:

4. Professional development	Participate in school, university, community and/or professional seminars and conferences.	Documentation of participation reviewed by advising committee.	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

Integrated Statement

Competency Area	Program Task Description	Verification Procedures	Evaluation
1. Integrated statement	Write narrative describing Teaching, Research and Service activities. Document should integrate student's experience across these three areas into an integrated whole, not exceeding three single-spaced pages.	Reviewed by faculty. Research, Teaching, & Policy Internships	Date: _____ Eval. sign:_____ Comments:

Appendix D

Prospectus/Dissertation Progress Form

Prospectus/Dissertation Progress Form

Candidate name _____   **Chair** _____

Date _____   **Semester** _____

Prospectus/Dissertation Title _____

_____

Status

Prospectus in progress	☐
Prospectus approved	☐
Dissertation in progress	☐

Progress since last meeting (less than 100 words)

Committee response summary

Committee evaluation

Excellent progress	☐
Progress	☐
Poor progress	☐

Appendix E

Sample Internship Options

SEDP Doctoral Internship Examples

To further apply their knowledge and develop specific competencies, doctoral students engage in a wide range of internships in research, policy, teaching, and community engagement. The following examples illustrate internship activities, however, doctoral students and faculty can generate additional options to build doctoral students' portfolios.

Research (Dr. Xu)
- Design and conduct research on improving transition outcomes for Black youth with disabilities; (development of proposal for funding; presentation, manuscript development) – Colleen Thoma
- Research to policy link in doctoral programs: collect data on how other programs nationally address this competency and design research studies to address policy issues (school choice; teacher shortages)-Colleen Thoma, Chriss Walther-Thomas, Jane West
- BEST in CLASS - An IES-funded program of study targeting the prevention of emotional/behavioral disorders in young children – Kevin Sutherland
- Middle School Violence Prevention - A CDC-funded middle school violence prevention program, that is part of a larger community-based program targeting reduction in risk for violence exposure – Kevin Sutherland
- Project KSR (early childhood special educator preparation project, funded by OSEP) - Pilot child outcome measures; conduct program evaluation; investigate effectiveness of specific technology methods for data collection – Yaoying Xu
- VCU Cognition and Learning Lab - participate in research studies about how children and youth learn and how cognitive abilities influence learning - Jason Chow
- Child Development Center - examine the development of language, mathematics, and cognition in young children - Jason Chow
- VCU Literacy Institute - Investigate administrators' involvement in school related family literacy activities to increase family engagement and children's school readiness skills - Yaoying Xu

Teaching (Dr. Walther-Thomas)
- Co-teaching specific course prior to teaching the course independently –
- Clinical supervision of teacher candidates
- Mentoring teacher candidates in specific skills and/or development of research posters
- Designing and teaching online version of graduate course – Chin-Chih Chin, Laron Scott
- Designing and studying effectiveness of ePortfolios – Laron Scott
- Comparing the differential effects of online blog reflections and face-to-face interactions on teacher candidates' intercultural competencies-Yaoying Xu
- Building and evaluating online learning community with international partners based on UDL - Serra De Arment

Policy/Service (Dr. Gilles)
- AUCD – Donna Gilles
- NACDD – Donna Gilles

- CEC, TASH
- IES
- Peter Paul Development Center – Kevin Sutherland
- Community-based needs assessment with Latino families about access and participation in community settings – Yaoying Xu
- Preschool evaluation project in collaboration with YWCA and Children's Museum of Richmond - Serra De Arment and Yaoying Xu
- National organizations and agencies, such as AAIDD, OSEP, MCHB, CEC, ASHA, SRCD, AERA
- *Research and Practice for Severe Disabilities* Student Editorial Board

Appendix F

Program of Study Form

VIRGINIA COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY

VCU School of Education

Make it real.

Ph.D. in Special Education & Disability Policy
STUDENT FINAL PLANNING FORM
To be submitted with first year review materials.

STUDENT NAME: _____ DATE:_____

	HOURS	SEMESTER	GRADE
FOUNDATION COMPONENT (6 HOURS MINIMUM)			
EDUS 702: Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship I	3		
EDUS 703: Foundations of Educational Research and Doctoral Scholarship II	3		
RESEARCH COMPONENT (15 HOURS MINIMUM)			
STAT/SOCY 608: Statistics for Social Research	3		
EDUS 710: Educational Research Design	3		
EDUS 711: Qualitative Methods and Analysis	3		
SEDP 711: Single Subject Research Methods	3		
Research Elective	3		
QUALIFYING EXAMINATION/1ST YEAR REVIEW			
CONCENTRATION COMPONENT (14 HOURS MINIMUM)			
SEDP 707: Critical Issues	3		
SEDP 708: Grant Writing	3		
SEDP 705: SEDP Policy	3		
SEDP 706: Personnel Development	3		
SEDP 709: Literature Review	2		
ELECTIVES (6 CREDITS)			
INTERNSHIP (8 CREDITS)			
SEDP 773 Policy/Service Internship	2		
SEDP 771 Research Internship	3		
SEDP 772 Teaching Internship	3		
2ND YEAR REVIEW			
3RD YEAR REVIEW (IF NEEDED)			
COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION/FINAL REVIEW			
DISSERTATION COMPONENT (9 HOURS MINIMUM)			
EDUS 899: Dissertation Research	9		
PREREQUISITE COURSES (AS APPLICABLE)			

50

TRANSFER COURSES (9 HOURS MAXIMUM)			

Student's Signature and Date: _____   Advisor's Initials and Date: _____

Coordinator's Initials and Date: _____   Revised 5/27/15

Appendix G

Doctoral Student Presentation Evaluation Form

Virginia Commonwealth University
Department of Counseling and Special Education
Ph.D. in Special Education and Disability Policy
Doctoral Student Guest Speaker Presentation Evaluation Form

Student_____ **Date** _____

Presentation Reviewer _____

<u>**Setting/Topic/Presentation Summary:**</u>

Directions: The ratings provided on this form are intended to guide doctoral students and the Department of Counseling and Special Education in providing constructive criticism for doctoral students in the development of teaching and presentation skills. Please rate the student on the basis of their performance of duties associated with the presentation assignment. For each item, check the box under the number that best describes the student's performance using the following scale.

1 = UNACCEPTABLE: Based on performance, this student is not currently prepared for successful completion of work at the next level (e.g., co-teaching a course, instructor of record assignment). At this stage, the student would benefit from basic adult learning instruction, modeling, and support to ensure effective, high-quality teaching presentations and effective student/participant learning and session satisfaction.

2 = MINIMALLY ACCEPTABLE: Based on performance, this student is minimally prepared for successful completion of work at the next level. The student is minimally independent and knowledgeable. The student would benefit from intermediate-level adult learning instruction, modeling, and support to ensure effective, high-quality teaching presentations and effective student/participant learning and session satisfaction.

3 = ACCEPTABLE: Based on performance, this student is satisfactorily prepared for successfully completing work at the next level. Student is independent and knowledgeable about the topic and effective teaching. The student demonstrated effective adult learning instruction, modeling, and student support. The presentation reflected quality teaching presentations and acceptable student/participant learning and session satisfaction.

4 = EXCEPTIONAL: Based on performance, this student is well prepared for successfully completion work at the next level. Student is very independent and very knowledgeable about the topic and effective teaching and student learning. The student demonstrated very effective adult learning instruction, modeling, and student support. The presentation reflected high quality teaching and effective student/participant learning and session satisfaction.

N/O = No Opportunity to Observe: The nature of your interaction with the student did not permit an assessment of this particular area.

53

Performance	1	2	3	4	N/O
1. Performance during the presentation					
2. Mastery of presentation material					
3. Effort					
5. Overall presentation skills					
6. Oral communication skills					
7. Responsiveness to students or other participants					
8. Technology skills					
9. Openness to student/participant Questions and feedback					
10. Meets presentation expectations (e.g., Topical depth, breadth, time slot)					
11. Attention to detail					
12. Overall rating					

Please briefly elaborate on the student's strengths and areas for improvement so we may have a more complete understanding of any teaching/presenting challenges. Please return the completed form to the student presenter and the instructor (SEDP 703, 772) and/or advisor, in the Department of Counseling and Special Education within one week of the presentation.

PRESENTER STRENGTHS:

PRESENTER AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT: