DOCTORAL HANDBOOK

2018 - 2019

Department of Educational Policy and Leadership
Dear EDPL Doctoral Student:

Congratulations on your admission to the doctoral degree program in Educational Policy and Leadership Studies at Marquette University. As a new doctoral student, you represent a very important member of the College of Education learning community. At the outset, you should know that our community deeply values academic rigor, the pursuit of scholarly excellence, and a life of caring for others. We subscribe to the tenet that our professional and personal lives should be centered in social justice and driven by faith.

The doctoral program in EDPL is intended to be challenging, stimulating, and personally relevant. Your work will occur in a context that balances theory, research, and practice in ways that will cause you to value the respective contributions of each. You will also come to value the opportunity to tailor your studies to fit a wide range of career paths in Education. Regardless of your goals, you will be held to an exceedingly high standard. You will be expected to expand, intensify, and sharpen your thinking and to experience the world in ever more considerate, profound, and socially conscientious ways. At Marquette, scholarly distinction is the norm, and doctoral students in the College of Education must aspire to leadership that betters the human condition. If these goals genuinely resonate with you, then your choice to study here was an astute one.

If you approach your doctoral studies with passion and conviction, you will experience unprecedented professional and personal growth. In fact, the opportunity afforded by graduate school to immerse one’s self in the ‘life of the mind’ represents a great privilege and honor. It is a time when your knowledge will expand enormously and your reasoning will become keenly analytical and uncommonly broad, yet intricately unified. Under the guidance of EDPL faculty who are exceptional teachers and mentors, prominent scholars, and exemplary models of service, you will literally be transformed – cognitively, affectively, and spiritually. Seize the moment and savor the experience.

Your educational experience at Marquette can be further enriched through participation in the many intellectual and cultural events that occur at the University. Go beyond your discipline. Seek the perspectives of those who are different from you. Cross borders. By engaging in these special learning opportunities, you will expand your horizons in ways that will ultimately benefit those you serve.

In sum, a Marquette doctorate in Education will set you apart. If we’ve done our work properly, you will leave here as a gifted professional, an intellectually curious and demanding consumer of research, a creator of vital new knowledge, and a steadfast human advocate. In the Marquette tradition, you will become “the Difference” and, in so doing, join the ranks of our most distinguished alumni.

Sincerely,

William A. Henk, Ed. D.
Professor of Education and Dean
College of Education
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DEADLINES</th>
<th>STUDENT <em>(in consultation with Advisor/Chair)</em></th>
<th>MAJOR ADVISER/ DISSERTATION CHAIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Jan. 15 of each year</td>
<td>Complete file turned into Graduate School</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Meeting with Adviser</td>
<td>Upon notification of admission</td>
<td>Make appointment with assigned adviser</td>
<td>Orient student to program; plan individual program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPL Doctoral Program Orientation</td>
<td>Fall of each year</td>
<td>Attend orientation</td>
<td>Attend orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>Register for courses</td>
<td>Meet with Advisor each semester to discuss upcoming coursework</td>
<td>Meet with student each semester to discuss upcoming coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program Planning Form (unofficial)</td>
<td>After two semesters or 12 hours of course work (whichever comes first)</td>
<td>Complete form with adviser; file with EDPL Office</td>
<td>Review with student and sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Program Planning Form (official) Including residency requirement plan</td>
<td>After six semesters or 18 hours of course work (whichever comes first).</td>
<td>Complete form with adviser; file with EDPL Office AND Graduate School (File amendments with Graduate School as changes occur.)</td>
<td>Review with student and sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of Progress</td>
<td>May of each year</td>
<td>Complete at least 6 credits; maintain 3.0 GPA</td>
<td>Review progress &amp; report to Doctoral Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>Any time before completion of DQE. Waivers possible on individual basis.</td>
<td><strong>Discuss requirements with advisor. Complete 9 credits or equivalent for two terms within 18 months</strong></td>
<td>Make sure evidence of residency or waiver is included in Doctoral Planning Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 1: Critical Analysis</td>
<td>By the last week of EDPL 8956, spring semester</td>
<td>Submit paper (from the products for EDPL 8955 or EDPL 8956)</td>
<td>Arranges for instructor &amp; second faculty to evaluate. Report evaluation for record. Guide any required remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 2: Foundations of Research</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks of completion of EDPL 8715</td>
<td>Submit required portion of research report completed in EDPL 8715</td>
<td>Arrange for instructor &amp; second faculty to evaluate, with comments. Report evaluation for record. Guide any required remediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly of Dissertation Committee (minimum: 3 members)</td>
<td>Before completing DQE Component 3: Proposal</td>
<td>Choose dissertation chair from COED, at least one committee member from EDPL &amp; one other from EDPL or MU. Additional members can be from outside of MU.</td>
<td>Consult with and advise student on composition of committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 3: Dissertation Proposal</td>
<td>After completion of coursework, before beginning dissertation research (can be done while enrolled in dissertation credits)</td>
<td>Submit dissertation proposal for dissertation for evaluation and oral defense; Sign up for semester of DQE Continuous Enrollment.</td>
<td>Support proposal writing; submit to committee with evaluation rubric. Schedule and oversee oral defense. Report evaluations for record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM</td>
<td>DEADLINES</td>
<td>STUDENT <em>(in consultation with Advisor/Chair)</em></td>
<td>MAJOR ADVISER/DISSERTATION CHAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 3: Dissertation Proposal &amp; Hearing/Defense</td>
<td>Create proposal with dissertation chair support. Submit proposal to dissertation chair &amp; committee at least 2 weeks prior to oral defense; Defend proposal.</td>
<td>Advise student on proposal; assemble student's committee for hearing; submit Proposal Approval Form to EDPL Grad Office &amp; Grad School; report evaluation for record.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Outline Form <em>(created immediately after proposal defense)</em></td>
<td>Submit outline on Dissertation Outline Form; get approvals from adviser. EDPL Office &amp; Graduate School</td>
<td>Review, approve, and sign outline. Submit Proposal Outline to EDPL Grad Office and Grad School immediately after Proposal Approval Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Review Board Proposal (IRB)</td>
<td>Before beginning any research that involves human subjects</td>
<td>Submit approval forms to Office of Research Compliance &amp; Graduate School; Copy of approval to EDPL Office</td>
<td>Advise student on IRB procedures and proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Credits</td>
<td>Enroll for dissertation credits</td>
<td>Advise student regarding dissertation credits; notify EDPL Office so that student can register for credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Completion</td>
<td>Follow all procedures outlined in Dissertation Directives on Graduate School website; Submit copies of dissertation to committee members at least two weeks prior to defense</td>
<td>Advise student throughout dissertation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement for Public Defense</td>
<td>Prepare Dissertation Defense Program and Announcement for Public Defense Forms; get necessary signatures and submit to Graduate School (emailed signatures sent to Graduate School allowed for faculty not on campus.)</td>
<td>Sign forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Defense</td>
<td>Defend dissertation before committee</td>
<td>Consult with student on defense procedures; chair public defense. Fill out and file appropriate forms with Graduate School. Submit committee evaluation to Doctoral Program Coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Graduation</td>
<td>Submit application to Graduate School – paper or online</td>
<td>Notify EDPL Director of Graduate Studies; review graduation audit sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Celebrate!</td>
<td>Celebrate!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: This Doctoral Handbook presenting program requirements, policies, etc. serves as a contract for the incoming cohort of students. Students will be notified of any future program changes.
changes and will be allowed to choose between following the original handbook or adopting the new requirements and policies, etc.
Dissertation Qualifying Exam (DQE) Guidelines
For the Degree of Ph.D. in Educational Policy and Leadership (EDPL)
Effective Fall 2018

Upon satisfactory completion of Critical Analysis DQE, Foundations of Research DQE, and Dissertation Proposal DQE, the student moves to candidacy and may proceed to dissertation research.

I. DQE Component 1: Critical Analysis DQE (DQE 1)

a. Description
   A paper produced in first two courses of the program sequence which demonstrates 1) comprehension, 2) critical analysis, and 3) sound, consistent logic/reasoning skills based on course readings/assignment as well as 4) writing proficiency. In short, the paper demonstrates the skills “to read and write with and against text.”

b. Process
   i. Student selects final paper from EDPL 8955/8956, Seminar I or II, in consultation with the instructor(s) and submits the paper by the last week of class in spring semester.
   ii. The instructor and a second faculty member, recruited by the Doctoral Committee Chair, will evaluate the paper using the rubric and generate feedback. [All faculty (clinical/participating and tenure-line) will be called upon to read. The second faculty member will be identified by the Chair of the Doctoral Committee and, where possible, notified by the beginning of the spring semester that they will be a reader.]
   iii. The instructor and second reader will together decide if the student meets DQE proficiency. Feedback, including the rubric rating(s) will be transmitted to the Chair of the Doctoral Committee, who will share it with the student. [The two readers may agree to provide joint feedback or individual feedback (separate rubric ratings and comments).]

c. Assessment
   i. A rubric will be used for both instructor and the second reader to evaluate comprehension, critical analysis, and sound logic/reasoning skills based on course readings/assignment as well as writing proficiency. (The instructor will provide feedback throughout the coursework on these skills and may use the rubric as a feedback and assessment tool. When the rubric is used to assess papers for class, the assessment for the course reflects course priorities and the specific expectations of the assignment and should not be interpreted as the official DQE assessment.)
   ii. For the DQE, the paper is assessed by the two readers as to whether it demonstrates that the student critically reads, analyzes, and writes at the level needed to progress in doctoral studies.
   iii. To achieve proficiency, the student must meet or exceed proficiency in all categories on the rubric.
   iv. Both readers will report their evaluation to Doctoral Committee Chair who will then notify both student and advisor as to whether the student has met proficiency and will provide the evaluators’ feedback. [Doctoral Committee Chair will report evaluations to Academic Coordinator (Melissa Econom) for records.]
d. Opportunity to Rewrite and Resubmit

i. If not proficient in one or more categories, the student may not proceed in the research sequence coursework unless otherwise approved. Student can enroll in a foundations requirement and/or elective/s from area of concentration. Advisor should confer with Chair of the Doctoral Committee regarding course options.

ii. Student has the option to revise the paper. Students are strongly encouraged to use the services of the Marquette Writing Center, with a specialist with graduate level expertise. The student may wish to consult with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee about an appropriate Writing Center specialist. (Due by June 30)

iii. The original readers (or others as assigned by the Chair of the Doctoral Committee) will assess the revision, and the Chair of the Doctoral Committee will communicate the results to the student.

e. Final Decision

i. If the revised paper is not proficient (or student declines the opportunity to revise the original paper), the student meets with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee and their advisor to discuss possible courses of action:
   1. Withdrawal from the university; or
   2. Apply to transfer coursework into a (second) master’s program – EDPF, or other with approval.

ii. Based on conversation, the advisor and Chair of Doctoral Committee select one of these options and communicate decision to student and Graduate School.

iii. On rare occasions, the advisor and Chair of Doctoral Committee may support an appeal to continue with time-bound remediation plan.
   1. Doctoral Committee will make the final decision to approve or reject the appeal for continuation with remediation.
   2. If requirements outlined in remediation are not met within designated timeline, no further appeal is available. Doctoral Committee will then recommend withdrawal or application to transfer coursework into a master’s program.

DQE 1 Timeline (alterable only by the Doctoral Committee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong> selects paper from among the products for EDPL 8955 or EDPL 8956 in consultation with Seminar instructor(s).</td>
<td>By the last week of EDPL 8956 in spring semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor and second reader</strong> determine proficiency jointly and provide decision, rubric rating(s) and written feedback to the Chair of the Doctoral Committee/Doctoral Program Coordinator.</td>
<td>End of the week in which spring grades are due or as arranged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair of the Doctoral Committee</strong> transmits decision and feedback to the student.</td>
<td>May 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not proficient, <strong>student</strong> revises the paper and submits the revision to the Chair of the Doctoral Committee.</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The two readers</strong> assess the revision and submit assessment to the Doctoral Chair.</td>
<td>July 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair of the Doctoral Committee</strong> communicates proficiency outcome to the student.</td>
<td>July 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not proficient, meeting of <strong>student, student's advisor and the Chair</strong> of Doctoral Committee to provide feedback and discuss student options (withdrawal, apply to transfer to second master’s program, or letter of appeal).</td>
<td>By August 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong> communicates intent. Appeal due, if that option is selected.</td>
<td>Start of fall classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Committee</strong> reviews appeal and issues decision.</td>
<td>During fall semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. DQE Component 2: Foundations of Research DQE (DQE 2) (after successful completion of DQE 1 and appropriate coursework)

a. Description
Written mini-research proposal that demonstrates student's ability to 1) identify a problem, 2) synthesize and critique relevant literature, 3) develop a theoretical framework, 4) formulate a research question, and 5) successfully maintain and articulate the logical links among each of the elements above, as well as 6) writing proficiency.

b. Process
i. Student completes mini-research proposal in EDPL 8715 (“Qual I”) as part of course project: mini-research pilot study.
ii. Though the instructor will evaluate the entire mini-research pilot study, including use of qualitative methodology, the DQE 2 includes only problem formation, synthesis and critique of relevant literature, theoretical framework, research question, and successful articulation of the logical links among each of these elements.
iii. Foundations of Research DQE (DQE 2) submitted within 2 weeks after EDPL 8715 ends (or earlier, if desired and appropriate).
iv. The instructor for EDPL 8715 and a second faculty member, recruited by the Doctoral Committee Chair, will evaluate paper and provide evaluation of level of proficiency, with feedback, within two weeks of receiving DQE 2 paper. [All faculty (clinical/participating and tenure-line) will be called upon to read. The two-reader team may choose joint or individual feedback.]

c. Assessment
i. A rubric will be used for both instructor and the second reader to evaluate DQE 2. (The instructor will provide feedback throughout the coursework on relevant skills and may use the rubric as a feedback and assessment tool. When the rubric is used to assess papers for class, the assessment for the course reflects course priorities and the specific expectations of the assignment and should not be interpreted as the official DQE assessment.)
ii. To achieve proficiency, the student must meet or exceed proficiency in all categories on the rubric.
iii. For the DQE, the paper is assessed by the two readers as to whether it demonstrates that the student’s is proficient in 1) identifying a problem, 2) synthesizing and critiquing relevant literature, 3) developing a theoretical framework, 4) formulating a research question, and 5) successfully maintaining and articulating the logical links among each of the elements above, as well as write at the level needed to progress in doctoral studies.
iv. To achieve proficiency, the student must meet or exceed proficiency in all categories on the rubric.
v. Both readers will report their evaluation to Doctoral Committee Chair who will then notify both student and advisor as to whether the student has met proficiency and will provide the evaluators’ feedback. [Doctoral Committee Chair will report evaluations to Academic Coordinator, Melissa Econom, for records.]

d. Opportunity to Revise and Resubmit
i. If not proficient in 1 or more categories, student is placed on “Conditional Continuation” (internal designation, not university or Graduate School). Advisor should confer with Chair of the Doctoral Committee regarding enrolling in further coursework.
ii. Student will revise paper. Revision is **due 4 weeks** after evaluation of DQE 2 is provided.

iii. Revised version will be evaluated, typically within 2 weeks, by the same two faculty readers (where possible) using rubric.

e. **Final Decision**

i. If the revised paper is not proficient (or student declines the opportunity to revise the original paper), the student meets with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee and their advisor to discuss possible courses of action:
   1. Withdrawal from the university; or
   2. Apply to transfer coursework into a (second) master’s program – EDPF, or other with approval.

ii. Based on conversation, the advisor and Chair of Doctoral Committee select one of these options and communicate decision to student and Graduate School.

iii. On rare occasions, the advisor and Chair of Doctoral Committee may support an appeal to continue with time-bound remediation plan.
   1. Doctoral Committee will make the final decision to approve or reject the appeal for continuation with remediation.
   2. If requirements outlined in remediation are not met within designated timeline, no further appeal is available.
   3. Doctoral Committee will then recommend withdrawal or application to transfer coursework into a master’s program.
III. DQE Component 3 & Dissertation Proposal (after successful completion of DQE 1, DQE 2, coursework)

a. Description

i. The DQE 3/Dissertation Proposal addresses Rationale, Literature Review/Theoretical Framework, and Methodology. The paper must also articulate logical links within and among these sections. This framework (and content of each section) is for empirical research, either qualitative or quantitative. Students whose dissertation methodology is not empirical (i.e., historical research) should work with advisor to select a framework appropriate to that methodology. Exceptions to this format, with the recommendation of the dissertation chair, may be approved by the doctoral committee.

ii. Rationale:
   1. Statement of problem, research focus
   2. Rationale and significance of addressing problem
   3. Reference to salient literature.
   4. Research questions.

iii. Literature Review/Theoretical Framework:
   1. Critical, synthesized review of empirical literature salient to topic
   2. Clear indication of how research can address an existing gap.
   3. Research questions growing out of that “gap”
   4. Theoretical Framework: thorough discussion of the theory that will ground/guide the research.

iv. Methodology:
   1. Research questions
   2. Description why research methodology (qualitative, quantitative, case study, historical, etc.) is well-suited to answer the questions posed.
   3. Description of research context and why selected
   4. Description of participants and how selected
   5. Description of data sources and how they will provide insight into research questions
   6. Description of data analysis methods, including theory connection to analysis.

v. Writing Proficiency, including articulation of logical links within and among the sections, clarity, and correctness.

b. Process and Assessment

i. Student will create complete Dissertation Proposal with dissertation chair support/supervision.
ii. Student will defend proposal in oral defense with dissertation committee (3 members, including chair. One may a PHD from another unit or institution).
iii. Written proposal and oral defense both evaluated by committee using the designated rubric.
iv. Chair of Doctoral Committee will report evaluation scores to Academic Coordinator for records.

c. Revision and Final Decision

i. Program advisor reports performance on Dissertation Proposal DQE to Academic Coordinator and Chair of the Doctoral Committee.
ii. If unsuccessful, student will take feedback from oral defense and work with advisor to revise proposal for a second oral defense.
iii. If not successful after second attempt, the Doctoral Committee has the option to terminate student and, possibly, encourage application for a designated masters. No additional attempts are possible.
Dissertation Qualifying Exam (DQE) Guidelines
For the Degree of Ph.D. in Educational Policy and Leadership (EDPL)

Upon satisfactory completion of Critical Analysis DQE, Foundations of Research DQE, and Dissertation Proposal DQE, the student moves to candidacy and may proceed to dissertation research.

I. DQE Component 1: Critical Analysis DQE (DQE 1)

a. Description
A paper produced in first two courses of the program sequence which demonstrates 1) comprehension, 2) critical analysis, and 3) sound, consistent logic/reasoning skills based on course readings/assignment as well as 4) writing proficiency. In short, the paper demonstrates the skills “to read and write with and against text.”

b. Process
i. Student selects final paper from EDPL 8955/8956, Seminar I or II, in consultation with the instructor(s) and submits the paper by the last week of class in spring semester.
ii. The instructor and a second faculty member will evaluate the paper using the rubric and generate feedback.
iii. The instructor and second reader will together decide if the student meets DQE proficiency. Feedback, including the rubric rating(s) will be transmitted to the Chair of the Doctoral Committee, who will share it with the student.

c. Assessment
A rubric will be used for both instructor and the second reader to evaluate comprehension, critical analysis, and sound logic/reasoning skills based on course readings/assignment as well as writing proficiency. (The instructor will provide feedback throughout the coursework on these skills and may use the rubric as a feedback and assessment tool. When the rubric is used to assess papers for class, the assessment for the course reflects course priorities and the specific expectations of the assignment and should not be interpreted as the official DQE assessment.) For the DQE, the paper is assessed by the two readers as to whether it demonstrates that the student critically reads, analyzes, and writes at the level needed to progress in doctoral studies. To achieve proficiency, the student must meet or exceed proficiency in all categories on the rubric.

d. Opportunity to Rewrite and Resubmit
i. The student will be notified as to whether they have met proficiency and provided with feedback.
ii. If not proficient in one or more categories, the student is placed on Conditional Continuation (departmental, not university or Graduate School designation) and cannot proceed in the core sequence coursework unless otherwise approved. Student can enroll in an elective from area of concentration. Advisor should confer with Chair of the Doctoral Committee.
iii. Student may/is encouraged to revise the paper. Students are strongly encouraged to use the services of the Marquette Writing Center, with a specialist with graduate level expertise. The student may wish to consult with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee about an appropriate Writing Center specialist. (Due by June 30)
iv. The original readers (or others as assigned by the Chair of the Doctoral Committee) will assess the revision, and the Chair of the Doctoral Committee will communicate the results to the student.
e. Final Decision
   i. If the revised paper is not proficient (or student declines the opportunity to revise the original paper), the student meets with the Chair of the Doctoral Committee and their advisor to discuss the student's options (below).
   ii. The student chooses one of the following options and communicates their choice (intent) to the Chair of the Doctoral Committee:
       1. Withdrawal from the university; or
       2. Apply to transfer coursework into a (second) master's program – EDPF, or other with approval; or
       3. Letter of appeal with a plan for remediation.
   iii. The Doctoral Committee reviews the appeal and makes a decision. This may include termination from the program, termination from the doctoral program with the option to transfer to a designated EDPL master’s program with earned credits, or specified requirements and timeline to move out of EDPL Conditional Continuation. If requirements are not met, no further appeal is available.
II. DQE Component 2: Foundations of Research DQE (DQE 2)

a. Description
   Written mini-research proposal that demonstrates student’s ability to 1) identify a problem, 2) synthesize and critique relevant literature, 3) develop a theoretical framework, 4) formulate a research question, and 5) successfully maintain and articulate the logical links among each of the elements above, as well as 6) writing proficiency.

b. Process
   i. Student completes mini-research proposal in EDPL 8715 (“Qual I”) as part of course project: mini-research pilot study.
   ii. Though the instructor will evaluate the entire mini-research pilot study, including use of qualitative methodology, the DQE 2 includes only problem formation, synthesis and critique of relevant literature, theoretical framework, research question, and successful articulation of the logical links among each of these elements.
   iii. Foundations of Research DQE (DQE 2) submitted within 2 weeks after EDPL 8715 ends (or earlier, if desired and appropriate).
   iv. The instructor for EDPL 8715 and a second faculty member will evaluate paper and provide evaluation of level of proficiency, with feedback, within two weeks of receiving DQE 2 paper.

c. Assessment
   A rubric will be used for both instructor and the second reader to evaluate DQE 2. (The instructor will provide feedback throughout the coursework on relevant skills and may use the rubric as a feedback and assessment tool. When the rubric is used to assess papers for class, the assessment for the course reflects course priorities and the specific expectations of the assignment and should not be interpreted as the official DQE assessment.) To achieve proficiency, the student must meet or exceed proficiency in all categories on the rubric.

d. Opportunity to Revise and Resubmit
   i. If not proficient in 1 or more categories, student is placed on “Conditional Continuation” and cannot proceed in the core sequence coursework unless otherwise approved, including the second required research methodology course. Student can enroll in an elective from area of concentration. Advisor should confer with Chair of the Doctoral Committee.
   ii. Student will revise paper. Revision is due 4 weeks after evaluation of DQE 2 is provided.
   iii. Revised version will be evaluated, typically within 2 weeks, by the same two faculty readers (where possible) using rubric.

e. Final Decision
   The Doctoral Committee reviews the appeal and makes a final decision. This may include termination from the program, termination from the doctoral program with the option to apply to transfer to a designated EDPL master’s program with earned credits, or specified requirements and timeline to move out of EDPL Conditional Continuation. If requirements are not met, no further appeal is available.
III. DQE Component 3 & Dissertation Proposal
   a. Description
      i. The DQE 3/Dissertation Proposal addresses Rationale, Literature Review/Theoretical Framework, and Methodology. The paper must also articulate logical links within and among these sections. This framework (and content of each section) is for empirical research, either qualitative or quantitative. Students whose dissertation methodology is not empirical (i.e. historical research) should work with advisor to select a framework appropriate to that methodology. Exceptions to this format, with the recommendation of the dissertation chair, may be approved by the doctoral committee.
      ii. Rationale:
           1. Statement of problem, research focus
           2. Rationale and significance of addressing problem
           3. Reference to salient literature.
           4. Research questions.
      iii. Literature Review/Theoretical Framework:
           1. Critical, synthesized review of empirical literature salient to topic
           2. Clear indication of how research can address an existing gap.
           3. Research questions growing out of that “gap”
           4. Theoretical Framework: thorough discussion of the theory that will ground/guide the research.
      iv. Methodology:
           1. Research questions
           2. Description why research methodology (qualitative, quantitative, case study, historical, etc.) is well-suited to answer the questions posed.
           3. Description of research context and why selected
           4. Description of participants and how selected
           5. Description of data sources and how they will provide insight into research questions
           6. Description of data analysis methods, including how theory connects to analysis.
      v. Writing Proficiency, including articulation of logical links within and among the sections, clarity, and correctness.
   b. Process and Assessment
      i. Student will write the complete Dissertation Proposal with support/supervision of dissertation chair.
      ii. Student will defend proposal in oral defense with dissertation committee.
      iii. Written proposal and oral defense will both be evaluated by committee using the designated rubric.
   c. Final Decision
      i. Program advisor reports performance on Dissertation Proposal DQE to Academic Coordinator and Chair of the Doctoral Committee.
      ii. If unsuccessful, student will take feedback from oral defense and work with advisor to revise proposal for a second oral defense.
      iii. If not successful after second attempt, the Doctoral Committee has the option to terminate student and, possibly, encourage application for a designated masters.
DISSEMINATION DIRECTOR/CHAIR

The dissertation chair guides the student through all work during official doctoral candidacy – the dissertation outline, proposal writing and hearing, dissertation study, writing, and public defense. Often the academic adviser during coursework is also the student’s dissertation director; however, if the student's choice of dissertation topic and/or methodology warrants a new chair/director, the student may select one. This selection is by mutual consent between the student and the faculty member, and needs to be communicated to the student’s advisor. Such a change in advisor also needs to be reported to the Director of Graduate Studies so that records in the Graduate School can be updated.

A list of the current faculty who serve as Advisers and Dissertation Directors for EDPL doctoral students, along with their academic interests, can be found in the POLICY AND PROCEDURES section of this handbook.

DISSEMINATION COMMITTEE

Candidates select their dissertation committee with the assistance of their adviser. The committee must include at least three members, including the chair. At least two members of the committee must be from the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership. Additional members of the committee can be selected from graduate faculty at Marquette University and may include one member from outside of the university. If the committee includes a non-Marquette member, the department must submit current curriculum vitae for that member to the Graduate School along with the Outline for Dissertation form. All members of the dissertation committee must be active scholars who hold earned terminal degrees.

DISSEMINATION DIRECTIVES

Detailed information and directions for planning the dissertation, assembling a dissertation committee, formatting the dissertation, arrangement order and detail in the dissertation, copyright law, and submission of the dissertation to the Marquette University Graduate School can be found on the Graduate School website at: www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml

In addition, all dissertations submitted to the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership must follow the most recent edition of APA Style Guidelines.

DISSEMINATION CREDITS

Doctoral students must take 12 hours of dissertation credits and may enroll for these while working on their dissertation outline and/or while working on the dissertation research. Students work with their advisors to determine how many credits hours they should take during any one term during the dissertation work. At times, students enroll in dissertation credits while preparing the dissertation proposal. However, students who enroll in, and pay for, dissertation credits before actually beginning work on their project will not be entitled to any tuition refund of these credits even if they should subsequently drop out of or are withdrawn from the program.

If the student has already completed the 12 dissertation credits required for graduation, but is still working on his/her dissertation, registration in dissertation continuation is required using the “Dissertation/Thesis/Professional Project Continuation Registration Form” which is available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml. The student may register for less than half-time, half-time, or full-time, based on the amount of work that is being done.
DQE Component 3: DISSERTATION PROPOSAL & HEARING

Typically, the dissertation proposal includes the components of what are traditionally in the first three chapters of the dissertation:

- Problem Statement/Rationale and Research Questions
- Literature Review and Theoretical Framework
- Methodology.

Non-empirical dissertations (such as a historical or philosophical dissertations) will have different chapters and student should work with dissertation director to construct appropriate proposal. With the help of the dissertation director, the student prepares a dissertation proposal for review by his/her committee and subsequent discussion with the committee in a scheduled proposal hearing where all members of the committee have an opportunity to question the student about the planned research, offer suggestions, and either approve the research plan or ask the student to do further work on the proposal. The dissertation chair has the appropriate form indicating successful defense signed by the committee members and submits it to the Graduate School.

DISSERTATION OUTLINE

Students must submit an outline for their proposed dissertation using the Outline for Dissertation, Thesis, or Professional Project form available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml. This form is typically submitted to the Graduate School during the first term that dissertation credits are taken and after the dissertation proposal has been approved by the student’s dissertation director and committee. The student’s dissertation director, committee, and department chair must register their approval of the student’s research plan on the dissertation outline form which is then submitted to the Graduate School for approval, along with the dissertation proposal.

Once the outline form is completed and signed by all parties, it is an agreement between the student, the dissertation committee, and the Graduate School for the student’s planned research. Any significant changes in the outline must be approved by all parties (dissertation director, committee, department chair, Graduate School).

IRB APPROVAL for RESEARCH

If the student’s research involves human subjects, the student is required to obtain written institutional review board (IRB) approval of the research from the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) PRIOR to initiating his/her dissertation research. The approval forms for human research may be obtained through ORC and must be submitted to the Graduate School upon approval. ORC requires the STUDENT to submit the necessary protocol forms for review and approval of his/her research. Additionally, students AND advisors must have certification of successful human subjects research training. Information for this certification is available on the OCR website, under “Training and Education.”

For more information about the research compliance process, students may check the ORC website at www.marquette.edu/researchcompliance or contact ORC at (414) 288-1479.

Approval of the student’s Dissertation Outline form by the Graduate School does NOT constitute approval by the Office of Research Compliance.
DISSEYATION BOOTCAMP

The Marquette University Graduate School offers three one-week periods of intensive research, reflection and writing each year for doctoral students writing their dissertations. Dissertation Boot Camps provide a dedicated time and location for students to come together and work towards the completion of their dissertations. Faculty facilitators are available throughout the week to monitor progress and offer suggestions. Each dissertator is assigned a facilitator with whom they meet daily.

PUBLIC DEFENSE & EVALUATION OF THE DISSERTATION

A public defense of the dissertation is conducted after the candidate has completed all other formal requirements for the doctoral degree. Before a public defense of the dissertation, a copy of the dissertation must be given to each member of the committee at least three and preferably four weeks before the defense date. The student and his/her adviser must select a date for the defense during the weekday working hours and must avoid public or religious holidays. If the student intends to graduate the same term the defense is made, the defense must be held before the deadline listed in the Academic Calendar.

Students must submit the Announcement for Public Defense of the Dissertation form, available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml, along with an electronically submitted dissertation abstract in MS Word format to the graduate School. Each committee member must sign the form confirming the date and time of the defense. Email signatures are acceptable from committee members not on campus. The form must be submitted at least four weeks prior to the scheduled defense date. The Graduate School uses this form to announce the upcoming defenses to the campus community.

Evaluation of both the written and oral defense of the dissertation is based on the following criteria:

- Provides well-reasoned rationale for research problem
- Grounds research in salient theory directly related to problem
- Demonstrates understanding of main arguments in literature related to research topic
- Evaluates the quality, representativeness, and interplay of arguments/evidence in literature
- Identifies a gap or gaps in the literature
- Formulates a question/questions that can challenge/extend current wisdom on research subject
- Uses an appropriate methodology to address the research question(s)
- Develops an evidence-based, persuasive argument, grounded and informed by theoretical framework, that contributes to the literature in a field
- Evaluates the interplay of their own research argument and evidence with those found in relevant literature.

GRADUATION

See general graduate student handbook and the graduate school website for information related to graduation (date for registering, renting academic apparel, times for hooding ceremonies, etc.) NOTE: doctoral students must be enrolled (either in dissertation credits or Dissertation/Thesis/Professional Project Continuation Registration Form) www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml during the semester in which they intend to graduate.
## EDPL PHD Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Foundations Courses</th>
<th>Required Research Courses</th>
<th>Concentrations (or Customized) Electives</th>
<th>Dissertation credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDPL 8955 Seminar 1</td>
<td>EDPL Multiple Paradigms</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPL 8956 Seminar 2</td>
<td>EDPL 8710 Interpretive/Critical Research 1</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDPL 8330 Sociology</td>
<td>EDPL 8720 Interpretive/Critical Research 2 OR 2nd Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 credits</td>
<td>12 credits</td>
<td>18 credits</td>
<td>12 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Domain

#### Leadership

- **EDPL 8712 Politics & Community Relations**
- **EDPL 8700 Organizational Theory**
- EDPL 8800 Law
- EDPL 8310 Contemporary Philosophy of Education
- EDPL 8860 Instructional Leadership
- EDPL 8870 Curriculum Leadership
- Advanced Statistics Course
- Special Topics
- ++Electives from other units

#### Teaching & Learning

- **EDPL 8445 Application of Learning Theories Applied to Curriculum & Instruction**
- **EDPL 8870 Curriculum Leadership**
- EDPL 8800 Law
- EDPL 8310 Contemporary Philosophy of Education
- EDPL 8860 Instructional Leadership
- Special Topics
- ++Electives from other units

#### Policy Analysis Customized

- **POSC 5281 Urban Policy**
- **POSC 6954 Research Seminar in American Politics**
- EDPL 8800 Law
- EDPL 8310 Contemporary Philosophy of Education
- Advanced Statistics course
- EDPL 8712 Politics & Community Relations
- EDPL 6700 Organizational Theory K-12
- Additional Statistics Course
- Special Topics
- ++Electives from other units

### K-12

- **EDPL 8712 Politics & Community Relations**
- **EDPL 8800 Organizational Theory in Higher Education**
- EDPL 8800 Law
- EDPL 8310 Contemporary Philosophy of Education
- EDPL 8250 History of Higher Education
- EDPL 8860 Instructional Leadership
- EDPL 8870 Curriculum Leadership
- EDPL 6200 Student Development
- EDPL 6140 Diverse Students on College Campuses
- Advanced Statistics Course
- Special Topics
- ++Electives from other units

### Higher Ed

- **EDPL 8712 Politics & Community Relations**
- **EDPL 8260 Organizational Theory in Higher Education**
- EDPL 8800 Law
- EDPL 8310 Contemporary Philosophy of Education
- EDPL 8250 History of Higher Education
- EDPL 8860 Instructional Leadership
- EDPL 8870 Curriculum Leadership
- EDPL 6200 Student Development
- EDPL 6140 Diverse Students on College Campuses
- Advanced Statistics Course
- Special Topics
- ++Electives from other units
PROGRAM OF STUDY: DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN EDPL

(must be completed with advisor by the end of the second semester)

STUDENT NAME: _____________________________ EMAIL: _____________________________
PHONE: _______________ MU ID#: _____________________________ EXPECTED COMPLETION: __________

FOUNDATIONS (15 CREDITS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8955 Seminar I. Social Contexts and Educational Policy (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8956 Seminar II. Social Contexts and Educational Policy (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8730 History of Education in the United States (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8330 Sociological Foundations of Education (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>One foundation elective (3 credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH (12 CREDITS):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8710 Multiple Paradigms in Educational Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8715 Interpretive and Critical Research I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Intermediate Research and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8720 Interpretive and Critical Research II OR Measurement and Evaluation/other Advanced Statistics Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ELECTIVES BY AREA OF CONCENTRATION (18 CREDITS):

_______   _________
_______________________________________________
_______   _________
_______________________________________________
_______   _________
_______________________________________________
_______   _________
_______________________________________________
_______   _________
_______________________________________________
_______   _________
_______________________________________________

QUALIFYING EXAM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Component 1: Critical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Component 2: Foundations of Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Component 3: Dissertation Proposal, Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISSERTATION (12 credits):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>Defense of Doctoral Dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signatures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>(Signature)</th>
<th>(Date)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
<td>(Date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dir. Graduate Studies</td>
<td>(Signature)</td>
<td>(Date)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1