

Instructions and Procedures Guide for the Human Development Program

Doctoral Comprehensive Knowledge Portfolio

August 2014

This package contains the instructions, evaluation procedure, and a checklist for the doctoral comprehensive knowledge portfolio for the Department of Human Development doctoral program.

Completing and receiving approval from the student's three-member portfolio faculty committee for the materials submitted for the portfolio completes all of the requirements for the doctoral comprehensive examination (there is no examination requirement other than fulfilling the portfolio checklist, with faculty committee approval).

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION PROCESS

Portfolios are first submitted to the advisor for initial approval, and then to the student's full committee for evaluation (see the document on evaluations procedures for a detailed description of the evaluation process).

The student should create one binder. Binders should have dividers for each item, and should include a cover letter describing the portfolio contents and how the portfolio reflects the student's content area. ***Include the Portfolio checklist in the binder.*** Citations for published papers, conference presentations, and chapters should be provided.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATING THE EDHD DOCTORAL COMPREHENSIVE PORTFOLIO

1. Student meets with advisor to plan comprehensive portfolio. The student chooses the Evaluation Committee during his/her second year of the program. The Evaluation Committee consists of advisor and two other faculty members.
2. The advisor and student decide on the set of items to go into the portfolio. They use the portfolio checklist to keep track of progress on the different items. Students should get feedback from their advisors before submitting items to the evaluation committee. This is particularly the case for the literature review. It is expected that the advisor reads the literature review several times after revisions before the literature review paper is submitted to the committee.
3. Student compiles the portfolio for submission to the evaluation committee. A paper copy of each item should be provided, along with citations for published papers, conference presentations, and chapters.

Item 1, the interpretative review article (see the document that lists the portfolio contents), is required of all students. Student selects *three* additional items to complete. Portfolios are first submitted to the advisor for initial approval, and then to the student's full committee for final evaluation. **The student should provide a cover letter describing the contents of the portfolio and how the portfolio reflects the student's content area.**

4. The committee evaluates each portfolio item.

Articles accepted for publication in reputable journals or books, papers presented at national conferences, grants submitted to reputable agencies or foundations, and reviews submitted to reputable journals do *not* have to be evaluated further.

Articles submitted and other items not judged by outside agencies will be read and evaluated by the committee. The student's advisor determines the appropriateness of the specific journals and granting agencies for the portfolio requirements.

5. The committee evaluates each item separately, and decides if it meets the requirements (based on all three faculty judging the item acceptable), or if the item needs to be revised and resubmitted (based on all three faculty member's evaluations). ***ALL*** items must meet the requirements for the portfolio to be judged acceptable.
 - a. For all items except the first one, an item judged as needing revision can either be revised, or the student can opt to submit another item in its place. Students are given ONE opportunity to submit revised items.

- b. If the first item (the literature review paper) is judged as needing revision, the student cannot replace it with another item but must submit a revised version. The student is given ONE opportunity to revise this paper.
- c. Students unable to successfully revise an item(s) will not be allowed to complete the EDHD doctoral program.

Timeline for Completion of the Portfolio

1. During the student's first or second year, the Evaluation Committee is chosen.
2. During subsequent years the student compiles the materials for the portfolio.
3. Completion of the portfolio must occur before the student advances to doctoral candidacy (students must advance to candidacy by their fifth year after admission to the program). It is recommended that the portfolio be completed by the end of the student's third year, particularly for full-time students.
4. The faculty will provide their evaluation on the Portfolio within 4 weeks of receiving it from the student.
5. All three committee members must approve the Portfolio.

Monitoring of Student Progress

Each year students shall complete a progress report that they submit to their advisor and the Graduate Director. This report will summarize their progress in the program and their progress toward completing the portfolio.

REQUIREMENTS

The first item is required. Choose three additional items to complete the portfolio. The choices should be made in consultation with your advisor. The faculty will provide their evaluation on the Portfolio within 4 weeks of receiving it from the student.

1. Interpretive or review article/chapter for field of specialization. This paper is expected to be longer than a typical seminar paper, and it should be of *publishable quality*. The review article must be first or sole authored by the student. The paper should be 35 to 45 double-spaced pages in length. This paper is submitted to the committee for their evaluation.
2. First or co-authored published journal article, or article submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal. Co-authorship means having one's name on the paper.
3. First or co-authored published chapter, or chapter submitted for publication. Chapters should be published in reputable academic publishing houses or university presses. Co-authorship means having one's name on the chapter.
4. First or co-authored conference presentation or poster presentation. In this instance co-authorship means first or second authorship, with a preference for first authorship. For poster presentations, a short abstract of the poster also should be provided.
5. First or co-authored policy paper or brief published or submitted for publication. Co-authorship means having one's name on the paper.
6. Review of an article for a journal, or review of a published paper. If the student has not done a review for a journal, then the review done for courses like EDHD 780 could be used.
7. Grant proposal (first or co-authored). This could be a grant for a new research project done with a faculty member, a grant to obtain support for one's dissertation work or other research, and so on. Rules for co-authorship are as above for papers or chapters. The student's advisor determines the appropriateness of the granting agency.
8. Annotated course syllabus. This syllabus should report a plan for each day's class session in brief form, and a week by week paragraph-long summary of what is covered during the week and what kinds of activities are/will be done. Sample assignments should be included in the syllabus. The syllabus should follow University approved syllabus format, including all essential elements regarding student related policies, e.g., late paper, absences, academic integrity, religious observances, disabilities statement, grading policies, etc. It should contain measurable course objectives and evidence of how each class or assignment addresses one of the specific course objectives (e.g., what is the link between these and the course goals?). Grading criteria should be presented.

EVALUATION

The members of the faculty portfolio committee read the literature review paper for the Portfolio requirement and assign one of the following recommendations (see attached checklist):

- A. PASS. Accept as is (no revisions)
- B. PASS. Accept “as is” for the Portfolio requirement.
The faculty members have comments and feedback which should be addressed by the student when the paper becomes part of the dissertation proposal (if this is appropriate; in many cases, it will be but it is not required to be part of the dissertation background chapter) or if it is submitted for publication (if this is appropriate; it does not have to be submitted for publication). Thus, comments can be given to the paper for revision for the next step; but the decision is to PASS for the portfolio requirement.
- C. DOES NOT PASS. Reject and revise the paper according to comments from the faculty portfolio committee.

The faculty readers send their evaluation to the student’s Advisor. The Advisor sends the decision by the committee to the Graduate Director. A PASS is assigned when all 3 readers agree to a PASS. Otherwise, the decision is DOES NOT PASS.

Graduate students can only revise the literature review *once*. If the paper does not PASS after one revision then the student is not allowed to advance to candidacy.

The faculty will provide their evaluation on the Portfolio within *4 weeks* of receiving it from the student.

The Graduate Director sends the decision to the Student Services Office in the COE.

The student must complete an *Advanced to Candidacy form*, which is located on the UMD Graduate Student website. After completing the form, the student then gives it to the Graduate Coordinator. The Graduate Coordinator will have it approved and delivered to the Student Services Office in the Benjamin Building.

PORTFOLIO REQUIREMENT CLARIFICATIONS

1. The decision by the faculty will be to assign PASS or DOES NOT PASS (there is no high pass).
2. Faculty members do not evaluate conference papers and publications; only the literature review is evaluated by the committee members. Regarding the appropriateness of the journals and granting agencies, this is up to the advisor to decide and provide guidance.
3. Faculty portfolio committee members decide if the Literature Review meets the expectations of an advanced seminar paper for the Portfolio requirement. Comments and feedback are provided with the expectation that the student will revise the paper based on the feedback for the dissertation background chapter and/or for submitting it for publication. While revising the paper for the dissertation or submitting the paper for publication are goals of the literature review, neither of these goals are required (but it is highly encouraged, and the advisor should guide the student toward one of these goals). Thus, the faculty should award a PASS if the paper meets the expectations of an advanced seminar paper and provide feedback toward the two goals mentioned.
4. The faculty will provide their evaluation of the Portfolio within 4 weeks of receiving it from the student.
5. Adjunct graduate faculty members who are former tenured or tenure-track faculty members can serve on the portfolio committee within one-year period of time after leaving University of Maryland.

Note: The Self Assessment statement has been eliminated as part of the Portfolio requirements.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO CHECKLIST

In preparing the Portfolio Checklist, an electronic version should be used. Please save this as a WORD file, send it by email to the Graduate Coordinator, then print a hard copy and place it in the mailbox of the Graduate Coordinator (HD office).

Please fill in the following information:

NAME:

ADVISOR:

DATE:

AREA OF SPECIALIZATION:

The first item below is required. Choose three additional items to complete the portfolio. The choices should be made in consultation with your advisor. *Consult the Portfolio Guidelines document for more details on the criteria for each item.* Place a check next to the item that you are submitting and type in the title of the document (use as many lines as necessary by pressing ENTER as you type).

1. Interpretive or review article/chapter for field of specialization.
 Completed. Title:

2. First or co-authored published journal article, or article submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal.
 Completed. Title:

3. First or co-authored published chapter, or chapter submitted for publication.
 Completed. Title:

4. First or co-authored conference presentation, or poster presentation.
 Completed. Title:

5. First or co-authored policy paper or brief published or submitted for publication.
 Completed. Title:

6. Review of an article for a journal, or review of a published paper.
 Completed. Title:

7. Grant proposal (first or co-authored).
 Completed. Title:

8. Annotated course syllabus.
 Completed. Title:

Department of Human Development

Assessment Rubric: PhD. Comprehensive Exam Portfolio Content Knowledge

Student Name:

ID#

Semester:

Advisor:

CRITERIA

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

FROM CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Meet expectations

Fails to meet expectations

The student demonstrates:

Clear presentation of the theory base in the content area;

Thorough review of relevant research in the content area;

Critical analysis of the theory and research in the content area;

Professional writing skills;

Professional approach to formatting the paper including use of APA style, text and reference formatting, and length.

OVERALL OUTCOME

_____ Pass

_____ Fail

COMMENTS: