



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD

Special Education Doctoral Program Handbook 2026-2027

*Note: This handbook may be updated after the initial dissemination with scholars.
If there are any changes, scholars will be notified.*

Table of Contents

Special Education Doctoral Program.....	3
Nature of the Special Education Doctoral Program.....	3
Special Education Faculty.....	3
Faculty Roles & Committee Responsibilities.....	4
Program of Study.....	6
Curriculum.....	6
Sample Program Plan.....	7
Sample Course Sequence (60 credits).....	7
Requirements.....	8
Course Information and Program Requirements.....	8
Annual Benchmarks and Timeline Information.....	14
Prior to Year 1: Course Plan.....	14
Year 2: Annual Review.....	14
Year 3: Comprehensive Portfolio.....	14
Years 4+: Dissertation.....	14
Information about Timelines, Graduation, and Post-Graduation.....	15
Beyond Coursework: Expectations & Guidelines.....	16
Active Participation.....	16
Expressing Programming Grievances or Concerns.....	16
Authorship and APA-Related Guidelines.....	16
Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidelines.....	17
List of Key UMD Websites and Resources.....	18
College of Education.....	18
Dissertation.....	18
Electronic Dissertation.....	18
Electronic Dissertation Style Guide.....	18
Graduation Overview.....	18
Graduate School.....	18
Graduation.....	18
Research & Writing.....	18
Student Resources, Family Care Resources and Other Supports.....	18
Appendix A. Annual Review - Year 2 (Early Assessment).....	20
Appendix B. Annual Review - Years 3 and 4 (Mid/Late Assessments).....	26
Appendix C. Supervised Research, Policy, or Practice Internship Forms.....	31
Appendix D. Comprehensive Portfolio Review.....	36
Appendix E. Rubric for Dissertation Proposal (Written & Oral Presentation).....	41
Appendix F. Rubric for Final Dissertation Defense (Written & Oral Presentation).....	43

Special Education Doctoral Program

Welcome to the special education doctoral program at the University of Maryland (UMD)! We look forward to working with you during your education as a special education doctoral scholar.

This handbook provides information about the special education Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree requirements. This document includes information on the program, faculty, program of study, benchmarks, and rubrics. We also include information on frequently asked questions and resources. Please note that this handbook is intended to supplement the University of Maryland Graduate School Website. Scholars in the special education doctoral program should become familiar with this handbook.

Nature of the Special Education Doctoral Program

The Special Education (also known as EDSP) doctoral program resides in the [Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education](#) (CHSE), one of three departments within the [College of Education](#) (COE).

The special education doctoral program emphasizes research and scholarship, leadership and professional development, and disciplinary knowledge. The program prepares future researchers, leaders, and teachers for positions in higher education institutions.

The PhD degree is a research degree. This preparation enables scholars to critically understand and evaluate the literature in the field, use appropriate principles to recognize, evaluate, and interpret issues and problems at the frontier of knowledge, and pursue appropriate research through close association with and apprenticeship to faculty members experienced in research and teaching. Scholars are encouraged to work with faculty to design programs uniquely fitted to their areas of interest. Furthermore, the special education program area encourages prospective scholars to engage in research under the supervision of a faculty member at the earliest opportunity and remain active throughout the duration of their program.

Special Education Faculty

The Special Education (EDSP) faculty are dedicated to preparing individuals to become scholars who can discover, integrate, and apply knowledge, as well as communicate and disseminate it. A Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) leads the Special Education doctoral program. **If you have questions about the Special Education Doctoral Program, Dr. Kang, our DGS, is your “go-to” person.** The following faculty members are actively mentoring or accepting doctoral scholars. A short bio is listed below for each faculty member. For more extensive information, visit their faculty website.

- [Philip Burke](#), PhD, Professor
 - Dr. Burke’s research interests are policy studies, legislative issues, and international special education.
- [Kelli D. Cummings](#), PhD, Associate Professor
 - Dr. Cumming’s research interests are related to language and literacy, second language/bilingual literacy development, early childhood special education, multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS), school improvement, social justice in schools, implementation science, learning disabilities, intersectionality, and special education teacher preparation
- [Shanna Hirsch](#), PhD, BCBA-D, Associate Professor

- Dr. Hirsch's research focuses on identifying effective and practical instructional methods for supporting student behavior. She is particularly interested in studying Tier 1 classroom positive behavior interventions and supports, function-based thinking, and functional behavioral assessment-based interventions.
- [Veronica Kang](#), PhD, BCBA-D, Assistant Professor
 - Dr. Kang's research focuses on provider training of social-emotional and language early intervention/early childhood special education, autism, and collaboration with immigrant communities.
- [Sehrish Shikarpurya](#), PhD, Assistant Professor
 - Dr. Shikarpurya's research focuses on developing interventions to improve the postschool transition outcomes of immigrant and racially minoritized youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families.
- [Ana Taboada Barber](#), PhD, Professor
 - Dr. Taboada Barber studies reading comprehension from a cognitive and motivational perspective. Her work centers on studying the influence of specific motivational variables (e.g., autonomy support, self-efficacy) and cognitive variables (e.g., executive function skills; inference making) on the literacy and language development of elementary and middle school students. She studies reading comprehension within classroom instructional contexts as well as an individual difference variable.
- [Jade Wexler](#), PhD, Professor
 - Dr. Wexler's current research focuses on developing and testing reading interventions for adolescents with reading difficulties and disabilities. She also develops and tests innovative professional development models that support teachers' adoption, implementation, sustainment, and scaling of evidence-based literacy practices schoolwide.
- [Gulnoza Yakubova](#), PhD, Associate Professor
 - Dr. Yakubova's research interests include autism, technology, mathematics, caregiver-implemented and culturally adapted interventions.

Faculty Roles & Committee Responsibilities

Advisor (Years 1-4)

- Your major advisor should be someone with full member status within the graduate school, often a tenure-track or tenured faculty member, and someone with whom you share a common research interest or methodological practice.

Portfolio Review Committee (Years 1-3)

- All portfolio review committees must include at least three members:
- **Chair (or co-chair):** the scholar's dissertation advisor who will serve as the first line of communication between the scholar and the other dissertation proposal committee members. A dissertation committee chair must be a Full Member of the Graduate Faculty.
- **Committee Members:** Two EDSP Graduate Faculty (all tenure-track and tenured faculty are full members of the graduate faculty). Please reference the [Graduate School Guidelines](#) around the membership of your committee. The Graduate Catalog contains the [policy](#) and a list of [current Graduate Faculty](#). Please note that if a faculty member has a doctorate and is a teaching faculty member, your chair can nominate the person to be an associate or special member (outside UMD).

Dissertation Proposal Committee (Year 3+)

- All dissertation proposal committees must include at least three members:
- **Chair (or co-chair):** the scholar's dissertation advisor who will serve as the first line of communication between the scholar and the other dissertation proposal committee members.
- **Committee Members:** The doctoral candidate and advisor should invite as many of the required Dissertation Committee Members as possible to the proposal meeting. Per Graduate School guidelines, the meeting may proceed with at least three members present, including the advisor. *Committee membership may change before the final oral defense.*

Dissertation Committee (Year 3+)

- All dissertation committees must include at least five members:
- **Chair (or co-chair):** the scholar's dissertation advisor who will serve as the first line of communication between the scholar and the other dissertation committee members. A dissertation committee chair must be a Full Member of the Graduate Faculty.
- **Committee Members:** a faculty member who possesses the necessary content or methodological expertise for the scholar's area of inquiry and will most likely belong to the EDSP program area or a related area
- **Dean's Representative:** Each committee must have a Dean's Representative as a voting or non-voting member. The Dean's Representative should have a research interest related to that of the student. The Dean's Representative must be a tenured member of the Graduate Faculty and must have a tenure home different from the student's program and that of the chair and any co-chair(s).
- Nomination of Thesis or Dissertation Committee can be found [here](#). The Graduate Catalog contains the [policy](#) and a list of [current Graduate Faculty](#). Please note that if a faculty member has a doctorate and is a teaching faculty member, your chair can nominate the person to be an associate or special member (outside UMD).

Program of Study

Curriculum

The 60 credit hours for the special education doctoral program are organized into five areas: Special Education (18 credits), Research Methodology and Design (15 credits), Elective Area (15 credits), Advancement to Candidacy (minimum of 12 credits), and Dissertation Research (minimum of 12 credits). The following information outlines the curriculum requirements. ***Please note that some courses in this sequence are pending PCC review.***

Special Education Area - Five Courses (18 Credit Hours)

- **EDSP 850** Intervention Research in Special Education
- **EDSP 860** Doctoral Research Seminar
- **EDSP 872** Theory and Empirical Design in Educational Research
- **EDSP 875** Legal and Policy Foundations for Individuals with Disabilities
- **EDSP 887 & EDSP 888** Apprenticeship in Special Education Supervised College Teaching I & II (Required) (6 credits) **Pending PCC review*

Research Methodology and Design Area - Five Courses (15 Credit Hours)

- **QMMS 645** Quantitative Research Methods I (*only required for scholars who did not complete an intro statistics course prior to enrolling in the doctoral program*)
- **QMMS 646** General Linear Models
- **EDSP 870** Advanced Single Case Research Designs in Special Education
- **EDSP 871** Qualitative Methods in Special Education

At Least **One** Intermediate Qualitative or Quantitative Methods Course

QMMS 610 Classroom Assessment and Evaluation; **QMMS 622** Theory and Practice of Standardized Testing; **QMMS 623** Applied Measurement: Issues and Practices; **QMMS 626** Instrumentation; **QMMS 647** Causal Inference and Evaluation Methods; **QMMS 651** General Linear Models II; **QMMS 655** Introduction to Multilevel Modeling; **QMMS 657** Exploratory Latent and Composite Variable Methods; **QMMS 722** Structural Modeling; **QMMS 724** Modern Measurement Theory; **TLPL 790** Mixed Methods Research in Education; **TLPL 792** Qualitative Research II: Analysis and Interpretation of Data

Elective Area - Four Courses (Minimum of 12 Credit Hours)

- Doctoral scholars will take a minimum of four additional courses (12 credits) approved by their advisor, which *may* include [EDSP 889: Supervised Research, Policy, or Practice Internship](#)* as well as additional research credits [EDSP 898 Pre-Candidacy Portfolio Research \(3-8 Credits\)](#)
- Doctoral scholars may also choose to pursue additional certificates such as the [Neuroscience & Cognitive Science Post-Baccalaureate Certificate](#) or the [Quantitative Methodology: Measurement and Statistics \(QMMS\) Post-Baccalaureate Certificate](#). The QMMS certificate requires 21 credits of QMMS coursework. Scholars who complete QMMS 645, QMMS 646, and QMMA 651 as part of the doctoral program may be able to apply 9 credits toward that requirement.

Doctoral Dissertation Research - Minimum 12 Credit Hours

- See the section on [EDSP 899 Doctoral Dissertation Research](#) for details

Sample Program Plan

This sample program plan shows one possible pathway for completing the Special Education PhD. It includes required coursework and sample credit distributions by semester. Before registering each semester, scholars must review their planned schedule with their advisor and obtain approval. Course sequencing may vary based on prior preparation, course availability, research opportunities, teaching assignments, internship plans, and dissertation progress.

Sample Course Sequence (60 credits)

Year	Fall	Credits	Spring	Credits
1	EDSP 875 Legal and Policy Foundations for Individuals with Disabilities	3	EDSP 850 Intervention Research in Special Education	3
	QMMS 645 Quantitative Research Methods I	3	QMMS 646 General Linear Models	3
	EDSP 860 Doctoral Research Seminar	3	EDSP 872 Theory and Empirical Design in Educational Research	3
	Year 1 Fall Semester total	9	Year 2 Spring Semester total	9
2	EDSP 871 Qualitative Methods in Education	3	EDSP 870 Advanced Single Case Research Designs in Special Education	3
	EDSP 887 Apprenticeship in Special Education Supervised College Teaching I <i>*Pending PCC Review</i>	3	Elective Area	3
	Intermediate Methods Course	3	Elective Area	3
	Year 2 Fall Semester total	9	Year 2 Spring Semester total	9
3	EDSP 888 Apprenticeship in Special Education Supervised College Teaching II <i>*Pending PCC Review</i>	3	Elective Area	3
	Elective Area	3	EDSP 898 Pre-Candidacy Research Portfolio	3
	Year 3 Fall Semester total	6	Year 3 Spring Semester total	6
4	EDSP 899 Doctoral Dissertation Research	6	EDSP 899 Doctoral Dissertation Research	6
	Year 4 Fall Semester total	6	Year 4 Spring Semester total	6

Requirements

The Special Education Doctoral Program continuously evaluates student progress and skill development. Scholars must maintain “good standing” throughout the program. Specifically, a student must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA and meet other program or Graduate School requirements.

Students do not earn credit toward the degree for courses in which they receive a grade of D+, D, D-, or F. For graduate students, all courses taken that are numbered 400 and above (except 500-level courses, those numbered 799, 898, or 899, and those graded with an S) will be used in the calculation of the grade point average. A student may repeat a course in an effort to earn a better grade. Whether higher or lower, the most recent grade will be used in computing the grade point average. Grades for graduate students remain as part of the student's permanent record. Guidelines for academic progress and probation may be found [here](#)

Course Information and Program Requirements

EDSP 886 Apprenticeship in Special Education Supervised Research (Optional Elective - 3 credits) *Pending PCC review.

Scholars may enroll in this course for individualized, faculty-mentored experience tailored to their prior background and career goals. Working directly alongside a faculty advisor, the scholar will engage in foundational research activities—including conducting literature reviews, formulating research questions, preparing IRB protocols, executing data collection, and receiving feedback on academic writing—to build core competencies for publication and long-term scholarship. Scholars will fulfill selected outcomes based on their individualized learning contract.

EDSP 887 & 888 Apprenticeship in Special Education Supervised College Teaching I & II (Required) *Pending PCC review.

Doctoral scholars will enroll in **two** supervised teaching college-level courses (3 credits each) across two semesters or within one semester which can be taken in any order.

- EDSP 887 will prepare the scholar for college level teaching in special education through a variety of activities including developing a syllabus, a teaching philosophy statement, observing classes, doing a guest lecture, and receiving feedback on their teaching practices.
- EDSP 888 will involve supervised college teaching experience with a faculty member or/and scholar's advisor to determine the most appropriate learning path based on their prior experiences in college level teaching and future goals after graduation.

EDSP 889 Supervised Research, Policy, or Practice Internship (Optional Elective - 3-8 Credits)

Doctoral scholars have the option of completing an internship in special education during the summer or academic year. This is a structured, supervised experience designed to deepen a scholar's expertise in research, policy, or practice related to individuals with disabilities.

- *Research Internship:* A scholar collaborates with a faculty member on a research project that is outside of their current scope of work. This is a supplemental experience meant to broaden the scholar's research knowledge and skills. The faculty member *cannot* be the scholar's advisor.
- *Policy Internship:* A scholar works at an external organization that focuses on federal or state policy initiatives.

- *Practice Internships*: The scholar supervises pre-service teachers during their practicum or student teaching; develops skills in mentoring, feedback, and evaluation of teaching practices.

Scholars are encouraged to seek summer funding for graduate school internships. If unavailable or ineligible, they may apply for special education endowment funds—up to \$5,000 annually—based on availability, for internships lasting 6–8 weeks with at least 3 days/week or equivalent. Contact the current DGS to confirm special education summer or semester funding. Internships may be completed at any point during the program, but scholars are encouraged to do so in their first or second year—ideally before the portfolio review. Scholars should coordinate with their advisor to arrange internship details, including hours, credit, and funding. Planning should begin at least one semester in advance (see Appendix C for forms). Some sites require up to a year of preparation and background checks. The internship requirements are as follows:

- **Prior** Internship goals and a statement of duties (signed by intern and supervisor) and Background screening (if applicable)
- **During**: Progress reports at the quarter and halfway point (signed by intern and supervisor)
- **After**: Supervisors complete reports with the intern and send them to the advisor. Scholars submit a 5-page APA-formatted reflection paper detailing their learning and development. All participants are also encouraged to present their experience at a special education event or symposium.

EDSP 898 Pre-Candidacy Portfolio Research (3-8 Credits)

Scholars must complete a **comprehensive portfolio** research (minimum 3 credits) as part of the requirements to Advance to Candidacy. They can enroll in 1-8 credit hours with a minimum of 3 credits. This review serves as the mid-assessment stage.

Near the end of all required core, methodology, and elective coursework, scholars should enroll in EDSP 898 to work towards preparing the following 2 papers and an oral presentation:

Paper 1: Evidence Synthesis

The paper should be submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal, or of publishable quality (i.e., ready to submit following minor revisions). The evidence synthesis may consist of a systematic literature review, meta-analysis, or scoping review. The committee will decide whether the overall performance of the candidate meets the following *evaluation criteria*:

1. *Has the scholar clearly described the process for the literature search included in the synthesis?*
2. *Has the scholar critically synthesized the body of literature that supports the research problem or void in the extant literature?*
3. *Has the scholar clearly described the purpose of the synthesis for the reader and linked that purpose/need to gaps in the literature?*
4. *Has the scholar reviewed the appropriate literature and research in enough detail so that the reader can understand what is known about the topic and what gaps/limitations are apparent in the research?*
5. *Has the scholar developed and clearly stated a research question as a result of the synthesis?*
6. *Has the scholar prepared a manuscript of publishable quality (ready for submission, requiring only minor suggestions from the committee but not at the journal's "revise and resubmit" decision level) that follows the guidelines for a specific journal in the field?*
7. *Has the scholar met the requirements for clarity of expression, quality of work and methodology, and originality are at the level of the journal?*

In the event the scholar does not meet criteria:

- Scholars have one chance to revise with specific recommendations from the committee within six weeks of the first review along with a letter explaining how the recommendations have been followed.

Paper 2: Demonstration of Scholarship

An evaluation of scholarship can be demonstrated from *one of the three options (in addition to the evidence synthesis) as **lead author (i.e., first or second author)**:*

- *Research article* submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal, or a manuscript is of publishable quality (i.e., ready to submit following minor revisions)
- *Book chapter* submitted for publication to reputable academic publishing houses or university presses, or of publishable quality (i.e., ready to submit following minor revisions)
- *Policy or practitioner paper or brief* published or submitted for publication, or of publishable quality.

Oral Presentation

Once the two papers are completed, the scholar provides an oral presentation (lasting 20-25 minutes), to summarize the following products:

Paper 1: Evidence Synthesis

- Clear statement of the purpose of the research
- Clear research questions that allow the student to address the purpose of the research
- Summary of major points in the body of literature
- Summary of gaps in the literature for this topic
- Summary of ideas for research designs that will contribute meaningful data to the field.
- Evidence of analytical and integrative thinking in reflecting on the program at the end of coursework, especially with respect to upcoming dissertation work integrity and ethical practice.
- Critical analysis/evaluation findings, including major themes, strengths, weaknesses, gaps.

Paper 2: Evaluation of Scholarship

Demonstration of the ability to interact with the graduate committee regarding descriptions or reasons for including materials from the list of optional items included in the Comprehensive Review Portfolio.

Summary of the research article/book chapter/policy paper, scholar's contribution to this publication, and the connection to scholar's dissertation research

If the scholar...

- **Demonstrates** readiness to proceed to the dissertation phase, they will enroll in EDSP 899 Dissertation Research and proceed with their plan for research.
- **Does not demonstrate** this readiness (specific recommendations for modifications or additional work are provided by the committee), the scholar has one opportunity to make revisions and schedule a second meeting no later than six months from the date of the first meeting. The scholar will attend to all required actions taken by the committee and provide a checklist that verifies how these actions have been completed. If the scholar does not pass the second Comprehensive Portfolio Review, their program will be terminated.

EDSP 899 Doctoral Dissertation Research

The purpose of the dissertation is to demonstrate competence in synthesizing relevant literature and in generating new knowledge for the profession using well-established research tools. The dissertation is the culmination of a scholar's doctoral studies and should represent their research interests and capabilities.

The special education program uses a 3-paper format for the dissertation. Chapters 2-4 (see below for descriptions of each chapter) should be tied together by an overarching theme and form a coherent contribution to a significant issue in special education or a related field (e.g., educational psychology, school psychology). The dissertation must follow the APA format, even if the journals to which you have submitted or plan to submit utilize different style guides.

Although the dissertation is developed in collaboration with the scholar's dissertation committee, the scholar is expected to take the lead in this research endeavor. It is the scholar's responsibility to convince the advisor and committee that the design and scope of the study are of sufficient quality to be publishable and potentially to make an important contribution to the field.

Chapter 1: Introduction gives an overview of the rationale, the problem, and a short preview of each chapter of the dissertation. (approximately 3-5 pages)

Chapter 2: Evidence Synthesis is a systematic review of the literature on the relevant topic. It provides an overview of the literature related to the dissertation research, in publishable quality* (i.e., submitted or ready to submit following minor revisions).

Chapter 3: Main Study is an empirical research study that includes the summary of the dissertation research with the following structures: introduction, method, results, and discussion, in publishable quality*.

Chapter 4: Supplemental/Commentary Paper can be an empirical, policy, or practitioner paper in publishable quality* that connects meaningfully to the main study.

Chapter 5: Conclusion gives a summary of the findings of each chapter and reviews implications for future research (approximately 5 pages)

**Usually, each chapter is about 35-40 pages excluding the references and appendices (figures and tables). If it is a practitioner or policy paper, it may be shorter (i.e., 20-25 pages). Scholars and advisors must review the [CRediT author statement guidelines](#) to determine the authorship when publishing to a journal.*

Dissertation Oral Proposal

Prior to the Oral Proposal:

- The Candidate and chair of the dissertation committee will schedule a two-hour time block for the oral examination and reserve a room with staff in the CHSE office.
- The Graduate School requires that an announcement of the oral defense be disseminated to all faculty and graduate scholars within the department in which the candidate's degree is to be awarded. The oral announcement must include the candidate's name; the date, time, and location of the defense; and the dissertation title. It is the program's responsibility to

disseminate the dissertation defense date announcement to its faculty and scholars. Doctoral candidates in the Special Education program should send announcement requests to Carol Scott at cscott18@umd.edu

- A written copy of the proposal must be sent to the student's Dissertation Examination Committee at least **10 working days prior to the scheduled oral defense** along with **Appendix EDSP Rubric for Final Defense (Written and Oral Presentation)**. It is the Advisor's responsibility to make sure committee members complete all forms and send them to the Director and Coordinator of Graduate Studies in Special Education.

Oral Proposal:

- After a successful oral proposal, scholars will advance to candidacy.
- Once advanced to candidacy by the Graduate School, scholars are automatically registered each fall and spring for 6 credits of EDSP 899 (Post-Candidacy/Continuous Registration). For example, a student advanced to candidacy during a semester will be automatically registered for 6 dissertation research credits beginning the following semester.
- For more details, check the Graduate School website:
<https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/doctoral-degrees-policies/>

Dissertation Defense

Part 1 - A public presentation by the candidate on the main aspects of the research reported in the dissertation (typically 30-35 minutes). This includes a brief summary of the research with an emphasis on the important results and the reasoning that led to the conclusions. During Part 1, questions from the audience to the candidate will be permitted. For questions from persons who are not members of the Dissertation Examining Committee, the Chair of the Dissertation Examining Committee will have discretion to decide whether such questions are germane to the topic of the dissertation and how much time will be allotted for the answers.

Part 2 - A formal examination of the candidate by the Dissertation Examination Committee. This part is open only to the Dissertation Examination Committee and the doctoral candidate.

At the conclusion of questioning, the doctoral candidate is asked to leave the room as the discussion and vote are limited to the members of the Dissertation Examining Committee. The Committee has the following options:

- **Accept** the dissertation without any recommended changes and sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- **Accept** the dissertation with recommendations for changes and, except for the chair, sign the Report of the Examining Committee. The chair will check that the changes to the dissertation have been made, and, upon his or her approval, sign the Report of the Examining Committee.
- **Recommend revisions** to the dissertation and not sign the Report of Examining Committee until the student has made the changes and submitted the revised dissertation for the Dissertation Examining Committee's approval. The Dissertation Examining Committee members sign the Report of Examining Committee if they approve the revised dissertation.
- **Recommend revisions and convene a second meeting** of the Dissertation Examining Committee to review the dissertation and complete the scholar's examination.
- **Rule the dissertation unsatisfactory.** In that circumstance, the scholar fails. Following the examination, the chair, in the presence of the Dean's Representative, must inform the

student of the outcome of the examination. The chair and the Dean's Representative both sign a Report of the Examining Committee indicating which of the above alternatives has been adopted. A copy of this statement is to be included in the scholar's file at the graduate program office, and a copy is given to the scholar.

Filing the Dissertation in Digital Form

The scholar is responsible for following the specific procedures for preparing and submitting the dissertation electronically by the published deadline in *Important Dates for All Graduating Graduate Students*. Note that there is a fee associated with this submission. See the Graduate School webpage for more information on procedures and guidelines.

Annual Benchmarks and Timeline Information

Prior to Year 1: Course Plan

- Review requirements in the *Special Education Program Doctoral Handbook*
- Meet with your advisory and develop tentative Course Schedule
- Review College of Education Office of Student Services Website for Required Forms, Dates
- Complete the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative ([CITI Training: Human Subjects Research Training-IRB](#))
- ***Clearance to Register:** After initial meeting, scholar and/or advisor emails Carol Scott cscott18@umd.edu for clearance to register; this is required each semester

Year 2: Annual Review

- Scholar and Advisor Complete Annual Review Form (see Appendix A) and Submit to Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) in Special Education
- Scholar and advisor meet to update any changes to Course Schedule, plan for Portfolio Requirements
- Check Important Dates for Graduate Students, [College of Education Student Services](#)

Year 3: Comprehensive Portfolio

Scholars complete the comprehensive portfolio for review by the special education doctoral program's graduate committee. After successful completion, scholars apply for advancement to candidacy. Scholars may register for additional EDSP 898 credits until the portfolio is complete and has been reviewed by the graduate committee.

- Scholar and Advisor Meet to Finalize Requirements for Comprehensive Portfolio ([EDSP 898 Pre-Candidacy Portfolio Research](#))
- Scholar and Advisor Complete Annual Review Form (see Appendix A) and Submit to Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) in Special Education
- Scholar Receives Advisor approval to forward Portfolio
- Graduate Committee Reviews and Evaluates Portfolio
- Apply for Research Using [Human Subjects IRB](#) - Must be approved before dissertation research begins
- Check Important Dates for Graduate Students, [College of Education Student Services](#)
- File Forms: [Application for Advancement to Candidacy](#)

Years 4+: Dissertation

- Scholar and Advisor Complete Annual Review Form (see Appendix A) and Submit to Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) in Special Education
- Continuous Registration for EDSP 899 Dissertation Research – *six credits each semester is required*
- Check Important Dates for Graduate Students, [College of Education Student Services](#)
- File Form: Nomination of Dissertation Examination Committee
- Complete Dissertation Proposal
- Complete Dissertation Proposal Oral Exam
- File Form: Oral Examination by Dissertation Committee
- Rubric: EDSP Dissertation Oral Exam
- File Form: Graduation Audit
- File: Dissertation Electronic Publication Form; Pro-Quest

Information about Timelines, Graduation, and Post-Graduation

Part-time Scholars

For part-time scholars, credit loads may vary by semester (e.g., 3 credits one term, 6–9 credits in another). It is important that scholars meet Graduate School timelines for advancing to candidacy and completing the dissertation defense. Scholars should work closely with their advisor to plan a schedule that ensures timely progress.

Application for Graduation

The scholar is responsible for filing and completing all forms required throughout their respective degree program as well as for graduation. [Forms](#) can also be found at the UMD Graduate School.

To ensure each student has met the graduate degree requirements, a request for a graduation “AUDIT” can be retrieved from the Student Services Office in the College of Education (Room 1204 Benjamin). The Student Services Office also provides a step-by-step graduation toward requirements [guide](#).

The deadline to apply for graduation is the 10th day of class of the semester in which a student intends to graduate. This deadline refers to the graduation application only; it does not indicate the deadline for the dissertation defense. Important dates for the dissertation defense and deposit are set each semester by the Graduate School and are distributed by the Department’s Coordinator of Graduate Studies (CG). Because these dates vary, scholars should consult the Graduate School’s academic calendar and review the departmental announcements sent at the beginning of each semester. All outstanding accounts due to the University must be paid in full before the degree will be conferred. This includes such items as late registration fees, library fines, parking tickets, as well as the diploma fee. Neither the diploma nor any transcripts will be issued until outstanding bills are settled. If the student does not graduate as planned, they must apply for the diploma again when they are able to graduate. Academic regalia (robe and cap) are required for all candidates at graduation and scholars must place the order.

Submission of Forms and Deadlines

When in doubt about a form or a specific deadline, contact Ms. Carol Scott, cscott18@umd.edu, Coordinator of CHSE Graduate Programs.

The [College of Education, Graduate Studies Office](#) provides documentation to the Graduate School that each graduating student has met all graduation requirements. [The Graduate School](#) official clearance office and must receive forms in support of graduation from the College of Education. Allow extra time to acquire the necessary signatures, in order to meet deadlines. All required forms are available on-line in a printable format. In order to graduate, scholars must meet the requirements and adhere to the policies of the admitted program, the department, the College of Education, and the Graduate School, and must meet published deadlines. The College of Education and the department may set regulations and requirements above and beyond Graduate School requirements.

Post-Graduation Assessments

Once a scholar has submitted the dissertation electronically, the UMD Graduate School requires them to complete a short survey that is confidential. The [UMD Doctoral Experience Survey](#), conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, is used to improve and enhance the doctoral

student experience at UMD. In addition, the Special Education Graduate Committee sends out a short Exit survey by email one year after the student exits the programs. The Special Education doctoral program Exit Survey is designed to collect information on the individual's post-graduate employment and to solicit feedback regarding the strengths and needs of the PhD program.

Beyond Coursework: Expectations & Guidelines

Active Participation

Advising Meetings

Scholars should meet at least quarterly with their advisors to plan coursework, review their portfolio, and discuss long-term goals. The content of these meetings is meant to be consultative regarding future planning and evaluative in terms of scholars' experiences and competencies to date. These quarterly meetings are to be formative in nature, and evaluation is designed to improve the scholar's skills. It is expected that the scholars will contact their advisor to schedule these meetings at both parties' convenience.

Scholar Meetings

Regular scholar meetings occur during the Fall and Spring semesters. Scholars are expected to attend all scheduled meetings unless they are traveling or have some other unavoidable conflict. The intent of the scholar meetings is to provide opportunities to connect outside of class, discuss program requirements, and receive didactic instruction on a topic (e.g., academic writing, conference presentations, job search).

Communication Expectations

Scholars are expected to be responsive to emails from faculty. To facilitate communication, scholars should respond to emails from their instructors, supervisors, and academic advisors within 2 days of receipt (during business hours: 8am-5pm, M-F). Scholars should also be proactive about their course of study and any questions about the program by contacting their advisor as needed.

Expressing Programming Grievances or Concerns

Your advisor should be someone who holds rank in the special education program and someone with whom you share a common research interest or methodological practice. If you are looking to change your advisor, you must complete the [Office of Student Services Graduate Studies Advisor Change Request Form](#)

Authorship and APA-Related Guidelines

Scholars should have first authorship on manuscripts based on their dissertations. Faculty will facilitate a fair and transparent process of determining order of authorship on collaborative research projects with scholars; discussions regarding authorship will ideally occur early in and throughout the research process (see APA Ethical Code, 2017, 8.12)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidelines

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to transform how we teach and conduct research. However, there are inherent limitations as well as concerns with AI. For example, concerns may include ethical and privacy issues, potential bias, and environmental impact. The special education faculty members expect scholars to adhere to the [University of Maryland's AI guidelines](#) as well as the Guidelines outlined in this handbook. We highlight recommend all students complete UMD's Teaching and Learning Transformation Center's [Artificial Intelligence and Information Literacy](#) course.

Special Education Coursework

The following policy was adapted from the University of Maryland AI Guidelines and Harvard AI Code of Conduct:

Instructors will establish course-specific AI guidelines that define the appropriate use of generative AI tools in their syllabus or assignment instructions. If not, scholars should assume that using generative AI tools to complete course assignments and assessments is not allowed.

For any assignment in which generative AI tools were used (always and only in accordance with the policy specified for the course or the particular assignment), scholars must include, in addition to a traditional bibliography, a written page entitled "explanation of AI tool use" that contains a description of which tools were used (e.g., UMD's TerpAI, ChatGPT, DALL-E), how each tool was used (such as in ideation, research, analysis, editing, debugging, etc.), the specific prompts entered into the model(s), how model outputs were evaluated, and whether and where model outputs were used in the work that was submitted.

Special Education Dissertation

It is the responsibility of the advisory committee to review and evaluate the thesis or dissertation as a representation of a student's individual effort. As such, the use of generative AI in theses and dissertations is considered unauthorized assistance per the Academic Code of Honesty and is prohibited unless specifically authorized by members of the advisory committee for use within the approved scope. If approved by the advisory committee, the extent of generative AI usage should be disclosed in a statement within the thesis or dissertation.

Special Education Research & Peer Review

Artificial Intelligence (AI) may not be permitted under certain circumstances such as completing article/manuscript reviews. Doing so may be a violation of the Institutional Review Board or journal review standards (see [Committee on Publication Ethics](#)). For example, you should not upload a data set, manuscript, or any part of it into a Generative AI tool, as there is no guarantee of where materials are being sent, saved, or viewed or how they may be used in the future, and this may violate the authors' confidentiality, proprietary and/or data privacy rights. It may also violate the terms of use of the Generative AI tool.

If you opt to use generative AI, you should always declare your use of AI in your writing, literature searches, and even when you are refining the language of your papers. You should be explicit in the Method section. Authors should detail specifically the prompts, the platform they used, when they did it, and how many iterations you went through (and any refinements they made). You should consider declaring this in your cover letter as well as in the body of your paper

List of Key UMD Websites and Resources

This is not an exhaustive list, rather it is a starting point for you to begin a search. If you have questions, please reach out to your advisor or the [Special Education Director of Graduate Studies \(DGS\)](#).

College of Education

[College of Education](#)
[Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education \(CHSE\)](#)
[Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education Faculty](#)
[Graduate Student College of Education Forms](#)
[Graduate Student Organization](#)
[International Student Graduate Policy](#)
[Counseling, Higher Education, and Special Education Graduate Student Association](#)

Dissertation

[Electronic Dissertation](#)
[Electronic Dissertation Style Guide](#)
[Graduation Overview](#)

Graduate School

[Graduate School Policies](#)
[Graduate School Catalog](#)
[Graduate School Catalog Academic Policies for Graduate Students](#)
[Graduate School Catalog Admissions Policies](#)
[Graduate Student College of Education Forms](#)
[Graduate Student General Forms](#)
[Graduate School International Student Supports](#)
[Graduate Student Parental Accommodation Policy](#)
[Graduate School Writing Resources](#)
[Graduate School Student Services](#)

Graduation

[Commencement Regalia](#)
[Doctoral Experience Survey](#)
[Graduation Overview](#)

Research & Writing

[APA Style](#)
[CITI Training – IRB](#)
[Citing generative AI in APA Style: Part 1—Reference formats](#)
[Student Paper Setup Guide, APA Style](#)
[Guidelines for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence \(GenAI\) Tools at UMD](#)

Student Resources, Family Care Resources and Other Supports

[Campus Child Development Center](#)
[Campus General Needs Assistance](#)
[Center for Young Children](#)
[Determination of In-State Status](#)

[Division of Information Technology](#)

[Family Care Resources](#)

[Graduate Student Parental Accommodation Policy](#)

[Housing, Long-Term](#)

[Immunization Form](#)

[International Student Supports](#)

[Leave of Absence Policy](#)

[Residency Classification](#)

[Thrive Center](#) - Provides resources, support, and programs to address: food insecurity, housing insecurity/homelessness, financial wellness, and specialized support for first-generation students.

[UMD Counseling Center](#) -If you feel you are encountering problems that hamper your academic performance or life on campus, contact the Counseling Center 301-314-7651 or Mental Health Services 301-314-HELP for resources or referrals or visit their website.

Appendix A. Annual Review - Year 2 (Early Assessment)

Directions: The intention is to provide information that should be used in formative evaluations scholars. Prior to the final advising meeting of the year (e.g., May), the scholar and advisor should independently complete this form. Then during the meeting, the scholar and advisor will discuss the ratings, identify areas of strength, as well as areas to strengthen. Once completed, advisors will upload a signed copy of this form on Box by November 15.



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

**TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD**

Annual Review - Year 2

Scholar Name:

Advisor:

Date:

Primary Area(s) of Interest:

Part 1: Scholar Self-Report

Research accomplishments:

Conference or internal presentations (APA Citation):

Papers submitted or published (APA Citation):

Teaching experiences:

Disciplinary Knowledge

Please complete the table below with information about which required classes you took and what grades you received in those classes.

Course Number	Course Name	Semester Completed	Grade

Evidence Synthesis Paper

Please describe your progress on your evidence synthesis. Have you chosen a topic? Have you begun your literature search? Have you begun critiquing studies?

Leadership and Professional Knowledge

Please list and describe leadership or professional activities in which you participated during the past year. These might include teaching or internship experiences or service opportunities (e.g., conducting professional development at a school, leadership position in a campus student organization).

Part 2. Scholar Self-Assessment: Please evaluate yourself on each of the following areas.

1. Accomplishment of assigned tasks	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
2. APA scholarly writing and publishing principles	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
3. Attendance and punctuality	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
4. Communication (oral and written) skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
5. Professional attitude and demeanor	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
6. Quality of relationships and teamwork	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
7. Quality of presentation skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
8. Receptiveness and responsiveness to feedback	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
9. Scholar exhibited growth as a professional educator, scholar, and/or researcher.	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
10. Overall performance	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations

***If an item was rated as *approaching expectations* or *often meets expectations*, please share your thoughts as well as strategies for improvement.**

Part 3. Advisory Assessment of Scholar

1. Accomplishment of assigned tasks	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
2. APA scholarly writing and publishing principles	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
3. Attendance and punctuality	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
4. Communication (oral and written) skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
5. Professional attitude and demeanor	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
6. Quality of relationships and teamwork	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
7. Quality of presentation skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
8. Receptiveness and responsiveness to feedback	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
9. Scholar exhibited growth as a professional educator, scholar, and/or researcher.	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
10. Overall performance	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations

Part 4. Advisor Feedback

Areas of Strength/Accomplishments:

Suggestions (share notes on academic progress, goals, teaching opportunities, resources):

List unfinished or ongoing projects or assignments from advisor (if not applicable, use N/A).

Part 5: Collaborative Goal Setting Based on Parts 1-4

	Immediate (within the next month)	Midterm (next semester)	Long-Term (1+ years out)
Disciplinary Knowledge			
Teaching			
Leadership and Service in Special Education			
Research			
Other			

Scholar's Signature & Date

Faculty Advisor's Signature & Date

Appendix B. Annual Review - Years 3 and 4 (Mid/Late Assessments)

Directions: The intention is to provide information that should be used in formative evaluations of scholars. Prior to the final advising meeting of the year (e.g., May), the scholar and advisor should independently complete this form. Then during the meeting, the scholar and advisor will discuss the ratings, identify areas of strength, as well as areas to strengthen. Once completed, the advisor will upload a signed copy of this form on Box



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD

Annual Review - Years 3 and 4

Scholar Name:

Advisor:

Date:

Primary Area(s) of Interest:

Part 1: Scholar Self-Report

Research Accomplishments:

Please list and briefly describe the research and scholarship activities in which you have participated during the past year. Also, please attach your CV highlighting the publications, presentations, and workshops that you have completed or have had in progress during the past year.

Please describe your progress on the empirical studies in your dissertation. Have you completed your proposal? Have you begun collecting data? Have you begun analyzing data? Have you begun writing your first empirical? Have you begun writing your second empirical paper?

Disciplinary Knowledge

Please describe your progress on the evidence synthesis in your dissertation. Have you updated your synthesis since you advanced to candidacy? Have you responded to faculty feedback from your comprehensive portfolio committee?

Leadership and Professional Knowledge

Please list and describe leadership or professional activities in which you participated during the past year. These might include teaching or internship experiences or service opportunities (e.g., conducting professional development at a school, leadership position in a campus student organization).

Part 2. Scholar Self-Assessment: Please evaluate yourself on each of the following areas.

1. Accomplishment of assigned tasks	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
2. APA scholarly writing and publishing principles	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
3. Attendance and punctuality	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
4. Communication (oral and written) skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
5. Professional attitude and demeanor	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
6. Quality of relationships and teamwork	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
7. Quality of presentation skills	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
8. Receptiveness and responsiveness to feedback	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
9. Scholar exhibited growth as a professional educator, scholar, and/or researcher.	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
10. Research Accomplishments (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
11. Disciplinary Knowledge (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
12. Leadership (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
13. Overall Performance	Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations

***If an item was rated as *approaching expectations* or *often meets expectations*, please share your thoughts as well as strategies for improvement**

Part 3. Advisory Assessment of Scholar**1. Accomplishment of assigned tasks**

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

2. APA scholarly writing and publishing principles

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

3. Attendance and punctuality

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

4. Communication (oral and written) skills

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

5. Professional attitude and demeanor

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

6. Quality of relationships and teamwork

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

7. Quality of presentation skills

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

8. Receptiveness and responsiveness to feedback

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

9. Scholar exhibited growth as a professional educator, scholar, and/or researcher.

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

10. Research Accomplishments (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

11. Disciplinary Knowledge (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

12. Leadership (see Part 1 of the Scholar Self-Report)

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

13. Overall Performance

Exceeds expectations	Consistently meets expectations	Sometime meets expectations	Never meets expectations
----------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

Part 4. Advisor Feedback

Areas of Strength/Accomplishments:

Suggestions (share notes on academic progress, goals, teaching opportunities, resources):

List unfinished or ongoing projects or assignments from advisor (if not applicable, use N/A).

Part 5: Collaborative Goal Setting Based on Parts 1-4

	Immediate (within the next month)	Midterm (next semester)	Long-Term (1+ years out)
Disciplinary Knowledge			
Teaching			
Leadership and Service in Special Education			
Research			
Other			

Scholar's Signature & Date

Faculty Advisor's Signature & Date

Appendix C. Supervised Research, Policy, or Practice Internship Forms

Directions: Scholar, advisor, and the organization point of contact will complete each form at the start, middle, and end of the internship. Once completed, the advisor will upload a signed copy on Box.



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD

Internship Goal Description Form

Scholar name:

Description of duties:

Responsibilities/Goal 1

Responsibilities/Goal 2

Responsibilities/Goal 3

Responsibilities/Goal 4

Responsibilities/Goal 5

Scholar's Signature & Date

Professional Organization's Signature & Date

Faculty Advisor's Signature & Date



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD

Internship Progress Report

Scholar name:

Date:

Advisor:

Summer Internship location/position:

The following section should be filled out by the UMD advisor, Professional Organization Point of Contact, and Scholar.

Responsibilities/Goal 1:

Progress Check #1: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #1: Comments/Action Plan

Progress Check #2: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #2: Comments/Action Plan

Responsibilities/Goal 2:

Progress Check #1: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #1: Comments/Action Plan

Progress Check #2: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #2: Comments/Action Plan

Responsibilities/Goal 3:

Progress Check #1: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #1: Comments/Action Plan

Progress Check #2: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #2: Comments/Action Plan

Responsibilities/Goal 4:

Progress Check #1: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #1: Comments/Action Plan

Progress Check #2: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #2: Comments/Action Plan

Responsibilities/Goal 5:

Progress Check #1: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #1: Comments/Action Plan

Progress Check #2: Rating: Meets, Approaches, or Does not meet expectations

Progress Check #2: Comments/Action Plan

The following section should be filled out by the Professional Organization Point of Contact at the end of the internship experience:

Overall Rating: Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Scholar's Signature & Date

Professional Organization's Signature & Date

Faculty Advisor's Signature & Date



COLLEGE OF
EDUCATION

TRANSFORMING
EDUCATION FOR GOOD

Post-Internship Evaluation

Advisor and scholar will respond to the prompts below.

- Dates of activity:
 - *Title and Description:*
 - *Report from Internship:*
-

Scholar's Signature & Date

Professional Organization's Signature & Date

Faculty Advisor's Signature & Date

Appendix D. Comprehensive Portfolio Review

Comprehensive Portfolio Review Checklist

Date Submitted to Director of Graduate Studies in Special Education:

Dear EDSP Graduate Committee:

I am submitting my Comprehensive Portfolio with my Advisor Approval. I understand that the EDSP Graduate Committee reviews my Portfolio, which includes my CV and three products/evidence of competence (e.g., published articles, submitted manuscripts, etc.),
_____CV

Evaluation of Scholarship and Mastery of Academic Discipline

1. Synthesis Paper:

- Title

If this is a co-authored published journal article, or article submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal.

- Date Submitted/Published/to be Submitted:
- Name of Journal

2. Choice of one or more from the following (only one is required)

- First or co-authored published journal article, manuscript submitted for publication to a peer-reviewed journal, or a manuscript is of publishable quality (i.e., ready to submit following minor revisions) if it is not yet submitted.
 - ☐ Date Submitted/Published/to be Submitted:
 - Title:
- First or co-authored published chapter, or chapter submitted for publication. Chapters should be published in reputable academic publishing houses or university presses.
 - ☐ Date Submitted/Published/to be Submitted:
 - Title:
- First or co-authored policy paper or brief published or submitted for publication.
 - ☐ Date Submitted/Published/to be Submitted:
 - Title:

Evaluation of Professional Practice

3. Choice of one or more from the following (only one is required)

- Research, Policy or Practice Internship: Description of agency, grant, or study, my responsibilities, products if applicable, and evaluation of my participation.
 - ☐ Dates of activity:
 - *Title of Description*
- First or co-authored conference oral or presentation. For both oral and poster presentations, students should also submit a copy of their submitted conference proposal.
 - ☐ Date Submitted/Presented
 - *Title:*
- Grant proposal including grant proposal for a research project; proposal to obtain support for one's dissertation work; proposal for personnel preparation grants; proposal for research. Rules for co-authorship are as above for papers or chapters (or faculty member attests to the components completed by the student). The student's advisor determines the appropriateness of the granting agency.
 - In Preparation (include due date for proposal):
 - Date Submitted:
 - *Title:*
- Internship, Examples include: Membership and service to a professional organization; service to a departmental, college, or campus committee; service in a community organization; evaluation from internship experience; and professional development activity for organization or school system
 - ☐ Dates of activity:
 - *Title and Description:*
 - *Report from Internship*

Student's Signature:

Advisor's Signature:

Rubric for Comprehensive Portfolio Review

Date:

Candidate Name:

Name of the Examining Committee Members:

Criterion	Meets	Does not Meet
Criteria used to judge the synthesis paper (written) include:		
Has the student clearly described the process for the literature search included in the synthesis?		
Has the student critically synthesized the body of literature that supports the research problem or void in the extant literature?		
Has the student clearly described the purpose of the synthesis for the reader and linked that purpose/need to gaps in the literature?		
Has the student reviewed the appropriate literature and research in enough detail so that the reader can understand what is known about the topic and what gaps/limitations are apparent in the research?		
Has the student developed and clearly stated a research question as a result of the synthesis		
Has the student prepared a manuscript of publishable quality that follows the guidelines for a specific journal in the field? Publishable quality is defined as the synthesis paper being ready for submission, requiring only minor suggestions from the committee (but not at the journal's "revise and resubmit" decision level).		
The requirements for clarity of expression, quality of work and methodology, and originality are at the level of the journal		

Overall Assessment: Overall performance of the candidate based on the evidence provided above.

_____ Satisfactory (Student has addressed the criteria satisfactorily, comments provided)

_____ Revise and Resubmit (Comments and recommendations) provided

In the event the student receives a rating of Unsatisfactory on the paper, it is returned to the student for revisions with specific recommendations from the Graduate Committee. Students are given **one chance to revise and resubmit** the paper within **six weeks** of the first review along with a letter explaining how the recommendations have been followed.

Criterion	Meets	Does not Meet
Criteria to Evaluate Paper Submitted for the Evaluation of Scholarship		
The paper submitted as part of the evaluation of scholarship is either published, submitted, or of publishable quality if it is not yet submitted. Publishable quality is defined as the paper being ready for submission, requiring only minor suggestions from the committee (but not at the journal's "revise and resubmit" decision level).		
Criteria to Evaluate Oral Exam for Comprehensive Portfolio Review		
Oral presentation of synthesis paper includes: • Clear statement of purpose of the research, • Clear research questions that allow student to address the purpose of research • Summary of major points in the body of literature • Summary of gaps in the literature for this topic • Summary of ideas for research designs that will contribute meaningful data to the field. • Student demonstrates evidence of analytical and integrative thinking in reflecting on the program at the end of coursework, especially with respect to upcoming dissertation work integrity and ethical practice.		

Oral presentation includes a brief review of the student's goal for the program and future employment. Students are able to reflect upon different activities, consider his or her own products and experiences during coursework, and reflect on progress to date in the program. This can include service, research, and teaching experiences		
Oral presentation includes a brief review of other optional items submitted for the Comprehensive Review Portfolio. The student demonstrates the ability to interact with the graduate committee regarding descriptions or reasons for including materials from the list of optional items included in the Comprehensive Review Portfolio.		

___ **Satisfactory: The student has demonstrated readiness to proceed to the dissertation phase of the program.** The student is ready to enroll in EDSP 899 Dissertation Research and proceed with his or her plan for research.

___ **Unsatisfactory: The student has not demonstrated readiness to proceed to the dissertation phase of the program** (specific recommendations for modifications or additional work are provided by the committee). The student has one opportunity to make revisions and schedule a **second meeting no later than six months from the date of the first meeting.** The student will attend to all required actions taken by the committee and provide a checklist that verifies how these actions have been completed. *If the student does not pass the second Comprehensive Portfolio Review, his or her program will be terminated.*

Appendix E. Rubric for Dissertation Proposal (Written & Oral Presentation)

Date:

Candidate Name:

Names of the Examining Committee Member:

Criterion	Meets	Does not Meet
Problem Definition: Provides an introductory chapter that includes: (a) statement of the problem encompasses all three papers: (b) summary of the most relevant literature reviewed in the synthesis (i.e., a systematic and critical review of the literature base relevant to the problem addressed in the dissertation), (c) theoretical framework, and (d) overview of the three papers to be presented in the dissertation.		
Synthesis: A full draft of the first paper		
Partial drafts of the other papers (i.e., the empirical studies, or policy or practitioner paper) that include, at a minimum, (a) rationale for each study, (b) research question(s) for each study, (c) proposed methods and analyses for each study.		
Presentation: Oral presentation (approximately 15- 20 minutes) on the purpose, significance of the research, methods, and literature reviewed. The student's ability to respond to oral questions is key to passing the proposal meeting.		
Broader Impact: Demonstrates awareness of broader implications of the research; discusses results in terms of implications for field, research		
Critical Thinking: Demonstrates capacity for independent research in the area of study; ability to make original contributions to the field		
Quality of Written Communication: Dissertation is professionally written; APA style is followed		

Overall Assessment: Overall performance of the candidate based on the evidence provided above.

_____ Pass

_____ Revise and Resubmit (Comments and Suggestions Attached or in Proposal)

_____ Does Not Pass

Appendix F. Rubric for Final Dissertation Defense (Written & Oral Presentation)

Candidate Name:

Date:

Names of the Examining Committee Members:

Criterion	Meets	Does not Meet
Part 1 – Public presentation by candidate: The candidate summarizes main aspects of the research reported in the dissertation in a summary of the dissertation, emphasizing the important results and explaining the reasoning that led to the conclusions reached. The audience (if present) is permitted to ask questions (Chair of the Dissertation Examining Committee has the discretion to decide whether such questions are germane to the topic of the dissertation and how much time will be allotted for the answers).		
Part 2 – Formal examination of the candidate by the Dissertation Examination Committee. The chair invites questions in turn from each member of the Dissertation Examining Committee. The questioning may continue as long as the Dissertation Examining Committee feels that it is necessary and reasonable for the proper examination of the student. The candidate is evaluated regarding his or her ability to respond to questions from the Committee about the research reported in the dissertation.		
Quality of Written Document Written product addresses criteria outlined in the proposal. APA style is followed.		

Conclusion: The committee has the following options:

- To accept the dissertation without any recommended changes and sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To accept the dissertation with recommendations for changes and, except for the chair, sign the Report of the Examining Committee. The chair will check that the changes to the dissertation have been made, and, upon his or her approval, sign the Report of the Examining Committee.

- To recommend revisions to the dissertation and not sign the Report of Examining Committee until the student has made the changes and submitted the revised dissertation for the Dissertation Examining Committee's approval. The Dissertation Examining Committee members sign the Report of Examining Committee if they approve the revised dissertation.
- To recommend revisions and convene a second meeting of the Dissertation Examining Committee to review the dissertation and complete the student's examination.

To rule the dissertation (including its examination) unsatisfactory. In that circumstance, the student fails. Following the examination, the chair, in the presence of the Dean's Representative, must inform the student of the outcome of the examination. The chair and the Dean's Representative both sign a Report of the Examining Committee indicating which of the above alternatives has been adopted. A copy of this statement is to be included in the student's file at the graduate program office, and a copy is given to the student