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Dear Doctor of Education Students:

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Doctor of Education program at the Johns Hopkins University School of Education.

You should take pride in your outstanding record that has made your admission to our program possible. We are confident that our rich learning environment will allow you to continue to excel in your academic and personal goals and that you will make a valuable contribution to our school’s tradition of scholarship, leadership, and service. As a Johns Hopkins student, you are a member of a remarkable learning community at one of the most renowned institutions in the world.

The EdD program faculty have developed this comprehensive handbook to guide you through the program. Please review this handbook carefully as it will answer many questions that you may encounter as you embark on this professional and personal venture. Additional details about the school, as well as resources for students, can be found on our website at: http://students.education.jhu.edu/studentaffairs/

Our faculty and staff join me in congratulating you on your admission and in extending our best wishes for your future success in our program. We appreciate your interest in the Johns Hopkins University, and we are looking forward to having you join our community of scholars.

Sincerely yours,

Mariale Hardiman, EdD
Interim Dean and Vice Dean, Academic Affairs
Johns Hopkins University Mission Statement

The mission of Johns Hopkins University is to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world. These are captured in the Ten by Twenty: Ten Goals for Johns Hopkins University for the Year 2020¹ to which each university division aligns its goals.

The School of Education (SOE) addresses this mission through its core values, vision, and Conceptual Framework (see Appendix A). The vision of the SOE² uniquely addresses the university mission.

Core Values of the School of Education

To achieve its mission, SOE faculty, staff, and students uphold and promote the following core values:

- **Innovation (in discovery, scholarship, leadership, and application):** As members of a university community known preeminently for research and its application, we challenge ourselves to create and test new approaches to the educational needs of our schools and communities, as well as in our own administrative and student support systems.

- **Excellence:** As reflective practitioners, we engage in regular self-assessment and invite external peer reviews to drive the continuous improvement of our academic programs, research activities, and administrative systems.

- **Collaboration and Partnerships:** We believe that multidisciplinary and interinstitutional teams, including other schools within Johns Hopkins and public school systems, provide the range of perspectives required to address the most challenging issues facing PK-12 schools and communities.

- **Evidence-Based Practice:** Research and its application and evaluation form an iterative cycle that guides informed practice in our program development, policy formulation, and school reform initiatives. So, too, evidence-based decision making shapes our internal activities such as student and financial services.

- **Integrity:** One hundred years of continuous service to our region's public schools and urban neighborhoods has earned us a reputation as a trustworthy partner in enhancing the quality of life for children, youth, and adults. By continuing to focus our actions and decisions on the students, schools, and communities we serve, we will sustain this primary commitment.

- **Civility and Diversity (in people, thought, and practice):** Civility and diversity are processes that form the warp and weft of our school community, weaving together the multiplicity of perspectives and experiences that enhance all our work.

Vision of the School of Education

The Johns Hopkins University SOE will lead the world in attracting the most talented and diverse individuals into the fields of education, counseling, and public safety. We will guarantee educational

---

¹ Ten by Twenty: [http://web.jhu.edu/administration/president/10x20](http://web.jhu.edu/administration/president/10x20)
² School of Education Vision: [http://education.jhu.edu/aboutus/mission.html](http://education.jhu.edu/aboutus/mission.html)
improvement and community well-being by assuring that our students, and others in the profession, have the most innovative tools and effective approaches to advance learning.

**Mission of the School of Education**

The Johns Hopkins SOE’s mission is to support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth, and adults.

We accomplish this mission through the following initiatives:

- Research
- Teaching
- Program Development
- Leadership and Service
- Partnership Programs

*Appendix A: JHU SOE Conceptual Framework*

**JHU SOE Doctor of Education Program**

**A Brief History**

The JHU SOE has had a Doctor of Education (EdD) degree program for many years. Originally this face-to-face program was structured and functioned as a typical Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) program with the goal of producing scholars for the professorate. In 2012, the decision was made to develop two distinct programs, a PhD, which remained as a face-to-face program, and an EdD, which was developed as an online doctoral program for practitioners. During the fall of 2012, a committee used the Carnegie Project on the Educational Doctorate (CPED, http://cpedinitiative.org) guidelines as a foundation in developing a new vision of an EdD program focused on practice. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the initiative, the shift in emphasis from the previous EdD caused the program to be more modern, more explicitly connected to the work of educators and leaders, and different from coursework in any PhD program. Additionally, the program was conceived to be delivered entirely online to reach a broad-based group of talented individuals who may not find a traditional program accessible.

**Overview**

The JHU SOE faculty offers this innovative and dynamic EdD program to address the dramatically changing landscape of education in the 21st century. This online, part-time, cohort-based EdD program is designed to prepare an exceptional corps of practitioner-scholars—educational leaders—for a wide variety of professional positions, both nationally and internationally. Graduates of the program attain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to examine educational issues deeply and effect meaningful change in preK-16 educational organizations. The graduates are prepared to set a high standard for transformational leadership in education, apply evidence-based practices to improve educational outcomes, and meet the vast challenges associated with improving learning outcomes in both public and private educational environments. Admission to

---


4 Appendices are ordered as they are found in the EdD Faculty Handbook for consistency. They are not ordered consecutively in the EdD Student Handbook.
the doctoral program is highly competitive and limited to highly qualified individuals who matriculate as members of a cohort. Candidates are expected to possess substantial knowledge, successful experience in educational settings, and high levels of professionalism upon admission.

The overarching goal of the JHU EdD program is to develop practitioner-scholars who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to examine significant educational problems and to design, implement, and rigorously evaluate effective educational interventions to affect change in the educational endeavor. Upon completion of the EdD, we expect each graduate to support the continued creation of new areas of practitioner-focused scholarship as well as promote an increase in the utilization of research findings in professional practice. Specifically, we expect graduates to:

- Participate in a diverse community of educational practice.
- Contribute to the public discourse on improvement of education.
- Engage in and promote evidence-based practices through the application of rigorous methodology.
- Link high quality education research to policy and practice.
- Provide leadership in their education context by applying advanced theoretical perspectives to problems of practice.
- Develop mutually beneficial partnerships between public and private interests.
- Lead innovative education policy.
- Implement inclusive and socially just policies, practices, and organizational change processes.

Academic preparation within the EdD program is grounded in a fusion of both research and practice. Research competencies for candidates include critiquing and integrating research results reported in the literature; examining a significant Problem of Practice (POP) through extant literature as well as empirically within one’s context of professional practice; independently designing and implementing an intervention; and conducting, analyzing, interpreting findings, reporting, and disseminating the results of their program evaluation. In addition to successfully completing all coursework requirements (Program of Study), candidates must also satisfy written and oral assessments that document attainment of competencies and an applied dissertation.

Because the EdD program is designed specifically for the practing educator, GREs are not required for admission to the program. However, other measures of the candidate’s readiness for doctoral-level work are considered as the coursework is rigorous and candidate selection is highly competitive. Students admitted to the EdD program have been identified for potential success based on previous academic success in rigorous undergraduate and graduate coursework, a well-articulated POP that aligns with the expertise of JHU faculty, and at least three years of professional experience within their professional context. Please refer to the program website at http://education.jhu.edu/Academics/doctoral/EdD/ for additional information.
Membership in the Carnegie Project on the Educational Doctorate (CPED)

The JHU SOE EdD program is a member of the CPED consortium of more than 85 colleges and schools of education worldwide. CPED is a national effort spearheaded by Lee Shulman and positioned to prepare practitioner-scholars to apply their practice to generate new knowledge and become informed experts who guide the profession to new achievements. As a group, CPED members work collaboratively to critically examine and strengthen the EdD program through testing, refining, discussing, providing feedback, and validating successful practices through joint conversations at semiannual convenings and research projects.

Visit the CPED website for further details: http://cpedinitiative.org

Program Leadership and Administration

EdD Director

Stephen Pape  Stephen.pape@jhu.edu
Website -  http://education.jhu.edu/faculty/SOE_Faculty/stephen-pape

Janet Mason - Senior Academic Program Coordinator  janet.Mason@jhu.edu

Ms. Mason answers questions about the following:
  • Documentation of comprehensive examinations, proposals, and dissertation defense
  • Graduation clearance

Qivon Annan - Administrative Coordinator  qannan1@jhu.edu

Ms. Annan works with the EdD Director in the following program management efforts:
  • Providing administrative support to the Director
  • Maintaining the Director's calendar (Please contact Ms. Annan to schedule an appointment with the Director.)
  • Managing special projects and data analysis

Cathy Cao - Program Coordinator  cathy.cao@jhu.edu

The Program Coordinator responds to questions about student records and course registration including the following:
  • Inquiries from potential students
  • Admissions process
  • Orientation/residency
  • Prerequisite tasks prior to first semester registration
  • Program plans/courses per semester
  • Scholarship awards
  • Current student issues

Students may contact the following offices for information related to these services:
  • Records & Registration (410-516-9816 or soe.registration@jhu.edu)
Program Requirements

The EdD program requires candidates to complete ninety (90) credit hours beyond the bachelor’s degree. Students enter the program with a master’s degree typically comprising a minimum of 36 graduate-level credits, which are automatically transferred into the EdD program. While the program was developed for students to complete in three years, students who opt for a longer duration may take up to five years to complete the program coursework. Students are required to complete their dissertation within seven years of entering the program.

The 2017 cohort will pursue a hybrid program. Candidates may pursue the three-year typical program, or they may pursue a combination of courses to fulfill the new (2018 cohort) program. Students who wish to pursue the doctorate in four or five years can work with their advisers to determine an appropriate program of study.

Note: Students must enroll for a minimum of 4.5 credits each semester to be eligible for federal financial aid. Financial aid information can be found on the following website http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/financial/

Students who do not have the required 36 master’s credits may be admitted on a conditional basis and must complete the additional graduate-level credits at an accredited college or university. These missing credits should be completed prior to beginning the program. Students with post-master’s graduate credit completed prior to program admission in related education content may petition for an additional 6 transfer credits by completing a Petition for Course Transfer Form (Appendix B). Transfer credit will only be given when content closely matches the EdD course at the appropriate level of rigor. All transfer credit must be approved by the EdD Director by the spring semester of the student's first year of doctoral study, otherwise the student is responsible for completing all courses in the course plan. Students are responsible for the content of the transfer courses on all program assessments (e.g., comprehensive examination).

Appendix B: Petition for Course Transfer Form

Please refer to the Example Program of Study for details of the coursework and length of program (Appendix C).

2016 Cohort or Earlier Program of Study

Students admitted into the 2016 cohort or earlier will follow the course plan below:

- CORE 1 - Science of Learning (12 credit hours)
- CORE 2 - Educational Organizations, Contexts, and Systems (12 credit hours)
- CORE 3 - Applied Research and Evaluation (9 credit hours)
- Area of Specialization (12 credit hours)
• Applied Dissertation (9 credit hours)

2017 Cohort Program of Study

The following coursework components are required beginning with the 2017 cohort. Students in the 2017 cohort may opt for the three-year program (see below) or transition to the new extended course format.

- Foundations of Education (12 credits + electives)
- Applied Research and Evaluation (9 credit hours)
- Specialization Area (12 credit hours + electives)
- Applied Dissertation (9 credit hours)

Students pursue an Area of Specialization from broad areas of study including the following:

Educational Contexts and Leadership (ECL)
Entrepreneurial Leadership in Education (ELE)
Urban Leadership (URB)
Mind, Brain, and Teaching (MBT)
Technology Integration in K16 Education (TechK16)
Higher Education (under consideration)

Appendix C: Example Program of Study
Appendix AA: Program Plan 2017

Program Coherence and Integration

Program coherence is critical to successful completion of the three-year doctoral program. There are several ways that the JHU SOE EdD program was built to ensure coherence. First, course content within the core areas introduces common topics iteratively. Second, students develop the foundation for their dissertation within the coursework. Third, program competencies have been integrated within the courses. Candidates provide evidence of achieving these competencies each summer through their work toward dissertation completion. To illustrate the integrated nature of the program, we highlight the learning trajectory across the three-year program in the following paragraphs.

While candidates come to the program with an articulated POP, the focus of Year One is to refine the POP into a researchable question(s). During the first year of their doctoral studies, students participate in two courses in which they examine educational issues including their POP from various disciplinary perspectives. In the Multiple Perspectives on Learning and Teaching course, candidates focus on psychological theories that broadly illuminate our understanding of how people learn. The Disciplinary Approaches to Education course challenges students to investigate educational issues from anthropological, historical, economic, and sociological perspectives. Students also take two courses that focus on examining educational problems. In Contemporary Approaches to Educational Problems, students are introduced to Improvement Sciences (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2015) as they learn to critically analyze research. Students also begin to build their knowledge of the research process through the online summer orientation and continue this learning within Research Methods and Systematic Inquiry I. In this course as well as during the summer dissertation credits during the summer, students empirically examine the
factors associated with and underlying causes for the POP within their context of professional practice. Students gather empirical evidence, through systematic observation, existing data analysis, or the collection of new data (if appropriate), to describe the POP within their context of professional practice and to understand how the factors/causes are functioning within their context. The synthesis of the literature developed during the first year of the program and the empirical examination of the context of professional practice (i.e., the needs assessment study) are the initial components for a student's Year One paper.

Students generally take 1–2 core courses during the summer semester. These courses may include an elective course. Students in specific specializations are encouraged to take the initial core course for their area of specialization, if available (i.e., MBT - *Mind, Brain Science, and Learning*; ECL - *Leadership in Educational Organizations*, and EdTech - *Technologies & Creative Learning*). In these courses, candidates continue their investigation of the Science of Learning and Educational Organizations, Contexts, and Systems core areas. All students are required to engage in the *Multicultural Education* course.

During the fall of Year 2, candidates begin to specialize within their area of specialization as they focus their efforts on identifying and/or developing a research-based intervention targeted toward impacting one or more factors associated with or underlying causes for the POP. These courses not only focus on a student’s area of specialization but also serve as the context in which they write their literature review for their applied dissertation study. Within the Year 2 research courses, candidates begin to consider how they will document the process of implementing the intervention as well as proximal outcomes of their intervention. The third year continues the focus in a candidate’s area of specialization as the core areas are completed. Candidates complete components of their dissertation within the specialization courses and complete the dissertation during the third summer.

The EdD program faculty are committed to developing an effective structure of support for students while holding them to the highest expectations for doctoral work. Since coursework provides an opportunity for students to begin elements of the dissertation, all faculty play a crucial role in supporting doctoral students to attain their goals for the program. To ensure success, the EdD program expects students to understand the integrated nature of the program while recognizing that the work done in courses is not an immediate dissertation product; further work beyond the semester will always be required to enhance and refine the product for the dissertation based on instructor and adviser feedback.

### Program Transition Points and Key Assignments

Candidates enrolled in the JHU SOE EdD program must successfully meet the requirements of several transition points, which are delineated in Appendix E: *Timeline of Transition Points*. Below is a description of the transition points.

#### Appendix E: Timeline of Transition Points

**Year One Paper**

This paper is a culmination of a student’s examination of the factors associated with and/or underlying causes for the Problem of Practice (POP). This paper represents a deep synthesis of research literature and an empirical study that is conducted within the contexts of professional practice. Students work with their advisers during the summer of Year One to revise, combine, and
enhance the work completed in the Year One courses. Students submit the Year One Paper and must show adequate progress toward Year One program competencies to continue into the fall semester courses. Students who are not successful in this summer project may be required to take a leave of absence. The Year One Paper is submitted to the adviser in August of the summer following Year One coursework completion.

**Year One Self-Assessment Paper**

Students present their Year One Self-Assessment Paper indicating how their work thus far in the program provides evidence of the Year One program competencies and goals. The Year One Self-Assessment Paper is submitted within the Blackboard program site and to the student’s adviser(s) before the completion of the summer term (date TBD based on SOE calendar).

*Year One Self-Assessment Assignment Description (anticipated revision available June 2017)*

**Comprehensive Exams**

The Doctor of Education Program (EdD) requires students to successfully complete an oral comprehensive examination as a transition between Year Two and Year Three coursework. Successfully completing the comprehensive examination is a formal assessment of a student’s readiness to enter the doctoral candidacy and begin his or her dissertation research study.

Typically, this transition point is completed the last week of the summer semester after Year Two courses have been completed. Students are required to orally respond to a minimum of four questions chosen by the Dissertation Advisory Committee (DAC). The DAC proctors the exam, which is scheduled for 2 hours.

There are three possible outcomes for the examination: Pass, Pass with Conditions, or Fail. If the conditions for a Pass with Conditions are not adequately met, the student is deemed to have failed the comprehensive examination and must take the examination again in its entirety.

Students who do not successfully complete the comprehensive exam should not move forward with their dissertation research. Students who do not successfully complete the comprehensive examination in their first attempt will have a second opportunity. If the second opportunity is not successful, the student will be asked to leave the program.

The comprehensive examination should precede the defense of the dissertation proposal. Students who will need to start their interventions and data collection before the end of the summer semester should speak with their advisers about taking the comprehensive examination earlier during the summer semester. These students should avoid a core course during this semester. Please refer to comprehensive examination description below, Appendix J: *Comprehensive Examination Protocol*, Appendix K: *How to Prepare for the Comprehensive Exams*, and Appendix V: *Report of Comprehensive Examination* for details and recommendations on how to prepare for a successful comprehensive examination.

*Appendix J: Comprehensive Examination Protocol*

*Appendix K: How to Prepare for the Comprehensive Exams*

*Appendix V: Report of Comprehensive Examination*
Dissertation Proposal

Following successful completion of the comprehensive examination and prior to submitting an IRB protocol to begin dissertation research, students must successfully complete an oral defense of their dissertation proposal. The dissertation proposal defense is a discussion during which students present the research that has shaped their understanding of the Problem of Practice, the proposed intervention to effectuate some positive change related to problem, and a plan to evaluate the intervention implementation to establish whether change has occurred.

The dissertation proposal is a culminating point in a student’s work over the first two years of the program. The dissertation proposal should consist of Chapters 1–4. Chapter 4 is a proposal for the dissertation study. A student cannot defend the dissertation proposal without the approval of the adviser. Once the adviser agrees that the student is ready to defend the proposal, the student should reach out to the committee members and determine a date and time for the defense. It is the student's responsibility to have a clean copy of the dissertation proposal to each member of the committee no less than two weeks in advance of the defense date.

The Doctoral Advisory Committee (DAC) determines the level of revision required including “minor revisions,” “substantial revision,” or “major revision.” Please refer to the applied dissertation description below, and Appendix L: Applied Dissertation Description, for definitions of these levels of revision. Refer to Appendices G and H for the Defense Protocol and the Approval of Dissertation Proposal Form.

A student is admitted into Doctoral Candidacy when he or she has successfully passed the comprehensive examination and defended his or her dissertation proposal. Students should wait to begin their dissertation study until they have been admitted to candidacy.

Applied Dissertation

Doctoral candidates are expected to demonstrate evidence of proficiency in independent research through the development and conduct of a research project related to a POP focused on the candidate’s context of professional practice. The applied dissertation provides evidence of a doctoral student’s ability and mastery of the skills necessary to frame an important educational issue and develop, implement, and evaluate an intervention. The applied dissertation is comprised of five primary components: (1) an introduction; (2) a clearly articulated, contextualized conceptual framework that depicts the relationships between underlying causes and associated factors within the context of professional practice; (3) an intervention and program evaluation; (4) documentation of the process of implementation; and (5) findings relative to proximal outcomes, analysis, conclusions, and implications for the educational practitioner.

Please refer to the guidelines outlined in Appendix L: Applied Dissertation Description. When the DAC members have approved the dissertation study, the student should facilitate the collection of the committee members’ signatures on the Approval of Dissertation Proposal Form.

Appendix L: Applied Dissertation Description
Dissertation Defense Timeline and Expectations

The final step toward completion of the degree is the defense of the student’s dissertation research. This is a defense of Chapters 1–5 of the dissertation, which should be formatted in accordance with the JHU ETD and APA formatting expectations. The same room and technology reservation protocol as noted in the Dissertation Proposal Defense is followed.

The adviser is the lead reader on the dissertation study. The DAC serves as disciplinary or methodological experts who should be consulted throughout the development of the dissertation study and writing the dissertation, but the adviser should see an initial draft and give several rounds of feedback prior to allowing the student to submit the dissertation to the committee. Students should expect feedback from their advisers within approximately 2 weeks of submitting a draft. See Appendix E: Timeline of Transition Points and Appendix G: Defense Protocol, for further details of the dissertation proposal and dissertation defenses.

Room and Technology Reservation

It is the student’s responsibility to secure the space and technology for the comprehensive examination and dissertation defenses (i.e., proposal and final dissertation). The room reservation and technology protocol is as follows:

1) The student must confirm the approved date/time with the DAC.
2) If the student and other committee members will be present at the defense, the student must email Schedule@jhu.edu and cc the EdD Program Coordinator to request a room at SOE. If a room at the Columbia campus is needed, this should be indicated in the email.
3) If the student or another individual is planning on attending virtually, the student must request by email Room 222 and access to technology for a virtual meeting. Tim Reiss (TCR@jhu.edu) is the contact for requesting technology in the assigned room.
4) The student must confirm this information with the program by sending an email to the Program Coordinator (TBD) with confirmation of the defense date, room, and that technology has been requested.
5) If the date and/or time for the defense is changed, the student must email the following to cancel the room and technology: Schedule@jhu.edu, Cathy Cao (cathy.cao@jhu.edu), and TCR@jhu.edu

Submission of Approved Dissertation

The University requires that students electronically submit their dissertation to the library through the electronic thesis or dissertation (ETD) system. The most up-to-date information is available at http://guides.library.jhu.edu/etd. To graduate in a given semester, the final dissertation with all edits must be submitted through the ETD system before the deadline for final submission. (See the ETD website for the deadline, which varies each semester.)

An electronic thesis or dissertation is a digital version of a student's dissertation that is available to the public via the Internet. The file must be a PDF/A, not a standard PDF. (See the ETD web page for help or attend one of the series of one-hour ETD workshops.)

The dissertation is intellectual property. Copyright is automatic, but registration with the Copyright Office establishes a public record of the copyright claim. To do so, students may register a copyright
with the Copyright Office. Information can be found under "Doctoral Dissertations" on the ETD submission web page.

As of December 1, 2015, the library reinstated a long-standing submission fee for dissertations. This $60 fee may be paid by credit card. Students must pay the ETD fee immediately after submitting the document as the dissertation will not be approved until the library verifies that the fee has been paid.

Appendix G: Defense Protocol

Appendix H: Approval of Dissertation Proposal Form

Appendix I: Dissertation Approval Form

Adviser and Dissertation Advisory Committee

Adviser

The adviser is responsible for guiding the student through candidacy and dissertation requirements, serving as a consistent support person and the main respondent to the chapters for the applied dissertation. The adviser develops a series of checkpoints each semester based on the program timeline (see Appendix E: Timeline of Transition Points).

When applicants are accepted as doctoral students, they are assigned an initial adviser who is typically the Director or another faculty member. The initial adviser helps students navigate orientation and the fall semester of program Year One. During the fall semester, students submit their revised POP statement, which the program faculty uses to match the student with (an) SOE adviser(s). (See Appendix Z: POP Statement Resource (October 15, 2016).

Appendix Z: POP Statement Resource (October 15, 2016)

Selection of Adviser

The selection of adviser, who serves as the Chair of the DAC, is based upon the student’s preferences within programmatic constraints, the shared interests of the student and the faculty member, and the teaching and advising responsibilities of the faculty member. If a student has a specific request for a faculty adviser, the student should notify the program at the time of the POP submission. The program will attempt to honor a student’s request if possible, based on the constraints noted above.

Students receive an email in the late fall/early spring semester suggesting a faculty member to serve as an adviser. Students should quickly schedule a call with the faculty member to discuss their POP and expectations of the advising relationship. After that conversation, if the match is mutually agreeable, the student completes a Change of Adviser/Committee Member Form to confirm the new adviser (see Appendix T). If the pairing is not mutually agreeable, the student must inform the Co-Directors of the EdD program, and the process will continue until the appropriate adviser is selected.
Change of Adviser

Doctoral students seeking a change of adviser at any time during their doctoral studies must inform their current adviser of their decision to request a change. They should then contact the Director to support identification of a new adviser. Once this person agrees to serve as adviser, students complete a Change of Adviser/Committee Member Form (Appendix T) and submit the completed form within the program site in Blackboard. This form must provide a rationale for the change and the signature of the new adviser indicating that he or she is willing to advise the student. A change in adviser must be approved by the program Director.

Appendix T: Change of Adviser/Committee Member Form

Faculty Co-Advisers

There are times when doctoral students are assigned co-advisers. Co-advisers may be in the form of two JHU SOE faculty who are partnering to work with a student due to their complementary expertise. In addition, students with adjunct advisers (i.e., non-JHU SOE faculty) or SOE faculty new to advising in the EdD program are assigned an SOE faculty member as program co-adviser and committee member. The co-adviser is the secondary adviser who supports the process and explains policies that are inherent in the multi-year duration of the relationship. As a member of the DAC, the co-adviser is integral to the development of the dissertation throughout the process.

Doctoral Advisory Committee

The DAC consists of three individuals. The chair or co-chairs of the student’s DAC is (are) the student’s adviser(s) and must be a full-time SOE faculty member. In addition, the committee includes at least one other SOE faculty member, and one outside member, who must have a terminal degree and may be a person from the student’s context of professional practice. Students should submit a completed Change of Adviser/Committee Member Form (Appendix T) along with the outside committee member’s current CV to the Program Coordinator for approval by the Director no later than fall of the student’s second year in the program.

Institutional Review Board

Students must recognize their responsibility in the conduct of research involving human participants and the role of the JHU Homewood Internal Review Board (HIRB) to the safety and well-being of the participants. No data may be collected prior to HIRB approval. Any data collected without HIRB approval constitutes academic misconduct.

Meeting Requirements for Ethical Research (HIRB)

The Johns Hopkins University is committed to protecting the rights and welfare of individuals participating in research. All human participant research conducted under the auspices of the University is evaluated by HIRB to ensure that the rights and welfare of participants are fully protected.

Students who intend to conduct their research with data from human participants must submit a proposal to the HIRB. (See the Human Subjects Protection Program website at [http://web.jhu.edu/Homewood-IRB](http://web.jhu.edu/Homewood-IRB).) All faculty and students in the EdD program must comply with the JHU guidelines for IRB.
1. For the purpose of the HIRB protocol, a student’s adviser is the PI on the dissertation study. The adviser is responsible for reviewing and submitting the IRB protocol, and in so doing the adviser is certifying that the IRB protocol is aligned with the student’s approved dissertation study.

2. Students develop the IRB protocol only after they have defended the dissertation proposal and all committee members have approved the study and signed the Approval of Dissertation Proposal Form (Appendix H).

3. IRB protocols should be submitted to both JHU HIRB and the IRB within the student’s context of professional practice (i.e., school district or other educational organization) at the same time. Once satisfied with the IRB protocol, JHU will approve the student’s study PENDING district or educational organization approval (if the district or educational organization requires approval from a formal board). Typically, the district will then approve the research or ask for changes. All changes will require modifications reported back to JHU HIRB. Once both bodies approve the research, JHU HIRB can officially approve the study.

4. Students should not recruit participants or collect data prior to JHU HIRB and home IRB approval. Once approved, students should use the stamped JHU HIRB approved letters to recruit participants.

5. In cases where the context of professional practice does not have an IRB and the Superintendent or other official approves the conduct of research, HIRB will require a letter indicating that the school district is aware of the study methods, has the authority to approve the conduct of research, and approves of the student’s dissertation study. That letter must be included within the HIRB protocol.

6. Once approved, all changes to the specifics of a study, regardless of how small, MUST be approved by both IRB bodies prior to making these changes to the approved study.

All doctoral students and faculty are required to obtain Human Subject Protections Certification by completing JHU’s CITI Program training and to maintain this certification. See https://www.citiprogram.org/Default.asp for up-to-date information. All students should have completed CITI training as part of their orientation and, therefore, should have certification for the entire time of their program unless they go beyond the three-year program. Students must send John Black (jblack1@jhu.edu) the completed CITI training certificate. If CITI training is completed at another institution, the student must create a CITI account or log in to an existing account and affiliate with JHU. (See Appendix U: Steps for Creating a CITI Account and Completing the CITI Training.) For questions about the process, contact John Black in HIRB (jblack1@jhu.edu).

**Appendix U: Steps for Creating a CITI Account and Completing the CITI Training**

Conferral of Degree and Graduation Ceremony

The University confers degrees three times a year in May, August, and December. There is only one graduation ceremony, however, held in May of each year. All graduates and faculty are encouraged to attend the graduation ceremony. This is an important event for students as well as their families, advisers, the SOE, and the university. Graduates will be hooded in the SOE ceremony during the May graduation ceremony following the conferral of their degree. Please note that participation in
the graduation ceremony may be up to nine months after the degree conferral date.

Applying for Graduation

Once a student is confident that he or she has completed all requirements of the degree, the student completes and submits the Application for Degree Form to be considered for graduation. The deadline for submitting this form, which is typically early in the semester, is listed on the following website: http://education.jhu.edu/graduation/

Program Resources for Students

Year One Cohort Coach

The Year One Cohort Coach provides academic support for EdD students during their first year in the program. This person serves as the student’s connection to and means for acculturation into the EdD program during this initial period in the program. The Cohort Coach monitors a student’s experience and progress in the program generally and builds community within the cohort of students by maintaining communication with the cohort, engaging with students within the Blackboard program site, communicating with individual students at least monthly, and creating critical friends groups.

The roles and responsibilities of the Cohort Coach include:

- Convening at a minimum, monthly meetings to help students understand doctoral; expectations including how to develop doctoral-level skills and competencies;
- Remaining available to students for email communication as needed;
- Responding to student emails and requests in a timely fashion;
- Supporting students’ general development as doctoral candidates;
- Guiding students in the development of doctoral-level thinking;
- Guiding students as they refine their POP statements;
- Identifying any areas of need among students; and
- Providing feedback to the Program Directors regarding the needs of students.

EdD Program Site

The EdD Program site is students’ connection to their EdD program. This site contains all program-developed or program-recommended resources to support students to successfully complete the EdD program. Students are encouraged to review the resources and materials for required forms, orientation materials, archived orientation recordings, discussion boards, and additional resources.

Starfish: Online Scheduling and Early Warning System

Starfish is a program within the learning management system (LMS) that provides an early warning system for students, faculty, advisers, and the Director to support students who are experiencing difficulty. Program faculty and administration can communicate with students and raise a flag to alert a student of a concern that may jeopardize his or her progress in the program. There are also flags that can be raised to alert faculty of personal or health issues that may prevent a student from participating in class for a certain period of time.
If a student sees that a flag has been raised, it is expected that the student communicates immediately with the faculty member to discuss the concern. The Director may also request a meeting to confirm that the issue has been resolved.

Many faculty use Starfish to schedule meetings during office hours. Students should look for the faculty office hours in Starfish to schedule an appointment. If the faculty member is not using Starfish, he or she may be contacted by email or phone. See Appendix Q: Starfish-Getting Started Guide for Students for more details.

**Appendix Q: Starfish- Getting Started Guide for Students**

**SPSS Statistical Software**

Students have access to virtual SPSS statistical software at no additional cost upon enrollment in their first semester of the EdD Program. It is not required that the student purchase SPSS statistical software, and if a student chooses to purchase a different statistical package, please note that the program will teach data analysis using SPSS software only.

To access the virtual SPSS, the student will need to download a Citrix client to his or her computer. Please go to [http://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/computing/computing-on-campus/computer-lab/myjlab/](http://studentaffairs.jhu.edu/computing/computing-on-campus/computer-lab/myjlab/) to access directions to download and use Citrix.

**Librarian Informational Sessions**

SOE Librarians: Liz Johns emjohns@jhu.edu and Sara Oestreich soestre1@jhu.edu

The SOE librarians provide various services for the EdD faculty and students. These supports have come to the students in the form of discussion boards within courses or the program site and synchronous sessions led by the librarians. Topics of these sessions include specific assignments within courses such as finding information from the perspective of each discipline for the Disciplinary Approaches to Educational Problems course, writing an annotated bibliography, evaluating information, synthesizing research literature, and using Google and Google Scholar.

**Library Resource Guides**

The library has developed resource guides that serve as a launching point for education research and contain contact information for the librarians:

- Education – [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/education](http://guides.library.jhu.edu/education)
- Counseling and Human Development – [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/counseling](http://guides.library.jhu.edu/counseling)
- Education in the Health Professions – [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/edhealthsci](http://guides.library.jhu.edu/edhealthsci)

**Electronic and Print Reserves (E-Reserves)**

Students have access to online readings through E-Reserves. This is available in each course for the duration of the course only. It is important that students download resources while they are available during the semester in which they are enrolled in the course. Once the course ends, students will no longer have access to the E-Reserves.
Plagiarism Software: Ithenticate and SafeAssign

The EdD program takes issues of plagiarism seriously. Faculty are encouraged to submit all student assignments through Ithenticate. Students should refer to the JHU SOE academic catalogue [http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/catalog/policies/conduct/academic.html](http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/catalog/policies/conduct/academic.html) for more information regarding Ithenticate and SafeAssign.

APA Formatting Style

The use of the most current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA) is required within all EdD courses. It is highly recommended that students buy the current APA manual. The following references are available to learn more about APA.

*Handy Guide for APA*

[https://ssw.unc.edu/files/web/pdf/Current%20Students/ThePortableEditor5final.pdf](https://ssw.unc.edu/files/web/pdf/Current%20Students/ThePortableEditor5final.pdf)

*Quizzes for Practice or Self-Assessment*

[http://www.niu.edu/writingtutorial/style/quizzes/APA.htm](http://www.niu.edu/writingtutorial/style/quizzes/APA.htm)
[https://awc.ashford.edu/apa-practice-quiz.html](https://awc.ashford.edu/apa-practice-quiz.html)

Teaching Assistants

Teaching Assistants (TAs) are graduate students who help faculty with the content and delivery of courses. TAs are supervised by the course instructor-of-record and are subject to established SOE policies on student academic employment. TAs are hired on an as-needed basis and are required to have completed the course in which they will serve and have achieved a grade in the A-range. If a student is interested in applying to be a TA, application is through JHU Jobs: [https://jobs.jhu.edu/jhujobs/](https://jobs.jhu.edu/jhujobs/)

Services provided by TAs include, but are not limited to, monitoring and leading discussion sessions, offering office hour assistance, and/or performing clerical tasks associated with course instruction. While TAs can recommend grades for assignments, the course instructor-of-record is responsible for making all grading decisions. See Appendix S: *Policy Statement: Teaching Assistants*, for the responsibilities of a TA.

*Appendix S: Duties of Teaching Assistants in the EdD Online Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*The information presented below reflects the policy as of May 17, 2017. Academic policies are subject to change. For the most up-to-date version of schoolwide policies, students should refer to the Academic Catalog.*

Policies Governing Academic Conduct

SOE students assume an obligation to conduct themselves in a manner appropriate to JHU’s mission as an institution of higher education and with accepted standards of ethical and professional
conduct. Students must demonstrate personal integrity and honesty at all times in completing classroom assignments and examinations, in carrying out their fieldwork or other applied learning activities, and in their interactions with others. Students are obligated to refrain from acts they know or, under the circumstances, have reason to know will impair their integrity or the integrity of the University.

The SOE defines academic misconduct as any intentional or unintentional act that provides an unfair or improper advantage beyond a student’s own work, intellect, or effort including but not limited to cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, unapproved multiple submissions, or helping others engage in misconduct. This includes the misuse of electronic media, text, print, images, speeches, and ideas. Any act that violates the spirit of authorship or gives undue advantage is a violation. Students are responsible for understanding what constitutes academic misconduct.

Other violations of academic integrity and ethical conduct include but are not limited to knowingly furnishing false or incomplete information to any agent of the University for inclusion in academic records; violation of the rights of human and animal subjects in research; and falsification, forgery, alteration, destruction, or misuse of the University seal and official documents. (For violations related to non-academic conduct matters, see Policies Governing Student Conduct.)

**Procedures Governing Student-Initiated Complaints**

Students who wish to initiate a complaint regarding the academic conduct of another student should consult with the instructor of the course in question or with their faculty advisers.

Students who wish to initiate a complaint related to non-academic student conduct should contact the Student Affairs office. See Procedures Governing Student Conduct Complaints.

Students who wish to communicate a concern or initiate a complaint about a faculty member should do so in writing to the Director and Vice Dean for Academic Affairs. This communication is held confidential. Students can also contact the Student Affairs Office directly to communicate or file a grievance about an SOE program, service, or faculty by contacting Jenny Eddinger (jedding@jhu.edu).

**Procedures Governing Faculty-Initiated Complaints**

The SOE places the highest value on intellectual integrity and personal trust within our community. Instructors are required to investigate any suspicion of academic misconduct and are encouraged to document the evidence and all communication with students concerning possible infractions. Before making a final decision in a case, instructors consult with the Program Director and faculty adviser. If the instructor ultimately determines that academic misconduct has occurred, the instructor completes SOE’s Academic Misconduct Form, providing a brief description of the infraction and the action to be taken.

The instructor must determine the penalty imposed at his or her discretion. For a first offense, and depending on the severity of the charge, the instructor may choose to 1) reduce the number of points or the grade level awarded for the assignment in question, 2) allow the student to resubmit the assignment, but set a limit on the possible number of points or the grade that the student may earn, 3) award zero points/an F grade for the assignment without granting the student an opportunity to resubmit, or 4) impose another type of penalty as he or she deems appropriate. If the instructor decides to impose another type of penalty (option #4), the penalty should be
determined in consultation with the Director. For a second offense, or for a particularly egregious first-time case of academic misconduct, the instructor must award an automatic F grade for the entire course and the student may be dismissed from the academic program.

If the student accepts the charge and the penalty imposed by the instructor, he or she signs the consent statement on the Academic Misconduct Form. A student who signs the consent statement admitting the infraction and accepting the penalty cannot subsequently appeal. Once both parties have signed the form, it is placed in the student’s record (which the Registrar’s Office maintains), with a copy sent to the student’s adviser, program lead, and the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs. This process should be initiated during the semester at issue and completed within 30 days of the instructor’s identifying the alleged academic misconduct.

If the student disagrees with the academic misconduct charge and/or the penalty imposed by the instructor, he or she must sign the acknowledgement statement on the Academic Misconduct Form, instead of the consent statement, acknowledging that he or she is aware of the instructor’s decision. In such cases, the student may appeal the decision to the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs (or designee). Any appeal to the Vice Dean must be submitted by the student in the form of a letter. In submitting an appeal, the student must provide a thorough rationale for the basis of the appeal and include supporting materials as evidence. Such materials typically consist of the disputed work in question, the signed Academic Misconduct Form, and any correspondence (such as email) between the student and the instructor. The appeal form and supporting materials must be received by SOE’s Office of Student Affairs within seven working days of the date the initial Academic Misconduct Form is signed by the instructor and student. The appeal letter and supporting materials should be mailed to the following address—Johns Hopkins University School of Education, 6740 Alexander Bell Drive, Columbia, MD 21046—or emailed to Jenny Eddinger at jeddinger@jhu.edu. The term “Academic Misconduct Appeal” should be referenced in the email subject line.

The Office of Student Affairs reviews and determines that the appeal was initiated within the 7-day appeal window and that appropriate supporting materials have been submitted. The Office of Student Affairs may contact the student for further information—for example, requesting additional supporting materials or clarification regarding the appeal.

Following the initial review by the Office of Student Affairs, and provided the appeal was initiated within the required 7-day timeframe and includes appropriate supporting materials, the Office of Student Affairs forwards the appeal letter and supporting materials to the Vice Dean. The Vice Dean (or designee) appoints a faculty hearing committee to review the case.

The hearing committee must comprise at least three faculty members, including one faculty member drawn from the academic area of emphasis offering the course in which the alleged infraction took place, plus a senior administrator (equivalent to an Assistant or Associate Dean-level appointment) and a representative from the Student Affairs office. Following a presentation of the evidence in support of the charge and the evidence the student offers in response, the committee renders a decision and determines the appropriate course of action. A written report prepared by the committee containing a brief description of the alleged infraction and the penalty imposed (if applicable) must be placed in the student’s record.

Following notification of the hearing committee’s decision, the student may submit a written appeal in the form of a letter within 7 working days to the SOE Dean. An appeal to the Dean must be based on procedural error that had a significant, substantive effect on the outcome of the proceedings, or
on newly discovered evidence that was not available at the time of the initial appeal. When the request is based on new evidence, the case may be referred back to the Vice Dean (or designee) or the hearing committee for further consideration. After final review of all documentation and the final recommendation of the Vice Dean (or designee) or hearing committee, the Dean (or designee) must make the final decision in the matter.

All academic misconduct appeals must be resolved within 60 calendar days from the date the student submits the initial appeal letter to SOE's Office of Student Affairs. For appeals that reach the Vice Dean/hearing committee/Dean's-level review stages, written notification of the final decision concerning the appeal must be communicated to the student, instructor, faculty adviser, and faculty program lead/division director, and a copy of the communication must be placed in the student's file, which is maintained in the Registrar's Office.

Residency Requirements

The program includes 3-day summer residencies in July or early August for each of the 3 years of the program. Students are responsible for all information conveyed during the residency. Students are required to attend either in person or through a review of the video recordings of the sessions. These residencies allow for face-to-face interactions with faculty, advisers, and other students as well as time for activities and important information related to the applied dissertation.

Leave of Absence

A student may request a leave of absence for personal or other reasons. The approval of the Vice Dean for Academic Affairs (or designee) is required before leave is granted for a specific period, not normally to exceed one year. A student whose leave of absence status expires has the option to request a leave of absence extension on a yearly basis, typically for 2 years only, subject to the approval of the Vice Dean (or designee). A request for a leave of absence is not automatically granted—decisions are made on a case-by-case basis. If a leave of absence is granted, the Vice Dean (or designee) notifies the Office of the Registrar.

To request a Leave of Absence, a student must complete and submit a Leave of Absence Form (http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/catalog/SchoolAdmin/registration/leave.html) for review by the Program Director and Vice Dean for Academic Affairs (or designee).

Students granted a leave of absence also need to withdraw from any course(s) in which they are enrolled at the time the request is approved. Students placed on a leave of absence are still required to meet tuition/fee and financial aid obligations.

Note: During a leave of absence, students will not have access to their adviser, faculty, or JHU resources.

Reinstatement From a Leave of Absence

Students returning from a Leave of Absence are required to submit a request for reinstatement. Students must complete a Request for Reinstatement Form during the semester prior to his or her reinstatement to begin the process of reinstatement. It is the student's responsibility to initiate the reinstatement process.
Withdrawal

Formal notification of intent to withdraw must be submitted in writing to the SOE registrar and EdD Program Director. Students must complete all course withdrawal procedures. It is the student’s responsibility to use the Drop/Add Form (http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/register/change/withdrawal.html) to withdraw from all courses.

Incomplete Coursework

An incomplete grade should be requested for unusual or unavoidable circumstances such as an extended illness but should not be requested for unsatisfactory or delinquent work. It is the student’s responsibility to request an incomplete from the instructor and provide a rationale for the request. The first step is for the instructor to approve the students’ request for an incomplete. This is followed by a discussion of the timeline for the completion of any outstanding work. Once decided, this timeline is codified on Appendix X: Contract for Incomplete Grade (I) Form and signed by both the student and instructor. This form must be approved by the EdD Director.

It is the student’s responsibility to submit the incomplete work to the course instructor and request a grade change by the date on the Contract for Incomplete Grade Form. While it is SOE policy to complete all outstanding work no later than four weeks after the start of the following term, whenever possible the EdD program encourages all incompletes to be resolved prior to the start of the next semester. Failure to complete the work outlined in the incomplete contract within the time designated by the contract will result in a score of 0 for any incomplete assignment. Further, any incomplete that is not resolved within 30 days of the start of the following semester or by the date indicated on the Contract for Incomplete Grade Form will convert to a grade of F.

Appendix X: Contract for Incomplete Grade Form

Time Limits

EdD students must complete the degree requirements within seven years of beginning the program of study. Doctoral students have five years after passing the comprehensive qualifying examination and entering Doctoral Candidacy to finish all degree requirements.

Extensions

Requests for extension of time in the program must be submitted in writing to the EdD Director. Once reviewed by the Director, the request, with supporting documentation, is forwarded to the Vice Dean for his or her review. While extensions of time are rare, each request is reviewed thoroughly with an appropriate outcome communicated to all interested parties. Students must be considered in good standing for the request to be considered.

Maintaining Candidacy Status

Although the prescribed coursework may have been completed, candidates must maintain their Candidacy until the degree is awarded. That is, candidates must register for one doctoral research credit each semester beyond the coursework until the dissertation is successfully defended and the degree is conferred. Students must register continuously, including for the summer term, to maintain their matriculation status in the EdD program.
Academic Standing

Please review the Academic Catalogue for the most current information regarding SOE policies (http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/catalog/policies/standards/unsatisfactory.html)

In a doctoral program, a graduate student’s academic standing is considered unsatisfactory and the student is placed on academic probation if any of the following outcomes occur:

- The student earns a grade of F for a course. No grade of F may be counted toward a doctoral degree, and a student may be dismissed from the program.
- The student earns a grade of C+ or lower in any course. No grade of C+ or lower may be counted toward a doctoral degree program. Students receiving a C+ or lower will be required to retake the course (if it is a required course) or take an alternate course (if it was an elective course).
- The student’s cumulative grade point average falls below 3.25 (on a 4.0 point scale).
- The student fails to make adequate progress toward the doctoral dissertation. The doctoral committee will consider progress based on expectations set by the program, discussions with the advisor, and input from the student.
- The student fails to meet other academic and/or professional expectations as defined by individual programs—for example, failing to display appropriate professional dispositions in a course/program.

Academic Probation

In the event that any of the above outcomes occur, the following actions are taken:

- The student is placed on academic probation for a period of not less than one semester. In the EdD program, the student is on probation for a period during which he/she completes 12 credit hours. While a student can appeal the award of a grade (see Grade Appeals policy), a student cannot appeal the decision to place him/her on academic probation.
- The student should contact his or her faculty adviser and the program Director to develop a plan for reinstatement to good academic standing. (Note: Doctoral students will receive a letter from their program explaining the terms of the probation and the requirements for reinstatement.)
- Any courses taken during the probationary period must be approved by the student’s faculty adviser.
- The student earns a grade of C+ or lower in any course. No grade of C+ or lower may be counted toward a doctoral degree program. Students receiving a C+ or lower will be required to retake the course (if it is a required course) or take an alternate course (if it was an elective course).
- The student will be released from probation once he/she has met the following conditions (where applicable): 1) completed any course(s) or substituted any elective course(s) with a satisfactory grade, 2) regained a cumulative grade point average of 3.25 as required for good academic standing, and 3) met all other conditions of probation set by his or her faculty adviser or the program Director.

Students who are placed on academic probation because they fail to make adequate progress on their dissertation may be required to take a Leave of Absence to remediate any issues related to
adequate dissertation progress. (Note: During a leave of absence, students will not have access to their adviser, faculty, or JHU resources.)

**Academic Dismissal**

Students will be automatically dismissed from their academic program, irrespective of his or her cumulative grade point average at the time, in the event that any of the following occur:

- Fails to meet the conditions for reinstatement to good academic standing while on academic probation (NOTE: Doctoral students must meet the requirements for reinstatement to good academic standing within 12 credit hours of being placed on academic probation, otherwise they will be automatically dismissed from the program).
- Earn a grade of C+ or below while on academic probation or having subsequently been reinstated to good standing following academic probation.
- Earns two or more F grades in a single semester or cumulatively over the course of his/her entire program of study.
- Earns two C grades (C+, C, or C-) in the same semester or cumulatively over the course of his or her entire program of study.
- Earns an F grade and one C grade (C+, C, or C-) in a single semester or cumulatively over the course of his or her entire program of study.
- Fail to successfully pass comprehensive exams after two attempts.

**Note:** A student who is unsuccessful in the first attempt to pass comprehensive exams will be strongly encouraged to take a Leave of Absence to adequately prepare for his or her second attempt. Any student who does not take a leave assumes full responsibility for all tuition and fees associated with continuing in the program with the knowledge that a second unsuccessful attempt in the exam will lead to Academic Dismissal.

**Note:** Dismissal decisions are final and cannot be appealed. While a student cannot appeal the School’s decision to dismiss him/her, a student may appeal the award of the original grade(s) (see Grade Appeals policy). Students who have been academically dismissed are permanently barred from registering for any credit-bearing courses or matriculating in a degree/certificate program in the School of Education.

**Confidentiality of Student Records**

Educational records of doctoral students in the EdD program are kept by University offices but faculty and staff members may also keep informal records relating to their functional responsibilities with individual students. The federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 identifies the rights of students and their families with respect to student educational records kept by institutions. This provides that information from records, files, and data directly related to a student may not be disclosed by any means (including telephone) to individuals or agencies outside the University (including parents or spouses) without the prior written consent of the student. Information contained in such records may be shared within the University with “university officials” having "legitimate educational interest” in such information. It is important for instructors to protect student confidentiality when listing any student grades, returning class papers or projects, and writing letters of recommendation.
The SOE prepares leaders and change agents who are ready to address complex challenges in education and communities.
## JHU SOE Doctor of Education Program

**Example Program of Study**  
*(2017 cohort – three-year program)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>Summer Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>[Problem Formation/ Identification]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED.855.718 Disciplinary Approaches to Education (3)</td>
<td>ED.855.712 Multiple Perspectives on Learning and Teaching (3)</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED.855.716 Contemporary Approaches to Educational Problems (3)</td>
<td>ED.883.718 Research Methods and Systematic Inquiry I (3)</td>
<td>Elective, MBT - ED.855.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELE - ED.855.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tech K16 - ED.893.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>[Solution Formation]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ED.833.719 Research Methods and Systematic Inquiry II (3)</td>
<td>ED.883.721 Evaluation of Education Policies and Programs (3)</td>
<td>ED.855.710 Multicultural Education (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialization Area Course I (3)</td>
<td>Specialization Area Course II (3)</td>
<td>ED.883.849 Applied Research Research Project/Dissertation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>[Solution Evaluation and Policy Recommendations]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ED.883.849 Applied Research Project/Dissertation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialization Area Course III (3)</td>
<td>Specialization Area Course IV (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total credits = 6</td>
<td>Total credits = 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Dissertation Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundations of Education – **red**  
Applied Research and Evaluation – **green**  
Electives – **blue**  
Applied Dissertation - **orange**

Appendix C: Example of Program of Study
Electives (9 credit hours - choose 3 courses)

ED.855.708 Mind, Brain Science and Learning (3)
ED.855.720 Leadership in Educational Organizations (3)
ED.893.708 Technologies and Creative Learning (3)
ED.855.714 Power, Politics, and Policy in Education
ED.855.643 Turnaround Leadership in Schools and Educational Organizations
ED.893.XXX Research on Effective Professional Development (under development)
Appendix E
Doctor of Education Program
Program Timeline of Transition Points

This document provides a suggested timeline for major submissions and revisions activities. Advisers and advisees can use this document as a guide to discuss and establish a tailored timeline that helps establish shared expectations. Any negotiated schedules must begin with the Electronic Thesis and/or Library timelines for submission.

Year One Paper (Chs. 1 & 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Adviser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End of Spring Semester</td>
<td>Student provides adviser with copies of spring semester papers with faculty feedback AND a bulleted outline of plan for changes and questions</td>
<td>Review and flexibly respond within two weeks*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15</td>
<td>Submit first draft of Chs. 1 &amp; 2**</td>
<td>Feedback to student by end of June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15</td>
<td>Submits 2nd draft of Chs. 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Feedback to student by Residency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 15-20 for a Pass/Fail adequate progress grade</td>
<td>Final draft submitted for a pass/fail grade</td>
<td>Make a Pass/Fail determination before start of Fall Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year One Self-Assessment paper due end of summer term</td>
<td>Submit to adviser as well as through Blackboard to program</td>
<td>Make a Pass/Fail determination before start of Fall Semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This assumes you can complete revisions and edits within 1-2 weeks of receiving them from your adviser.

**Begin working now to get your chapters into the Electronic Dissertation Defense Format – URL http://guides.library.jhu.edu/c.php?g=202613&p=1334746
**Dissertation Proposal (Chs. 1-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to student’s possible proposal defense date</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Adviser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Weeks <strong>Student should place their specific dates in this column</strong></td>
<td>Submit initial proposal draft to adviser.</td>
<td>Review, edit with suggested revisions and return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With adviser approval, arrange TENTATIVE dissertation defense date with Committee members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Weeks</td>
<td>Receive edits and revisions from adviser. Prepare 2\textsuperscript{nd} draft of proposal to include revisions and edits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Weeks</td>
<td>Submits 2\textsuperscript{nd} draft of proposal with revisions and edits to adviser.*</td>
<td>Provide feedback and return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Weeks</td>
<td>Receive edits and revisions from adviser.* Prepare finalized proposal draft.**</td>
<td>Approve finalized dissertation draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Weeks (at least)</td>
<td>Submit the final reviewed and revised proposal to the dissertation committee.</td>
<td>Check in with committee members one week after it has been sent – any major concerns.***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Defense meeting</td>
<td>Present for up to 15 minutes, brief introduction to literature review and focus on methodology.</td>
<td>Adviser and Committee Members raise any concerns, provide feedback and identify strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After proposal defense</td>
<td>Submit revised proposal with list of requested changes and explicit statement of the changes to your adviser.</td>
<td>Review edits and return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Weeks later</td>
<td>Receive edits and complete revisions to the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 Weeks later</td>
<td>Request final sign off as needed Submit IRB application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This assumes you can complete revisions and edits within 1-2 weeks of receiving them from your adviser.

**Begin working now to get your chapters into the Electronic Dissertation Defense Format – URL [http://guides.library.jhu.edu/c.php?g=202613&p=1334746](http://guides.library.jhu.edu/c.php?g=202613&p=1334746)*

***If any major concerns, communicate with the committee members to determine if a new date needs to be scheduled and further revisions should be implemented.*
HIRB

Following successful completion of the proposal defense process students must begin their IRB process.

Typically, the Hopkins IRB can provide tentative approval of your proposal contingent upon receipt of approval from your district’s IRB. The IRB processes at each individual district (or charter school) will vary widely. You MUST have clear documentation of the local IRB process and evidence of having completed the process. Note that some localities may not have any IRB formal process in place; in these situations, the student is responsible to obtain documentation of local leadership approval of the proposed work. A letter from an appropriate district supervisor should indicate that s/he has the authority to approve the conduct of research in the district, understands the study methodology, approves the conduct of the dissertation study, and acknowledging that Hopkins IRB approval will serve as permission for the conduct the research study.
# Dissertation Defense Timeline

REMEMBER: You must know the due dates for submission to the library before discussing these dates with your adviser. Use the submission due date as a hard stop (which it is) but remember to build in a cushion!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior to student’s possible dissertation defense date:</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Adviser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Weeks</strong></td>
<td>Submit initial dissertation draft to adviser.</td>
<td>Review, edit and suggested necessary revision; return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student should place their specific dates in this column</em></td>
<td>With adviser approval, arrange TENTATIVE dissertation defense date with Committee members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 Weeks</strong></td>
<td>Receive edits and revisions from adviser. Prepare 2nd draft of dissertation to include revisions and edits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Weeks</strong></td>
<td>Submits 2nd draft of dissertation with revisions and edits to adviser.*</td>
<td>Provide feedback and return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Weeks</strong></td>
<td>Receive edits and revisions from adviser.* Prepare finalized dissertation draft.**</td>
<td>Approve finalized dissertation draft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Weeks (at least)</strong></td>
<td>Submit the final reviewed and revised dissertation to the dissertation committee.</td>
<td>Check in with committee members one week after it has been sent – to ask whether they have any major concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Defense</strong></td>
<td>15-minute presentation, brief discussion of literature review and methods; focus on the results and recommendations.</td>
<td>Adviser and Committee Members raise any concerns, provide feedback and identify strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After dissertation defense</strong></td>
<td>Submit revised dissertation with list of requested changes and explicit statement of the changes to your adviser.</td>
<td>Review edits and return to student in 2 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Weeks later</strong></td>
<td>Receive edits and complete final revisions to the dissertation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-2 Weeks later</strong></td>
<td>(or however long it takes to make the final revisions and polishing/formatting) Revise and submit to the library.***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This assumes you can complete revisions and edits within 1-2 weeks of receiving them from your adviser.

**At this time, if your adviser approves the dissertation draft, you may schedule your defense date with your committee. Be sure to proactively seek out available dates with members. They will be busy and this part of the process may take more time than you expect.

***Upon approval by library, a digital version of the dissertation will be available to the public via the internet.
The JHU SOE EdD program provides the following guidelines for advisers who are responsible for the conduct of the two major transition points within the JHU EdD program: the dissertation proposal defense and the dissertation defense. Because these meetings are very similar, we refer to the “defense” throughout this document to refer to either of these key evaluation points.

Prior to the Defense

The student and adviser should meet in advance of the defense to determine that the student is ready to defend the proposal or dissertation study. Prior to this meeting, the student will have provided his/her adviser the final draft of the document for review. This meeting is an opportunity for the student to practice his or her presentation and to rehearse how to respond to typical questions she/he might encounter during the defense.

Submission of Document to Committee

The student’s dissertation proposal or dissertation should be presented to the student’s committee a minimum of two weeks prior to the defense date. The document should not be submitted to the committee until the dissertation adviser has reviewed the document and approved it for submission to the Doctoral Advisory Committee. Students should consult the Electronic Thesis and Dissertations website (http://guides.library.jhu.edu/etd) for formatting requirements.

General Defense Protocol

The defense meeting follows a pattern. Guests may attend the presentation segment of any defense. Guests may not be in the room when the committee is questioning the candidate or is discussing the candidate’s work. Below are the typical stages of the 2-hour defense meeting.

1. The committee gathers and asks the student and guests to leave the room. The committee briefly discusses general feedback and any concerns by the committee regarding the defense moving forward.

2. The adviser outlines the protocol for the defense. This should include the timeframe for the presentation, the way in which committee members will be invited to pose questions, and the collection of written committee feedback at the conclusion of the proposal defense.

3. The student presents his/her dissertation proposal or study for a maximum of 15 minutes. The student’s presentation should do the following:

   • Clearly articulate, provide a rationale for, and contextualize the Problem of Practice (POP);
   • Briefly present literature and empirical evidence for the choice of the intervention;
• Present an argument for the intervention based on a sound theoretical frame and synthesis of relevant research;
• Discuss a methodologically sound study to examine both the process of intervention implementation and proximal outcomes potentially associated with the intervention; and
• Findings, discussion, conclusions, implications, and future research. [This section would not be included for the proposal defense.]

4. At the completion of the presentation, guests should be asked to leave.

5. The Dissertation Advisory Committee members commence with the examination phase of the defense with questions to probe the student’s written or oral presentation of his/her dissertation proposal or study.

6. When the committee has completed the examination, the adviser concludes this part of the defense and invites the student to leave the room. The committee deliberates on the quality of the written and oral defense resulting in one of the following ratings:
   a) Minor revisions required—committee approves the proposal or dissertation by signing the; adviser determines that changes have been made and signs the completed form.
   b) Substantial revision required—committee does not sign off on the proposal or dissertation; adviser determines that changes have been made in conference with student; committee receives final proposal or dissertation for final review; committee signs the appropriate form only after all members of the committee have approved the final document.
   c) Major revision required—committee does not sign off on the proposal or dissertation; adviser determines that changes have been made in conference with student; committee receives final proposal or dissertation for second review; committee determines a new defense date; student defends the proposal or dissertation a second time.

7. The doctoral student is invited back into the room after the committee’s deliberations, and the dissertation adviser provides the committee’s feedback. Committee members' then sign the \textit{Dissertation Proposal Approval Form} or \textit{Dissertation Approval Form} reflecting their deliberations.

\textbf{Following the Defense}

After the defense meeting, the adviser and student will discuss the required revisions and establish a timeline for completion of the changes. The student should submit the document with the required changes and write a memo delineating the feedback and revisions made reflecting this feedback. Once revisions have been made to the satisfaction of the adviser, the appropriate documentation reflecting completion of this phase of the doctoral program should be submitted to the program.

\textbf{Audio-recording Defense}

Audiotaping of the proposal meeting is acceptable, but requires permission from the adviser and each member of the committee prior to the date of the defense. Students may not audio-record the committee deliberation.
Committee Attendance Requirement

All members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee must be present for the defense in person or virtually. In the event that a committee member is not available for a student’s defense, a substitute may be assigned by the program Co-Directors.

Protocol Questions

If a student has a question about the defense process, he or she should contact the dissertation adviser with his/her question/concern. If a satisfactory answer is not received, he or she should inquire with the EdD Program Co-Directors. Advisers should feel free to inquire with the Program Directors at any time to clarify policy or procedure.
Appendix J: Comprehensive exam protocol

Comprehensive examination Protocol

The Doctor of Education Program (EdD) requires students to successfully complete an oral comprehensive exam as outlined in the Doctor of Education Student Handbook. This exam should be scheduled for 2 hours in duration. The comprehensive exams are conducted during the first week of the fall semester of the 3rd year of the program. The exams are intended as a measure to assess the preparation of the student to enter doctoral candidacy; formally noting that a student can move forward with their dissertation study as approved through the dissertation proposal defense. Students who do not successfully complete the comprehensive exams will not be allowed to move forward with their dissertation work. If a student does not successfully complete the comprehensive exam in the first attempt, he or she will have a second opportunity; however, if the second opportunity is not successful, the student will be asked to leave the program.

The comprehensive exam requires a committee to sit for and grade the exam. In the Doctor of Education Program, the dissertation committee serves as the comprehensive exam review committee. The Program will provide a list of 10 comprehensive exam questions that will serve as the question pool for students eligible to sit for the exam within that academic year. It is up to the dissertation advisor to determine which questions are best suited for his or her student. It is expected that a student would answer between 3-4 questions during the comprehensive exam; however the number of questions will be decided by the adviser. In grading the exam, the dissertation committee will assess the answers provided by the student and reach a consensus regarding the final grade. Grades for the exam are as follows:

- **PASS**: An exam that meets the level of “pass” is one in which the student clearly articulates a comprehensive understanding of the content in each question, and presented a breadth of knowledge consistent with a scholar-practitioner. The student is not only able to discuss theoretical concepts, but also the application of these concepts in practice. Further, the student illustrates a breadth of knowledge of research in a substantive area and can articulate how this research is both applied in practice and can be strengthened through additional research.

  *A student who receives the grade of “PASS” has successfully completed their exam*

- **PASS WITH CONDITION**: An exam meets the level of “pass with revision” when the student responds with a familiarity of content; however, there are minor errors during the discussion. This score on a comprehensive exam suggests that a student is at the level where he or she is knowledgeable; however, additional work may be needed in a specific area before being considered competent and moving into candidacy. A student who is not able to fully describe a theoretical framework, is not able to clearly articulate an application of scholarly knowledge in his/her practice, or requires prompting (offering the student additional information to guide students towards an answer) by the committee before the answer is complete should be graded in this category.
A student who receives a “Pass with Condition” has not successfully completed the exam. A student must complete the revisions required by the committee, and once the committee evaluates the submitted revision, the work is graded and a final decision is rendered as “Pass” or “Fail”.

- **FAIL**: A student who is not able to properly discuss theoretical concepts, uses improper research terminology, or is not able to articulate how research is applicable in his or her practice should be graded with a “fail”. This suggests that the student shows little to no competence in their ability to engage in a scholarly conversation or is not able to articulate research into practice.

A student who “FAILS” the exam has not been successful, and will have one more attempt to successfully complete the exam per the Student Handbook.

It is not a program requirement that students be physically present for their exam. The technology is available for the exam to occur remotely using the Polycom Cloud Access technology. Additional information on this process will be made available in the tools section of the EdD Program site on Blackboard. It will however, require proper scheduling prior to the exam.

During the week of the comprehensive exams, SOE room 222 and Polycom Cloud Access technology has been reserved for the EdD program, and scheduling will occur through a master calendar managed by Cathy Cao (cathy.cao@jhu.edu). This will be made more explicit below where roles and responsibilities of the comprehensive exams are defined.

**ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The comprehensive exams will require the Dissertation Adviser to do the following:

- Assist the student in study preparation as needed – help to guide the student to content he or she may be lacking and make recommendations to improve study skills. Content for the comprehensive exams comes from Year 1 of the program, and the research courses during Year 2.
- Meet with Program Directors the week prior to the exams to ensure clear understanding of protocol within the exam.
- Review the exam questions prior the day of the exam to determine which questions are best suited for your student. Faculty should receive the list of exam questions no later than 2 weeks prior to the exam.
- Be available during the first week of the semester to serve on the student’s exam committee.
- Inform the external committee members of the comprehensive exam process and expectations.
- Serve as the lead for communicating the process of questioning the student during the exam. The Dissertation Adviser is responsible for establishing the process by which questions are asked within the exam itself (eg: does chair ask all questions, or will each
member ask a question; will there be follow up questions to the student’s answer, how will the committee grant student time to make notes and contemplate the question).  

**NOTE: all of these decisions should be communicated to the student prior to the exam itself.**

- Serve as the lead for grading the exam and bringing the committee to consensus as to the final grade. NOTE: there are three grading options (see above for description)– Pass, Pass with revision, Fail.
  
  - If the student were to receive a pass with revision, any necessary revisions, including the method by which the committee will assess this additional information, will be discussed by the committee and presented to the student with the grade. The additional work for the revision can take various forms, including (but not limited to) a follow-up discussion with the adviser (on behalf of the committee), a brief writing assignment, or a follow-up exam session with the committee.

- Complete the student’s **Report of Comprehensive Examination** form and return it to the Program Director(s) upon the completion of the exam.

The comprehensive exams require the **STUDENT** to do the following:

- Study for the exam – it is recommended that students develop study groups to assist in the study process. PLEASE NOTE – The program will **not** provide questions or specific content to guide your studies. The questions will be drawn from course content through the first year of your studies and the research courses in year 2.

- Work closely with your adviser to set a date and time during the exam period. Students will not be limited to a time during the day, but please note that the technology may only allow for 3 defenses at one time using remote access.

- Reserve the room and the technology for the exam. Protocols for this process will be available in the Program Site on Blackboard each year, and you must check with Cathy Cao (**cathy.cao@jhu.edu**) to ensure that there is a free space on the master calendar during your requested time/date.

- Confirm exam date and time with dissertation adviser and all committee members.

- Inform the program, through an email to Cathy Cao (**cathy.cao@jhu.edu**) of the final comprehensive exam date and time

- When a question arises, ask your adviser first. If this cannot be answered by your adviser, then make sure to ask the question in the program site discussion board that will be specially created for comprehensive exam questions. This way everyone can see the question and answer.

- Ask your adviser all questions related to protocol PRIOR TO the exam date so that you are ready to start the exam immediately upon arrival.

- Bring the **Report of Comprehensive Examination** form with you to the exam. This document can be found in the EdD Program Site in Blackboard.

- Show up promptly to the exam, and be prepared.
Doctor of Education Program
How to Prepare for the Comprehensive Exams

Introduction to the Doctoral Comps
The comprehensive examination (comps) is the opportunity for doctoral students to provide evidence of a solid theoretical and research-based foundation developed through their doctoral program. Unlike assignments in individual courses that focus on particular areas of study, comprehensive exams ask you to synthesize your learning across the program. Although this might sound like a scary time – it can actually be the most stimulating and useful part of your program. It is an intellectual and scholarly conversation with your professors and your peers. As you will start to see, the comps do not simply probe your knowledge of the literature from all your courses (although they do that as well) but also prepare you for the many conversations that will come your way as an educator with a doctoral degree from Johns Hopkins University. Being adept at building connections between the literature sources to respond to questions is essential for your future.

Exam Content and Format
You may want to know – What questions will they ask? – But that it is not something you will be explicitly told. Just as in the real world of the practitioner, you will have the authentic experience of being asked a question that is either unanticipated or even though anticipated has a slightly different twist. The questions will be written by the faculty as a collective. Each of the courses you have taken may be represented in some way with either a direct question about the theories that are foundational to that area of study or a question that needs the work from several courses blended. The faculty will prepare approximately ten questions, and your adviser will select four from the mix. Your adviser might tweak one or more of the questions to more closely fit your Problem of Practice (POP) and dissertation study, but in each case prepare with the idea you may need to make connections between theoretical underpinnings, your POP, and your dissertation study. Note that not all questions will not be related to your dissertation study. There may be a question that is asked of all doctoral candidates and known in advance. This question should not be taken casually. Use this advanced knowledge about one of the questions to showcase what you know. Take the time to develop a cohesive and well-supported answer response that you can deliver in approximately 20-30 minutes – yes, time it.

The exam is based on your core courses but when appropriate you can bring in linkages to your specialty courses as the concepts are repeated across courses in different ways. Remember,
studying should not focus on memorization and regurgitation but instead the understanding needed to share deep knowledge as you discuss, compare, and advance ideas surrounding a theory or concept learned in your core courses. Keep in mind that the courses are not silos of information but a web of interrelated ideas.

This examination is oral because unlike PhD candidates who will commonly express themselves in publications for peer-reviewed journals, you will likely communicate and disseminate your ideas through conversations with administrators, teachers, parents and guardians, business leaders, community members and other stakeholders. Your message should be scholarly, logical, and on target to the question asked—all of which is practiced in the comprehensive exam. Comprehensive exam preparation is a foundation for your success in the program as well as in the field of education. As you situate yourself in the literature you have been studying since your first class in the program, here are some ways to build that into a body of knowledge that you will always draw upon.

Here are some tips:

Map out a plan of action
Start with your goals in mind. If you intend to have a study partner or a study group set non-negotiable meeting dates (set in stone). Plan the topics for each of your meetings so that all courses are adequately covered (don’t forget the research methods courses in your planning!!). You will need to come prepared to each of these meetings to honor the time and efforts of your partner or team – so devote time each week to this process.

Study groups
Consider establishing study groups. This will allow the internalization of a large amount of information with a team effort. To gain a new perspective on your reading, your study group should anticipate questions that your faculty will likely ask – and decide that each of you will become an “expert” on a different course. It will help you think critically about what you read, which might help you recall the information when you need it during the exam. Actually write and share responses with one another. Finally, role play with one person in the group acting as the examinee and the other group members asking probing and follow-up questions.

How would you respond to a particular question – don’t just think about it - either write it out or if you are with a group of peers in a study session – answer it orally as you would on exam day. Create a safe environment where you and your peers really critique answers – now is not the time to be shy about telling each other how the answer could be improved. It is better to have missteps now and get serious feedback that tests those fledgling answers then to test them out at exam time. Also preparing answers orally in front of your peers is the situation you will face – you need to ease yourself into that environment and practice the way you will respond including the pressure and the need for on the spot thinking. Practice, Practice!! Again practice answering speaking slowly and clearly and with a logical organization.
**Identify the important literature**

Create a list of the essential readings by examining your syllabi, your notes, and by adding some fresh perspectives from your individual research. As you immerse yourself in the key course readings keep in mind that you must build connections between theories or identify how one theory is subtly different from another. For example, how are Constructivism and Vygotsky’s sociocultural similar? Different? Which is more useful for your dissertation study? How might these theories be applied to another context? One way to structure your readings to highlight the similarities and contrasting points or schools of thought is to organize the information in a spreadsheet or some other system that organizes the readings by theme, conceptual framework, methods, and findings. This approach will help you find similarities and differences in the literature. Know the constructs and theoretical positions of all the major researchers from your course readings and your field of specialization. If possible, identify a few more recent journal articles if you need to bring additional clarity to the process of comparing and contrasting the major schools of thought linked to your various courses. This will locate you in the literature and in the discussion.

**Write (or draw) to learn**

Take notes on all your readings and again organize them with key themes that emerged from your coursework. Exploring these themes can help you see how strands of thought in the program are related to each other or are distinct. It is that level of understanding that will showcase your knowledge during the exams. If you find a visual representation helpful – drawing (by hand or computer) a conceptual framework of how key ideas are connected can be a worthwhile exploration. Use strategies for creating the visual representations that work for you (if you choose to work in a study group each member can take one major theme or you can work on them as a group as you discuss ideas).

**Don’t just state ideas – cite them**

Remember, now is not the time to think you can respond easily to anything thrown at you – instead have well thought out responses prepared that are supported by the literature. Part of demonstrating scholarly thinking and scholarly answers is to cite the theorists and researchers that have shared these thoughts and tested them in practice. Here is an evolution of studying for comprehensive exam starting from low level behaviors (where passing is unlikely if you only have these competencies) and moving up to those behaviors essential to passing the exam:

1. Beginning conversation – just describe the content from a course;
2. Making connections – link the content within and between courses as well as to your individual POPs and dissertation study;
3. Advancing the application of the literature – apply the literature to concepts, ideas, and current educational problems by blending different sources and researchers; and
4. Readying for the final phase – start seeing ways to approach any research question – considering question frameworks, question organization, critical topic area and how to make cross curricular/content connections.
That day
If you’re very nervous during your exam, you may talk fast. To alleviate this issue, you may want to plan a signal with your adviser that will help you know to slow down. Remember, if you are asked a question you don’t understand fully or you draw a blank, asking for clarification can help you change your perspective on the question and give you more time to develop a strong response. You can also reason through an answer by focusing on the connecting literature you do know and drawing from these connections.

Basic tips for answers
Below are several (non-exhaustive) basic tips to consider:
1. Answer the question that is asked; be direct and succinct;
2. Avoid focusing on personal examples unless asked to do so;
3. Begin with theory and research, and lead with theory and research prior to applying it to your experience and practice;
4. Think of three main points and support them with evidence;
5. Use a clear structure (refer back to the evolution of a comprehensive examination response above);
6. Use empirical examples with scholarly references as appropriate; and
7. Take a moment to gather your thoughts and organize your response before speaking.

Possible outcomes
1. Passing the comprehensive examination – congratulations!
2. Passing the comprehensive examination conditionally: This is an indication that you were on the right track but didn’t meet the full criteria of providing substantive, well-constructed responses with references for support. If your committee indicates that you have passed with conditions, you will need to fulfill another component (possibly a written response) before actually passing the assessment. It is important to understand that this additional component must be completed satisfactorily prior to passing your comprehensive examination. You can still fail even if you have passed with conditions.
3. Failing a comprehensive examination: Although occurring infrequently, some students will fail the comprehensive examination. If this happens, all students are allowed to re-take a comprehensive exam once. Your committee will work with you to help you pass it successfully on the second try. Set up a meeting with your adviser as soon as you have recovered from receiving the notice of the failure so you can begin setting up a plan that will allow you to successfully complete the retake.
Overview

This Applied Dissertation Description situates the Applied Dissertation within the larger online EdD program by providing (1) an overview of the Applied Dissertation, (2) a description of the Problem of Practice (POP), and (3) guidelines for researching and writing an Applied Dissertation. The doctoral coursework will provide a context for the development of your dissertation across the following phases of the program:

1. Year One—Foundation for Chapters 1-2: Synthesize research literature to understand factors and underlying causes for a Problem of Practice (POP) from a systems or organizational perspective. By factors, we mean constructs or variables that don’t necessarily cause the issue but may be associated with the problem in some way; for example, parents’ educational background is a strong predictor and a factor associated with college enrollment, but is not causal. By underlying causes for your POP, we mean constructs or variables that research suggests are predictors of a particular outcome; for example, poor school conditions and low salary can be a predictor of teacher attrition. This review of the literature serves as the rationale for an empirical examination to understand the factors and underlying causes as they manifest within your context of professional practice.

2. Year Two—Foundation for Chapters 3-4: Synthesize research literature to broadly examine interventions leading to a potential solution or intervention related to one or more of these factors or underlying causes; AND methods of evaluation and assessment of BOTH the process of implementation and proximal (i.e., following immediately or soon after the intervention) outcomes of your intervention.

3. Year Three—Foundation for Chapter 5: Implement a research-supported intervention; discussion of the process of implementation of the intervention; analysis and evaluation of proximal outcomes resulting from the implementation of the intervention; AND findings/conclusions.

Your adviser will provide ongoing programmatic and academic support for the development of the Applied Dissertation.

Scholarship

This program requires doctoral students to develop the knowledge, skills, and research competencies of a scholarly practitioner and to apply these aptitudes in the practice of studying educational issues. Boyer (1997) proposed an expanded definition of scholarship including four domains: (1) Scholarship of Discovery; (2) Scholarship of Integration; (3) Scholarship of Application; and (4) Scholarship of Teaching. Competencies within this EdD program are focused on these four
areas of scholarship. Scholarship of Discovery will advance doctoral students’ knowledge of underlying causes and factors identified in the literature related to the POP as they manifest within the doctoral student’s context of professional practice. It will also support doctoral students’ ability to effectively intervene in their context of professional practice and document the implementation as well as proximal outcomes resulting from their intervention.

Doctoral students will demonstrate Scholarship of Integration by applying interdisciplinary knowledge gained through coursework and independent inquiry to contextualizing their POP from various theoretical perspectives and develop an evidence-based solution. During the third year of the program, students will apply this integrated knowledge of theory and practice through the implementation and evaluation of a potential solution to address underlying causes or factors identified with the POP. Finally, doctoral students will demonstrate Scholarship of Teaching by communicating their findings to various stakeholders and engaging a community of practice.

Description of Applied Dissertation and the Problem of Practice

Unlike the traditional doctoral dissertation, the Applied Dissertation focuses on a solution to a significant POP within the doctoral student’s context of professional practice. The POP is the underlying issue identified by students as they have worked within their context of professional practice. It is the focus of their multidisciplinary investigation. Below is a description of the dissertation development across a three-year program. Students who opt for a longer program will determine an appropriate timeline with their advisers. Program approval of any changes to the three-year program must be approved by one of the EdD Co-Directors.

During the first year in the program, doctoral students establish the POP, provide a rationale for the importance of the POP, and provide evidence of the POP broadly (i.e., through examination of literature) and evidence of the manifestation of the problem within the students’ contexts of professional practice through systematic observation. Once the problem has been established, students investigate factors associated with or potential underlying causes for the POP from a systems and organizational perspectives and construct a conceptual framework that proposes the relationship between the key factors/causes and the POP thereby establishing a rationale for your study. Based on a strong understanding of the literature and the students’ context, they conduct an empirical study to examine one component of the conceptual framework that will deepen the students’ understanding of these factors/underlying causes as they manifest within their context of professional practice and establish evidence of a need for improvement in this area of their practice or professional context. At the end of the first year, doctoral students will provide evidence of first year competency mastery through the submission of their Year One Paper and Year One Self-Assessment Paper.

During the second year, students propose an intervention to address one or more factors examined through their empirical study in their Year One Paper. The EdD program holds a broad conceptualization of interventions to include classroom interventions, district policy changes, and program development as well as many other practical solutions to improve the context in which the doctoral students are employed. Students will also design an evaluation plan to evaluate the process of enacting the intervention (i.e., implementation fidelity) and outcomes of the intervention. At the end of the second year, doctoral students will provide evidence of
first and second year competency mastery through the submission and oral defense of a proposal for their dissertation study and successful completion of the oral comprehensive examination. The proposal will be defended in the presence of the students’ Doctoral Advisory Committee. Upon successful completion of the proposal, the student will be allowed to submit his or her protocol to the university Institutional Review Board (IRB) and, only after approval is received can the student begin implementation. Students are advanced to doctoral candidacy when they successfully defend their dissertation study and pass their comprehensive examination.

During the third year of the program, students will examine the intervention implementation and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention using mixed methods approaches. Students should be able to critically evaluate the potential value of the intervention and provide recommendations based on their dissertation study. The Applied Dissertation will focus on documenting the students’ progress through the dissertation study.

Characteristics of the Applied Dissertation that make it unique to this program include:

- The Applied Dissertation is the culmination of students’ work across courses, independent research, and empirical analysis;
- Major segments of each project are embedded within coursework and distributed across the program;
- Dissertation studies focus on a POP within the candidates’ context of professional practice; and
- Projects possess potential for significant change or impact within the organization and/or have implications for policy.

The Applied Dissertation provides evidence of a doctoral student’s ability and mastery of the skills necessary to frame an important issue within their context of professional practice, identify and develop a potential intervention to address factors related to this issue, implement this intervention, document the implementation of the intervention, and analyze and evaluate its efficacy within an education or related field. Most importantly, the Applied Dissertation provides doctoral students the opportunity to critically examine factors related to a significant POP within their context of professional practice and develop an evidence-based intervention or policy recommendations to address factors relevant to the issue.

Components of Applied Dissertation

The Applied Dissertation is comprised of 4 primary components: (1) an introduction, (2) a clearly articulated, contextualized, and evidence-supported POP that highlights underlying causes and associated factors within the context of professional practice, (3) an intervention and program evaluation, (4) documentation of the process of implementation, and (5) findings relative to proximal outcomes, analysis, conclusions, and implications for the educational practitioner. The following outline illustrates the fundamental components of the Applied Dissertation including the year in the program when the work will be competed. Each of the components is revised during successive years.

Please refer to the APA Publication Manual (APA, 2010) and the JHU library’s formatting
guidance for sections of the dissertation. The Electronic Theses and Dissertations website URL is http://guides.library.jhu.edu/etd.


NOTE: This Order and Content may be changed with the discretion of the adviser.

Order and Content

Front Matter

a) Title page
b) Abstract
c) Preface, including acknowledgments
d) Table of Contents, with titles and page references
e) List of Tables, with titles and page references
f) List of Figures, titles and page references
g) List of Plates, with titles and page references

Executive Summary (Year 3)

Ch. 1 – Understanding the POP (Year 1)

a) Introduction that establishes the POP within the literature; provides a rationale for why the problem is an important problem; and provides evidence for the POP broadly as well as within the context of professional practice. This introduction should lead to the statement of the POP.
b) Problem of Practice—Provide a clear statement of the POP.
c) Clearly articulate a systems approach to understanding and organizing underlying causes and factors. Clearly identify the appropriate theoretical frames and perspectives that will be used to explore the POP.
d) Clearly identify and organizes potential underlying causes and factors related to the POP.
e) Synthesize research literature that informs the development of a conceptual framework or model of the relationships between the factors and causes. Provide a critical review, analysis, and synthesis of scholarly literature.
f) Summary of the factors and underlying causes leading to a rationale for the chosen factors examined empirically in Ch. 2.

Ch. 2 – Empirical examination of the factor and underlying causes (Year 1)

a) Introduction—provides connection between Ch. 1 and the empirical study in Ch. 2.
b) Context of Study—Description of the context including overview of the target population (i.e., those who are impacted by the intervention, which may go beyond the study participants).
c) Statement of the purpose of the empirical study including research questions related to underlying causes and factors related to the POP.
d) Method:
   1) Research Design—provide an overview of the research design for your study:
(a) Participants—description of the sample and participant selection.
(b) Measures and Instrumentation—description of all variables (including how each will be defined and measured in this study), data sources such as existing data, assessments, measures/surveys, and/or interview protocols; include a discussion of validity and reliability from existing data OR indicate in the Procedure section how you intend to address issues of validity and reliability.
(c) Procedure – outline of the steps and timeline:
   1. Data collection methods—description of data collection procedure.
   2. Data analysis—how will the data be analyzed including specific steps to code qualitative data and statistical analyses for quantitative data. You should also consider how you will manage the data, but this does not have to be explicated in this section.
(e) Findings and Discussion—systematic discussion of the findings including elaboration of description of context based on the empirical study
(f) References (moved to end of project each year)

Ch. 3 – Intervention literature review (Year 2)
   a) Connection to Ch. 2—Summary of empirical findings from Ch. 2 with rationale for focus on specific types of interventions.
   b) Theoretical framework OR conceptual framework that provides the foundation for the intervention.
   c) Synthesis of the intervention literature targeted toward contributing factors that were determined to be important within the context of professional practice; provide an argument through the synthesis of the literature for the proposed intervention.
   c) Brief summary with overview of proposed intervention.

Ch. 4 – Intervention procedure and program evaluation methodology (Year 2)
   a) Introduction providing connection to Ch. 3 and leading to the purpose of the study and research questions for the intervention.
   b) Research Design including logic model:
      i) Process evaluation – design for examining the implementation of the intervention.
      ii) Outcome evaluation – design for examining the proximal outcomes of the intervention.
   c) Method:
      i) Participants—Description of sample (this may be general at the proposal stage but is rewritten with specifics in the dissertation), participant selection, and/or site identification; comparison group description if applicable.
      ii) Measures or Instrumentation—description of all variables, data sources such as existing data, assessments, measures/surveys, and/or interview protocols.
      iii) Procedure:
         (1) Intervention—detailed description of the intervention including a timeline for the intervention. (NOTE: This description should elaborate the description provided in the summary for Ch. 3.)
         (2) Data collection—description of data collection procedure to examine BOTH the process of implementation and proximal outcomes of the intervention.
(3) Data analysis—description of the data analyses including specific steps to code qualitative data and statistical analyses for quantitative data. You should also consider how you will manage the data, but this does not have to be explicated in this section.

(4) Summary Matrix—include a matrix showing alignment between research questions, measures or instrumentation that operationalizes the variables of interest, data collection, and data analysis as an Appendix; refer to appendix as appropriate throughout Procedure section

Ch. 5 – Findings and Discussion
   a) Process of implementation—rich description of the process of intervention implementation
   b) Findings—statement of the empirical findings organized by research question
   c) Conclusions—Summative statements relative to findings
   d) Discussion—Discussion of the findings including recommendation and limitations of the study - relationship to the literature, relationship to the theoretical framework, relationship to practice

References

Clarifying Questions to Ponder

The following questions are provided to guide students toward the successful write-up of their study. The questions below will help to position the students’ work to address each element identified below:

1) Does the Executive Summary provide an overview of the dissertation?

2) Does the introduction of the POP (Ch. 1) ...
   a) Establish the POP? Provide a rationale for why the problem is a problem? Provide evidence for the POP broadly as well as within the context of professional practice? Provide a clear statement of the POP?
   b) Clearly articulate a systems approach to understanding and organizing underlying causes and factors?
   c) Clearly identify the appropriate multidisciplinary lenses that will be used to explore the POP?
   d) Clearly identify and organizes potential underlying causes and factors related to the POP?
   e) Synthesize literature that informs the development of a conceptual framework or model of the relationships between the factors and causes? Provide a critical review, analysis, and synthesis of scholarly literature? Discuss the theoretical perspective as appropriate.

3) Does the empirical examination of the factors and underlying causes (Ch. 2) ...
   a) Situate readers in the perspective of the doctoral student’s organization – the context for the POP?
   b) Build a connection to the literature review related to factors and underlying causes for the POP?
   c) Establish the approach for examining the underlying causes and associated factors within the context of professional practice?
d) Clearly delineate the underlying causes and factors associated with the POP as they are manifested within the context of professional practice?

e) Clearly and convincingly establish the significance of the problem within the field of education?

4) Does the literature review related to the intervention (Ch. 3) ...
   a) Build connections to the findings from the empirical study of the factors and underlying causes for the POP?
   b) Establishes a theoretical framework (or combination of supporting theoretical frameworks) that serves (serve) as a frame for the intervention and/or final expected outcome.
   c) Synthesize important literature related to interventions that addresses one or more underlying causes or factors associated with the POP?
   d) Analyze the research for strengths and weaknesses?

5) Does the evaluation procedure (Ch. 4) ...
   a) Build a connection to the literature review presented in Ch. 3 including the argument for the intervention?
   b) Establish research questions for the dissertation study?
   c) Clearly articulate appropriate and rigorous methods to evaluate outcomes of the intervention or analysis of policy and procedure?
   d) Clearly indicate all components of the methods including the participants, measures, procedure for the intervention and for evaluation, data collection, and data analysis?
   e) Clearly articulate the intervention implementation procedure?

6) Does the findings chapter (Ch. 5) ...
   a) Clearly articulate a description of the process of implementation as well as a critical assessment of the implementation drawing on multiple sources of data?
   b) Clearly articulate the outcomes of the study based on the analysis of the data?
   c) Provide valid and reliable conclusions to inform stakeholders and other educational professionals?
   d) Provide a logical and precise argument as well as conclusions for practice?
   e) Discuss limitations of the study?
   f) Illustrate a multidisciplinary approach to educational improvement?
   g) Leverage both practical experience and scholarly knowledge in the design of an intervention to address underlying causes and factors associated with the POP?
   h) Connect back to the literature, the theoretical frame and the original context for the study to connect to practice?
Getting Started Guide for Students

What is Starfish?

Starfish is an early alert communication system that is integrated with Blackboard and allows instructors and advisors to monitor a student’s academic progress. This system allows students to easily schedule appointments with faculty members and advisors.

Recommended Browser Settings for Starfish

1. Microsoft Internet Explorer:
   - On the tool bar, select Tools -- Internet Options -- Privacy.
   - Make sure that the settings for the Internet Zone are no higher than Medium High.

2. Firefox:
   - On the tool bar, select Tools -- Options -- Privacy.
   - Click on "Accept Third-party cookies."
   - Click on "Ok"

3. Safari:
   - On the tool bar, select Edit -- Preferences.
   - Next to "Accept Cookies:" click "Always."

How do I access Starfish?

You can access Starfish by logging into Blackboard and clicking the ‘Starfish’ tab at the top.

>> Setup Your Profile (optional)

Your profile lets instructors and advisors know who you are and how to contact you. It also includes the email address for where you want to receive updates and reminders.

- In the upper right hand corner, click on your name to edit your profile
  - Select the Upload a photo, set email preference, update phone number, etc.
  - Browse for a photo on your desktop (JPEG, GIF, and PNG). Click the Upload Now button.

Please Note: This email preference is for Starfish purposes ONLY. Your primary email for all other purposes i.e. ISIS self-service will continue to be your JHU email.

>> Make an Appointment with a Faculty Member or your Advisor

1. Once inside Starfish, click the Success Network tab in the top left.
2. Locate the appropriate office (i.e. Office of Academic Advising) and click the link to expand the list of service members for that office.
3. Click the **Schedule Appointment** link to view the service member’s calendar. (Note: If there is no ‘Schedule Appointment’ link, online scheduling is not available through Starfish for this member or office.)

4. Move through the calendar using the mini calendar tool located in the left column. All dates with available time slots will be **bold**.

5. Available meeting times will have a **Sign Up** link. Click this link to make an appointment for that time.

6. Complete the form and click the **Save** button. You’ll get an email confirmation of the appointment.

**>> Online Scheduling not available**

1. Click on the email address to send an email to request an appointment.

   ![Email Icon]

   jhu.edu.JHU.TEST

   Online scheduling not available

**>> Frequently Asked Questions**

*What if I need to cancel or modify an appointment I made?*

   Find the appointment on your **Dashboard** shown on the Starfish home page. Click either the “**X**” to cancel the appointment or the “**edit symbol**” to modify the appointment.

*What if my advisor or instructor has to cancel the appointment?*

   You will be notified by email of the cancellation and it will disappear from your **Dashboard**.

*What if I need more help?*

   Send an email to [starfish@jhu.edu](mailto:starfish@jhu.edu) with your questions.
Policy Statement: Teaching Assistantships

It is the policy of the Johns Hopkins University School of Education (SOE) that individuals appointed as Teaching Assistants (for on-line and face-to-face courses) abide by the policies stated below.

Scope
This policy applies to all individuals appointed as Teaching Assistants in the SOE at Johns Hopkins University.

Definition
Teaching Assistants are graduate students who help faculty with the content and delivery of courses. Services provided by Teaching Assistants include, but are not limited to, monitoring, leading lab and/or discussion sessions, offering office hour assistance to students, and/or performing clerical tasks associated with course instruction. While Teaching Assistants can recommend grades for assignments, the course instructor-of-record is responsible for making all grading decisions. Teaching Assistants are supervised by the course instructor-of-record and are subject to established SOE policies on student academic employment.

Qualifications
To be eligible for appointment as a Teaching Assistant a student must:

- be a degree-seeking graduate student (master’s and doctoral students only) without existing admission conditions imposed by SOE’s Dean or Vice Dean of Academic Affairs;
- be in good academic standing (i.e., have maintained a 3.0 GPA or better throughout the course of his/her degree) and be making satisfactory progress toward a graduate degree; and
- remain registered in courses that count toward the graduate degree for at least three semester hours (i.e., credits) during each semester while employed as a Teaching Assistant.

Selection and Appointment
All Teaching Assistant appointments are subject to approval by the Dean or his/her designee. Funding availability is considered in all appointments. Any faculty member and/or program director can recommend a graduate student for a teaching assistantship appointment.

Terms of Appointment
Appointments should, in general, be made on a semester-by-semester basis. The period of appointment shall not exceed one academic year and shall terminate at the expiration of the stated period of appointment without notification of non-renewal.
Duties of Teaching Assistants

- Teaching Assistants may only be assigned duties that are adjunct to regular classroom instruction.
- All duties performed by Teaching Assistants shall be under the supervision and direction of a designated member of the faculty or the course instructor-of-record. Such duties may include student practice sessions, discussion sessions, assistance in laboratories, recitation sessions, review sessions, and other similar activities.
- Teaching Assistants may make recommendations for course assignment grades provided that the Teaching Assistant holds a higher degree than the degree program in which s/he is assisting. Thus:
  - Teaching Assistants with a master’s degree may recommend grades for students in undergraduate courses; and
  - Teaching Assistants with a doctoral degree may recommend grades for master’s students.
- Teaching Assistants may be assigned to hold office hours, hold student conferences, and to perform similar common academic duties.
- Teaching Assistants may NOT be assigned regular classroom instruction duties, nor may they serve as an instructor-of-record for any instructional activity.
- Teaching Assistants may NOT submit final grades to ISIS self-service and/or the ELC gradebook.

Supervision of Teaching Assistants

All Teaching Assistants shall be under direct and assigned supervision of a faculty member (either a full-time faculty or a faculty associate) and shall regularly report on the conduct and performance of their duties to the supervising faculty. The supervising faculty shall, at the end of each semester, file with the Vice Dean of Academic Affairs a written evaluation of the performance of all Teaching Assistants under the supervising faculty’s direction. The evaluation shall become a permanent part of the Teaching Assistant's personnel file.

Other Employment Information

Although they are not members of the faculty, Teaching Assistants are expected to conform to the same standards of conduct in the performance of their academic duties as are members of the faculty and shall respect the rights and opinions of students and uphold the academic standards of the School of Education.
Steps for Creating a CITI Account and Completing the Human Subjects Research Training

PLEASE BE SURE TO FOLLOW THE DIRECTIONS BELOW IN ORDER TO SELECT THE CORRECT TRAINING, AS IT IS A BIT CONFUSING. IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL THE HIRB OFFICE AT 410-516-6580 BEFORE YOU BEGIN THE TRAINING.

1. Go to: https://www.citiprogram.org/Default.asp
2. If you already have a CITI account, sign into your account and proceed to step #5.
3. If you are new user to the CITI Program, register to create an account by clicking on New Users Register Here. Complete the registration process. Make sure you select Johns Hopkins University as your institution, create your username and password etc.
4. You will be asked to complete some basic member information and also which course curriculum you need to take. The system will guide you through a series of questions to determine which course is appropriate for you.
5. THIS IS THE TRICKY PART...Choose, “Yes, I need to take the training in Human Subjects Research (HIRB Training)”. You DO NOT need to complete the Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) course for IRB purposes.

If you choose to complete the RCR Course, you will still need to complete the Basic Course in the Protection of Human Research Subjects for IRB purposes.

Please look below to guide you through the correct selections.

1. If you conduct research in any of the following settings, select all that apply.
   - Yes, I need to take the training in Human Subjects Research (HIRB training)
   - Yes, I need to take the course on Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)

6. On the next screen, if you have not previously completed the Basic Course, select the Basic Course. If you are renewing your certification because you have completed the basic course over 5 years ago, please select the Refresher Course.
7. On the next screen, you will be prompted to select your curriculum. Select Social & Behavioral Research Investigators if you are submitting an expedited application.

If you have reviewed the exempt checklist on the HIRB website and you feel your research fits into one category, or have been told your research will be Exempt, select Exempt Research. Please note that if your research is determined to not be exempt, you will need to complete the Social & Behavioral Research Investigators module as well.

If you are conducting research only as part of a classroom activity, select Classroom Protocols.

8. The IRB does not require you to complete the Good Clinical Practice (GCP) course.
9. This will bring you back to the main page. Scroll down until you see “My Courses”. Under Status, you will see “Not Started - Enter”. Click ‘enter’ to be taken to the course.

10. Complete the course as required. You do not have to complete the course all in one sitting; you are allowed to use multiple log-on sessions. The minimum "passing" aggregate score for the quizzes is 80%. A running tally is compiled in the Grade Book. If you want to improve a score on a quiz, you may repeat any quiz in which you didn't score 100 % correct.

11. Print out a copy of the completion certificate for your files and save a copy to your computer as well. A copy will be sent automatically to your institutional administrator. You may return to the course site in the future to obtain a copy of the completion report or take the other offered courses.
Throughout your EdD program, you will be asked to write your Problem of Practice (POP) statement, or different iterations of your POP statement, in course assignments as well as in your dissertation. Below are some suggestions for how you might think about writing your POP statement as well as several examples. Please refer to the Applied Dissertation Description (July 2016) for further discussion.

Your POP statement should be a single, succinct paragraph that delineates the broad problem in society, some evidence of this broad problem within the research literature, and how this problem manifests itself in your context. More explicitly, you could follow these steps to writing this statement of the POP:

1. State the broad problem in society. You may want to begin with an introductory or explanatory sentence.
2. Provide at least three evidential statements of the problem including citations. These are statements that provide evidence that the problem exists in various forms.
3. State how this big problem manifests itself in your professional context.

Examples:

**Achievement disparities among traditionally underserved students**

A snapshot of the American educational landscape in 2011 reflects a strikingly similar portrait of the K-12 environment 30 years ago. From *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983) to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB, Act of 2001), the state of education remains distressed, particularly for traditionally underserved students. Stagnant academic performance persists among low-socioeconomic and minority students (Lee, 2006), and National Assessment Education Statistics data analyses delineate how achievement gaps have remained relatively stable between different groups of students (Lee, 2006; Rampey, Dion, & Donahue, 2009). High school dropout rates have risen in some groups of traditionally underserved populations (Balfanz & Letgers, 2006; Barton, 2000; Greene, 2002; Greene & Winters, 2005; Sum & Harrington, 2003, Swanson & Chaplin, 2003). Further, school failures within our most needy districts in urban and rural locales leave underserved populations without access to educational resources. NCLB (2001) was passed to ameliorate the persistent performance differences, yet the result in many places has been to widen already existing gaps in achievement and access to educational resources. The persistent low levels of achievement and unequal access continue to frustrate practitioners and researchers. In Green High School (GHS), student success records mirror the US national patterns: traditionally underserved minority students graduate at lower rates than their privileged counterparts, gaps exist between many groups, fewer of these students are represented in AP courses, resources have been withdrawn from the school as a result of NCLB policies, and dropout rates at GHS have not abated (CITATION to school records).

**Explanation:** In this particular example, the POP statement remains broad and focused on the outcome problem: achievement disparities among traditional underserved students. This statement provides evidence that this problem exists: NAEP data, graduation rates, drop-out rates, school failures, and diminished access to educational resources. Lastly, it describes how the problem within the context of professional practice reflects the national problem.

**POP Statement Submission for Advising process:**

For the POP statement that you will submit to begin the advisory selection, please consider including some information that briefly outlines the factors associated with the problem. This list should follow the POP
statement and may be provided in bulleted format. It will allow us to better align adviser selection with your specific interest BUT is not required at this time.

Below are several POP statements that are examples. They are not necessarily exemplars of the format presented above but show some variation within this format. They are provided only as examples for you to consider.

Neuroscience misuse in schools

While interest in the brain sciences and neuroscience literacy has grown considerably, misconceptions and misapplications of hastily-applied brain research grew parallel to that interest. Specific misunderstandings and incorrect notions about the brain, either in structure or function, were isolated, identified, and labeled as neuromyths (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD], 2002). Particularly within the field of educational neuroscience, or mind, brain, and education, the role of neuromyths has been examined in terms of teachers’ beliefs about what affects and underlies student learning (Dekker, Lee, Howard-Jones, & Jolles, 2012). Examples of some neuromyths include the belief that humans regularly use 10% of their brain capacity; that there are visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners; and that people are either “left-brained” or “right-brained” (OECD, 2012). While there is evidence that teachers do adhere to some of these neuromyths (Alekno, 2012; Dekker et al., 2012; Gleichgerrcht, Luttges, Salvareza, & Campos, 2015; Rato et al., 2013) and that neuroscience research findings can be utilized to transform instructional practice (Dommett, Devonshite, Plateau, Westwell, & Greenfield, 2010), there is currently no validated connection between teacher belief in neuromyths and teacher instructional practices. Though there is research indicating that there is a relationship between teacher beliefs and practices more generally (Allinder, 1994; Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988; Aston & Webb, 1986; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Guskey, 1988; Knapp, 2013; Stein & Wang, 1988; Youyan, Tan, Liau, Lau, & Chua, 2013), the support for that relationship exists primarily in regard to teacher efficacy. Thus, this study seeks to determine the extent of this problem within two private schools and then broadly in a state-wide survey.

Community college student attrition

Despite the increase in access to 2-year college programs, the likelihood of community college students to graduate with an associates or baccalaureate degree remains grim within the U.S. The challenges facing community college students as they persist to achieve a baccalaureate degree by upward transfer or graduation with an associate degree are often too simply identified as being underprepared and financially under-resourced. Community college students face many obstacles to persistence that impede their ability to earn a degree and transfer including being academically underprepared (Bailey, 2012; Fike & Fike, 2008), financially under-resourced (Dowd & Coury, 2006; Mendoza, Mendez, & Malcolm, 2009), and more often first generation college students without knowledgeable support at home of college processes including registration, financial aid, and transfer (Dowd, Pak, & Bensimon, 2013; Goldrick-Rab, 2010, Lareau, 2011). Further, there are few barriers to registering for courses or opting for a program of study in the open-access community college environment, which may lead to students taking unnecessary courses or those not covered by financial aid (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). Among the many ways community college students differ from their 4-year university counterparts is that they tend not to seek student support services or integrate themselves in campus life (Martin et al., 2014). Thus, despite the many institutional supports available, community college students often make decisions about curriculum and transfer without professional advice. Taken together, these factors lead to the problem of low graduation and transfer rates for community college students, and this case remains true in Jane Doe Community College in a mid-Atlantic suburban city.

App Z POP Statement Guidance (May 30 2017)
NCAA Eligibility

Since 1965, initial-eligibility requirements have existed to ensure that high school student-athletes are academically prepared for the rigors and time demands they will face at a 4-year institution (Pickle, 2008). What remains, however, is high overall number and proportion of high school student-athletes who fall short of meeting NCAA academic initial-eligibility requirements annually. For high school student-athletes to qualify to practice, compete, and receive athletically-related financial aid during their first year of full-time enrollment at an NCAA Division I or Division II institution, they must meet minimum academic initial-eligibility standards as certified by the NCAA Eligibility Center. NCAA proprietary data show that approximately 200,000 high school students annually register with the Eligibility Center with the goal of becoming NCAA Division I or Division II student-athletes. Among those students, approximately 90,000 are actively recruited by a Division I or Division II college or university and thus receive a final academic certification. Of those 90,000 students who receive a final academic certification, approximately 13% annually fall short of meeting initial-eligibility academic requirements and, in many cases, miss the opportunity for higher education. In particular, approximately 20% of all recruited high school football players are academically ineligible coming out of high school. African American high school football players, many of whom come from limited-resource, urban school districts, comprise the largest demographic subset of academically ineligible high school student-athletes. Accordingly, the POP addressed in this study focused particularly on low-income and minority high school football players and was thus situated within broader studies related to college access and achievement gaps among low-income and minority students.