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Introduction

The Johns Hopkins University School of Education’s doctoral programs are a significant feature of the School’s research function and contribute greatly to its mission to support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth, and adults. The Ph.D. in Education program ensures that candidates have the competencies to be scholars and researchers in education and to meet the myriad challenges associated with ensuring education quality and improvement. The program includes formal coursework, internships, and research preparation for students seeking leadership positions in university teaching, research, policy development, administration, and supervision of educational and human services organizations. Graduates of this program are prepared to fill faculty and research scientist positions at research-intensive universities or secure positions at research institutes and centers that conduct and manage large-scale education-based evaluations.

Doctor of Philosophy Program

The School of Education (SOE) offers a dynamic and innovative full-time Ph.D. program in Education that integrates and builds upon the research of its faculty and the broader Johns Hopkins academic community. Graduates of our Ph.D. program acquire exceptional content area expertise within a comprehensive multidisciplinary frame of reference, which enables them to: (1) bridge successfully the theory and research to evidence-based practice gap; (2) become actively involved in public policy development and evaluation; (3) conduct research on complex databases linking educational practices to student outcomes, or lead laboratory- or school-based research programs that inform efforts to improve educational practices and student outcomes; and, (4) develop national models of educational practice that guide curriculum development and educator preparation.
Major Elements, Fundamental Requirements, and Procedures

The overarching goal of the program is to develop scholars who have advanced research skills with specific emphases on policy analysis and education improvement. To accomplish this goal, the program provides students with both a multidisciplinary core of learning activities and opportunities. All SOE Ph.D. students will devote four (or five) years to full-time study and research as a resident student. This period of time will provide opportunity for full engagement and participation in the academic community and allow students to develop and demonstrate the scholarly capabilities required of the degree. There may be opportunities to obtain additional funding for work with permission of the advisor and/or the director of the Ph.D. program. This additional work is limited to 8 hours/week during semesters in which students are registered full-time. During periods when courses are not in session, students may work for additional pay at the discretion of the advisor. Students may not receive pay and course credits for the same work.

University Requirements for Ph.D.
(from website: http://web.jhu.edu/administration/provost/initiatives/Ph.D._board/)

There are three fundamental requirements for the Ph.D. at Johns Hopkins University: dissertation, residence, and oral examination. None of these requirements can be modified or changed without unanimous consent of the schools and the Provost.

1. Dissertation: All Ph.D. students must successfully complete a dissertation in accordance with relevant school and program guidelines prior to degree conferral.

2. Residence: All Ph.D. students must have completed two consecutive semesters of full-time study prior to degree conferral.
3. **Oral Examination:** All Ph.D. students must successfully pass a required oral examination conducted by five faculty members. The oral examination must include the chair and at least one other member from outside the candidate's home department.

It is university policy that all program and university requirements for the Ph.D. must be completed in 12 years or less from start of the doctoral program. The Doctor of Philosophy Board reviews all candidates for the Ph.D. prior to conferral to ensure that the fundamental requirements for the Ph.D. have been met within the timeframe delineated.

**Credit Requirements**

Program requirements include 90 graduate credits made up of coursework, teaching, and research credits over four to five years (8-10 semesters). Students will typically enroll in 12 credit hours per semester for the first three years (6 semesters) and 9 credit hours per semester during the final year of the program. All students are expected to maintain enrollment as a full-time graduate student throughout the course of study.

The current requirements include the following:

- Research Methods and Statistics courses (minimum 18 credit hours)
- Core Seminars (15 credit hours)
- Major and/or minor area electives & readings (minimum 21 credit hours)
- Doctoral Research and/or Teaching Credits (18 credit hours)
- Dissertation research (18 credit hours)

The student may petition for up to 12 credits of prior master's level graduate coursework to be transferred to fulfill these 90 credits. The students' doctoral advisor and the Ph.D. Program Director must approve this request (see Appendix A Forms). Thus, a minimum of 78 credits must
be completed at the doctoral level while at JHU and may draw upon existing course offerings in the
School of Education, Bloomberg School of Public Health, and the Krieger School of Arts and
Sciences. Core seminars are not eligible for transfer credit. Students will be engaged in research
teams with faculty throughout their doctoral program of study, however, it is possible that some
students may require less time in formal coursework and more time in independent study or
completing their dissertation research.

Selection of the Doctoral Advisor

When applicants are accepted as doctoral students, they are assigned an interim doctoral
advisor either during admissions or during the first few weeks of the first semester in the program.
During the first two years of study, students may retain their interim doctoral advisor or identify a
doctoral advisor they believe to be more compatible with their professional interests. Selection of
the permanent doctoral advisor by the end of their second year of study is based upon the student’s
preferences, the shared interests of the student and the faculty member, and the responsibilities of
the faculty member. Advising faculty may also recommend changes based on their understanding of
the student’s interests and other matters. The doctoral advisor is responsible for guiding the student
through candidacy and toward meeting their dissertation requirements.

Open communication and transparency are the cornerstone of a strong program, and
changes in advisors are a necessary component of a flexible program. Students seeking a change of
doctoral advisor at any time during their doctoral studies should be discussing these matters
informally with the advisor and other relevant faculty. If a change becomes desirable, the student
must inform their current doctoral advisor in writing of their decision to request a change. Then,
they must submit a Change of Advisor Form (see Appendix A Forms) to the Director of the Ph.D.
program indicating they have informed their current advisor (include a copy of the letter to the advisor). The selection of a new doctoral advisor will be based on the willingness and availability of the faculty member identified by the student and is overseen by the Ph.D. Program Director.

**Planning the Program of Study**

Students should work closely with their doctoral advisor(s) to determine the appropriate balance of coursework, teaching, and research for each semester. Advisors are encouraged to keep documentation in the form of an electronic document that tracks ongoing changes in plans so that they can be incorporated into the student's Program of Study. The Program of Study will document specific courses the student has taken or plans to take, credit hours that have been approved for transfer from previous graduate level coursework, and the completed and planned research and teaching experiences. The initial Program of Study should be completed no later than the end of the second semester of the student's first year of doctoral studies (see Appendix A Forms). For the initial Program of Study, the student and his/her doctoral advisor will jointly review the student's graduate record to determine the courses, readings, and independent studies that can be counted toward the major area of study. Inasmuch as the content of the program will have a definitive influence on the types of competencies the student will acquire, congruence between the program of studies and the student's professional goals is essential. Students are encouraged to identify the roles they want to be capable of performing at the conclusion of their studies (i.e. college/university professor, research scientist, etc.) as these roles will influence their research and other academic activities leading to the dissertation.

The Program of Study serves as a working document between the student and the doctoral advisor and should be reviewed often. As the student progresses through the program, changes or
substitutions may be necessary as goals evolve and opportunities emerge. The student's doctoral advisor must approve any/all changes and submit an updated Program of Study to the Director of the Ph.D. program.

**Continuous Integration of Coursework with Research and Teaching**

In addition to what might be considered formal coursework, students will spend a significant part of their graduate career engaged in research and teaching activities tailored to their interests and goals. During the first three years of the Ph.D. program, research and/or teaching activities will be focused on developing the appropriate skills and background to prepare for the dissertation. These activities should take the form of an on-going apprenticeship between the student and his/her advisor and are designed to provide instances of direct and indirect instruction within an intellectual community that enables students to conceptualize and develop socially and scientifically valid lines of research. Doctoral advisors will work with students to determine the appropriate activities and adjust the plan of study as interests and goals evolve, but the major focus should be on developing depth and focus in a research area leading to a dissertation. For most students, this will entail a primary commitment to the research activities of the doctoral advisors and collaborators. However, students and advisors will also discuss areas where student interests overlap with other faculty research interests to develop plans for additional interactions that will enrich the plan of study and allow the students to pursue independent research projects. Students may ultimately work on a variety of projects provided that they form a coherent training plan with the necessary depth and focus. In the final year(s) of the program, research activities will be focused on the completion of a dissertation.
Doctoral Studies Committee and Annual Review

A Doctoral Studies Committee oversees and coordinates the Ph.D. program within the SOE. This committee, chaired by the Director of the Doctor of Philosophy program, is composed of SOE faculty members representing various academic programs and centers and a non-voting doctoral student representative. The Doctoral Studies Committee, in consultation with students’ doctoral advisors, ensures that doctoral students receive an annual written evaluation of their progress during the summer following each spring semester. The purpose of the annual review is twofold: (1) students receive feedback on the progress and direction of their doctoral program of study; and (2) the Doctoral Studies Committee is able to monitor the progress of the doctoral students as individuals and a group.

Procedures. In the latter half of the spring semester, students will be prompted to complete a self-evaluation form (see Appendix A Forms) outlining the progress from the most recent year and goals for the coming year. The Doctoral Studies Committee will simultaneously solicit feedback from faculty who have interacted with the students throughout the year. Using the student self-evaluation, faculty feedback, and personal interactions with the student, the doctoral advisor will compose a letter on behalf of the Doctoral Studies Committee outlining the student’s strengths and weaknesses, offering constructive suggestions, and indicating upcoming deadlines.

The doctoral advisor will submit one of the following determinations as part of the letter:

- Student is making satisfactory progress.
- Student should be placed on probation and provided remedial services. Specific terms for getting off of probation must be spelled out in the subsequent letter.
- Student should be terminated from the program.
The Doctoral Studies Committee, in consultation with the doctoral advisor, will finalize the letter to the student. The advisor will then schedule a meeting with the student to go over the letter and the recommendations. This should not supplant on-going discussion between the student and advisor but will formalize the feedback and keep students on track. The student and advisor will sign the letter and return one signed copy to the Doctoral Studies Committee.

**Doctoral Advisory Committee**

As a student progresses through the doctoral program, he or she assembles a Doctoral Advisory Committee, with guidance from the doctoral advisor, to assist with and evaluate comprehensive oral examinations, the dissertation prospectus, the dissertation proposal, and the dissertation. The Doctoral Advisory Committee consists of three persons, including the committee Chair. The Chair must be a promotion-track faculty member within the School of Education. The two additional committee members must be faculty from the School of Education or a related discipline from another JHU school. This committee should be established no later than the end of second academic year.

**Qualifying Exam**

Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program are required to complete written examination and an oral defense with their Doctoral Advisory Committee. The purpose of these activities is to test the student’s ability to synthesize and integrate the specialized knowledge acquired during the first two years of his or her program of study, and the committee’s role is to assess whether the student is prepared to handle the independent research required to proceed to the dissertation proposal. The exam also serves to prepare students for the subsequent Doctoral Board Oral that is a university requirement and includes external examiners.
The Qualifying Examination will consist of two components:

1) A take-home written exam that covers both broad common questions and targeted questions on the student’s major and minor areas. Students have 5 days to complete the exam. Students will typically be given the following that will still result in a comprehensive examination of their readiness to proceed to a dissertation proposal:

   a. Choose from a set of stats/methods questions

   b. Choose from a set of course questions

   c. Choose from a set of research area questions: This portion should include questions that probe preliminary ideas for the student’s doctoral thesis. Students should be prepared in advance to address questions about thesis plans in both the written and oral portions.

The Ph.D. program will provide the template of questions to advisors so that committees may tailor the questions to the students’ needs and specific areas of research.

2) Oral Defense: This portion will typically take the form of a meeting with the Doctoral Advisory Committee and should focus on clarifying answers from the written exam, as needed, and discussing the potential dissertation topic in sufficient detail for the committee to judge preliminary feasibility and preparedness.

As a general rule, the student’s doctoral advisor and members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee oversee the qualifying exam. The student should consult individually with the faculty members who will prepare his or her exam questions at least one semester before the written
examination is scheduled to ensure agreement on the body of knowledge as defined by the student's program of study. Together, the student and committee members should develop a reading list to guide the preparation for the exam. Students are advised to complete the qualifying exam prior to the start of the fall semester of the third year of study and are required to have it completed by September 30 at the start of the third year. All qualifying exam activities must be concluded prior to the development of the dissertation proposal.

The written exam answers are reviewed and students are notified of the results by their doctoral advisor approximately two weeks from the day of completion but prior to scheduling a meeting (see below). The possible outcomes for the written exam are as follows:

- **Unconditional pass**: No additional work is needed before either proceeding to the prospectus or meeting (if written prospectus was completed simultaneously).

- **Conditional pass**: The work is largely complete, but the committee would like some additional written work prior to the prospectus and/or meeting.

- **Fail**: The work is inadequate and must be repeated.

The doctoral advisor will complete the student progress form and submit it to the Ph.D. program director and administrator indicating the outcome of the written exam. In the event of a conditional pass, the committee must specify the conditions that need to be met in detail along with the deadline for completion. Any student who fails a written comprehensive examination, in part or in total, will be given a second opportunity to pass that examination within three months of the failure. Failing an examination for the second time will result in termination of the student's participation in the Ph.D. program.

Following successful completion of the written exam, students are required to complete
an oral defense and discussion of next steps. The meeting will serve as an opportunity for the
Doctoral Advisory Committee to probe the student’s knowledge and discuss the initial plans for a
doctoral thesis. In this evaluation, the committee should come to a consensus on whether the
student is prepared to begin work on the formal dissertation proposal. The committee may
recommend an unconditional pass, conditional pass, or failure. In the case of a conditional pass, the
committee will outline and document, in a written letter, the conditions that must be met. These
may include, but are not limited to, an additional written piece, an additional meeting following
exploration, or both. The timeline for completion of any conditions must be specified. Failure to
meet the conditions may result in termination of the student’s participation in the Ph.D. program.
Any student who fails at any stage of the qualifying process, in part or in total, will be given a second
opportunity to pass that examination within three months of the failure. Failing an examination for
the second time will result in termination of the student’s participation in the Ph.D. program.

The doctoral advisor will complete the student progress form and submit it to the
Doctoral Studies Committee indicating the outcome of the qualifying exam process. The Doctoral
Studies Committee will track these indicators. A letter will be generated to the student indicating
successful completion or conditions that must be met for successful completion.

**Doctoral Board Oral**

The Doctor of Philosophy Board for the Johns Hopkins University requires all students to
complete either a preliminary or final Doctoral Board Oral (DBO) examination as part of the
completion of the Ph.D. For more information see:

[http://web.jhu.edu/administration/provost/initiatives/Ph.D._board/Oral_exam](http://web.jhu.edu/administration/provost/initiatives/Ph.D._board/Oral_exam)

The DBO for candidates for the Ph.D. degree has three major objectives:
1. To assess a candidate’s proficiency in the discipline.
2. To give a student the benefit of a critical examination of his or her work by scholars within and beyond the graduate program.
3. To provide a means for monitoring the academic quality of candidates within each program.

The School of Education allows the DBO to be conducted in conjunction with EITHER the proposal defense or the thesis defense. The decision about which stage must be determined prior to scheduling the proposal defense so that the program can ensure proper committee assignments at all stages of student progress. The decision will be noted on the proposal committee and defense form before it is approved by the Ph.D. program director.

Per university requirements, the DBO committee must have a minimum of 5 members of the JHU faculty with 2 members who are external to the student’s program or department. The School of Education meets this requirement by requiring at least one external member with a primary appointment outside of the School of Education. The second external member can either be outside of the School or from an area of research that is clearly outside of the student’s research focus. In addition, at least one of the external members must be at the rank of associate professor or higher in order to serve as the chair of the DBO meeting. Please note that the chair of the DBO is not the same as the student’s doctoral thesis advisor, and this individual’s role is to conduct the meeting in a manner that gives all committee members an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback.

The outcome of the DBO is part of the outcome of the milestone with which it is attached (proposal or thesis defense). See relevant sections for details.
Dissertation Proposal

If a majority of the Doctoral Studies Committee agrees that the qualifying exam is complete and the student is prepared to advance to the dissertation proposal, the student will begin developing a detailed Dissertation Proposal during their third year of coursework. **Students are strongly encouraged to write and obtain committee feedback on a dissertation prospectus as they are developing the proposal.** The full dissertation proposal must include a statement of problem and purpose, a comprehensive review of literature, and a detailed description of the data source and research method. Students are strongly encouraged to use the formatting of a doctoral thesis to facilitate later writing of the actual thesis.

Upon recommendation of his or her Doctoral Advisory Committee, a Proposal Defense is scheduled by the program administrator with the approval of the Director of the Ph.D. Program. This meeting may be with the students Doctoral Advisory Committee or the students full Dissertation Committee depending on whether the student and advisor have elected to conduct the Doctoral Board Oral at the proposal stage or at the final thesis defense (SEE DOCTORAL BOARD ORAL ABOVE).

After the oral examination, the examiners will assign one of three outcomes: “unconditional pass,” “conditional pass,” or “fail.” Immediately after the examination, the chair of the examination committee should tell the candidate in person which of the outcomes has been determined. If the candidate receives an unconditional pass (e.g., a majority of favorable votes), the examination committee is discharged. If the candidate receives a conditional pass, the exact terms of the condition(s) are to be reported on the examination form, i.e., what course(s), if any, need be taken, in what time frame the conditions(s) should be met, and any other pertinent information that will
point out clearly to both the student and faculty how to satisfy the condition(s). As soon as all conditions have been met, the chair of the examination committee must report the removal of the condition(s) in writing to the Ph.D. program director.

In the case where the student is completing the DBO as part of the proposal, it is possible, although unlikely, that the committee will feel that the proposed work can proceed but that an external examination of the student’s knowledge should be repeated. In such a case, the committee may elect to pass the proposal but not the DBO. This should be recorded as a conditional pass with the specific condition of repeating the DBO as part of the dissertation thesis defense.

If the candidate fails, the examination committee, through the chair, should recommend a course of further action:

- No further examination. Student will be dismissed from the program.
- Re-examine the candidate by the same committee at a later date. The candidate must receive a Pass or Conditional Pass on the second attempt. A second failure will lead to dismissal.
- Re-examine the candidate by a different committee at a later date. Reasons should be given for the change in the committee membership. The newly formed committee must have representation from the previous committee. The candidate must receive a Pass or Conditional Pass on the second attempt. A second failure will lead to dismissal.

The committee may recommend whatever action in its judgment seems desirable, taking into consideration the background of the student, previous performance, potential, and reaction to oral questioning. The Doctoral Studies Committee will be guided by these recommendations, but will assume responsibility for whatever action is taken.
At the conclusion of the examination, after a vote has been taken, the chair of the examination committee should record the results of the examination and have each committee member sign the form. The chair should also sign the form and fill in the date. The signed original must be returned to the Doctoral Studies Committee. Upon passing the dissertation proposal, the student qualifies for doctoral candidacy. Advancement to candidacy is a statement of approval indicating that the student possesses the necessary research skills and scholarly ability to proceed to the dissertation stage of doctoral study. Students will receive formal notification of their candidacy status from the chair of the Doctoral Studies Committee within two weeks of passing the DBO Examination. Students who are not approved for candidacy will be dismissed from the Ph.D. program.

**Review of Research Proposals Involving Human Subjects**

Once admitted to candidacy, the student must apply for the Homewood Institutional Review Board (HIRB) approval (if not previously approved), conduct his or her proposed study, and write the dissertation. All dissertation research studies involving human subjects must be submitted to and approved by HIRB prior to the initiation of the study. If conducting the research under an approved IRB protocol, then any necessary amendments must be made prior to initiation. Find complete instructions on the human subjects review process online at [http://web.jhu.edu/Homewood-IRB](http://web.jhu.edu/Homewood-IRB).

**Dissertation & Defense**

The dissertation is the final and most significant requirement for the Ph.D. Once they have attained candidacy status and with the guidance of their doctoral advisor and Doctoral Advisory Committee, students implement, write, and defend the research they have undertaken to address a significant educational issue. Students are expected to develop a research question, demonstrate
mastery of the relevant literature, analyze data, and interpret the results in light of previous studies. Once the dissertation has been completed and approved by the doctoral advisor(s), it must be reviewed and approved by the Ph.D. Program Director. Upon approval, the student will schedule a public presentation and a closed oral defense. If the DBO was completed at the proposal stage, then the dissertation defense may be conducted with the student’s Doctoral Advisory Committee, but all members of the full committee should be invited to participate. The thesis advisor and one additional reader must receive the dissertation at least three weeks prior to the defense and provide a readers’ letter to be included with the dissertation document provided to the full committee. All readers should receive the dissertation document at least two weeks prior to the scheduled presentation and defense. Any changes or suggestions recommended at the final oral defense will be documented for the student. Upon completion, these changes will be verified by the doctoral advisor and the Ph.D. program director.

Graduation

The Application for Graduation form and detailed information on requirements for graduation are available online at: http://www.students.education.jhu.edu/register/graduation.html. The application must be submitted no later than the start of the student’s final term of dissertation research. Commencement information is sent the first week in April. To receive his/her diploma, a student must pay all student accounts in full and resolve any outstanding charges of misconduct or violations of academic integrity.
## Typical Program (required courses underlined)

Note: This is an example of a typical case. All course plans and activities are tailored to the student needs and goals, and timing of specific courses may vary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Basic &amp; Inferential Statistics (3)</td>
<td>Linear Models (3)</td>
<td>Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Methods I (3)</td>
<td>Research Methods II (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Seminar – How Schools Function (3)</td>
<td>Core Seminar – Policy, Process, and Environment or Cultural Perspectives (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Core Seminar – Science of Learning or Schools in Society (3)</td>
<td>Research/Teaching Credits (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Core Seminar – Science of Learning or Schools in Society (3)</td>
<td>Core Seminar – Policy, Process, and Environment or Cultural Perspectives (3)</td>
<td>Annual Review, Doctoral Advisor and Advisory Committee identified Comprehensive Exams &amp; Prospectus (Summer of Year 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hierarchical Linear Models (3)</td>
<td>Research Writing Course (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative Methods (3)</td>
<td>Elective/Methods (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Teaching Credits (3)</td>
<td>Research/Teaching Credits (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Elective/Methods (3)</td>
<td>Elective/Methods (3)</td>
<td>Annual Review, Proposal Defense &amp; Doctoral Board Oral Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective/Methods (3)</td>
<td>Elective/Methods (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any Missing Requirements</td>
<td>Any Missing Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research/Teaching Credits (3)</td>
<td>Research/Teaching Credits (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 12</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dissertation Research (9)</td>
<td>Dissertation Research (9)</td>
<td>Dissertation Public Presentation &amp; Oral Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total credits = 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milestone Checklist
The Director of the Ph.D. Program and Doctoral Studies Committee will track your progress through the program by recording completion of specific milestones. The following table is a summary of those milestones and their expected timing. (Future iterations will include specific calendar dates where appropriate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILESTONE</th>
<th>APPROX. TIMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOE assigns interim doctoral advisor</td>
<td>Year 1, Semester 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Self Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Development Plan (IDP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Initial Program of Study</td>
<td>End of Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form Doctoral Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Year 2, Semester 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Self Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review &amp; Update IDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Program of Study</td>
<td>End of Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Exams</td>
<td>Summer Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 18 Credits Methods/Statistics</td>
<td>Years 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 18 Credits Research/Teaching</td>
<td>Years 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 21 Credits Electives/Readings</td>
<td>Years 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Dissertation Proposal* (&amp; Doctoral Board Examination)</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Self Evaluation</td>
<td>End of Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review &amp; Update IDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm Program of Study</td>
<td>End of Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 18 Credits Dissertation Research</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 90 Total Credits</td>
<td>End of Year 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation, Public Presentation, &amp; Oral Defense* (&amp; Doctoral Board Examination)</td>
<td>By end of Year 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Doctoral Board Oral Exam may be completed as part of either the dissertation proposal defense or the final dissertation thesis defense.*
# Program of Study Form*

**Johns Hopkins University **
School of Education
Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Name__________________  JHU email ______________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I. Research Methodology: 18-24 credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.883.601</td>
<td>Basic and Inferential Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall (1st yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.883.725</td>
<td>Research Landscape (Methods I)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall (1st yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS.230.604</td>
<td>Linear Models for the Social Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring (1st yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.883.xxx</td>
<td>Research Methods II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring (1st yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td>Research Methods (Elective)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td>Research Methods (Elective)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>II. Coursework in Core Knowledge-Base or Minor Area: 21 credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>III. Core Seminar: 15 credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.855.755</td>
<td>How Schools Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall (1st yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.855.764</td>
<td>Schools in Society</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall (1st yr or 2nd yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.855.815</td>
<td>Science of Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall (1st yr or 2nd yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.855.835</td>
<td>Socio-Cultural Perspectives</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring (1st or 2nd yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.855.xxx</td>
<td>Policy, Process, and Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spring (1st or 2nd yr)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IV. Internship: 18 credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students must register for 3 Research or Teaching Credits each semester beginning with the 1st spring semester and continue for the remaining 5 semesters of coursework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>V. Dissertation Research: 18 credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.883.849</td>
<td>Dissertation Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.883.849</td>
<td>Dissertation Research</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degree requires a minimum of 90 credits. 78 credits must be at the doctoral level.

Student Signature:__________________  Date:__________________

Adviser:__________________  Date:__________________
Transfer of Credit

Directions: Complete form and return to your adviser for signature. Include an official transcript if one is not on file with your application. Once signed by the adviser, please send to the SOE Office of Doctoral Studies, Education Building - Room 132.

Date: ____________________

Name: ____________________  SIS ID: ________________

Please transfer _____ credits from ____________________________

College or University

for the following course(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th># of credits</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These credits will be applied to the Doctor of Philosophy program.

______________________________
Signature

Approved:

______________________________  _______________________
Adviser’s Signature  Date
Johns Hopkins University  ∙  School of Education
Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Selection of Major Adviser Form

I, ________________________________ formally request

Student Name ________________________________

________________________________________ as my major adviser for

Adviser Name ________________________________

the Doctor of Philosophy program.

________________________________________ Date

________________________________________________________________________

Student Signature ______________________________________________________

Adviser Signature ______________________________________________________

Director’s Signature ____________________________________________________
# Graduate Student Self-Evaluation

**Name**

**Advisor**

**Year**

**Entered Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements Checklist</th>
<th>Date/Semester Completed</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Interdisciplinary courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Improvement: Policy &amp; Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Cultural Perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations of Ed Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversies in Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods &amp; Statistics (18 credits)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Research Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional methods or statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elective Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quals** (Summer after year 2; due by 1st semester of 3rd year)

- Written
- Oral

**Dissertation Elements**

- **Prospectus** (Due by 1st semester of 3rd year)
- Dissertation Proposal/Graduate Board Oral
- Dissertation Defense

**Teaching Assistantships**

*Document course number/name/section, semester/year, enrollment & professor for all TA experiences below*

**Teaching Assistant Experience**

*Required TA-ship:*

*Additional TA-ships:*

*TA (intensive):*
Graduate Student Self-Evaluation

Provide a narrative reflecting on your progress & challenges in the last academic year, including research, conference, publication and other relevant activity, as well as your future goals for the coming academic year.

- Describe your progress in the last academic year. Please include challenges you have faced, research you have conducted, presentations, publications, teaching experience, and other relevant activities.

- Describe your goals for the coming academic year, including coursework, research plans, and professional skills you hope to acquire.

- Describe the supports that you need to accomplish the goals you have indicated.

PLEASE ATTACH A PDF OF YOUR CURRENT CV.
Appendix B: Rights and Responsibilities of PhD Students

Statement of the Rights and Responsibilities of Ph.D. Students at Johns Hopkins University

Preamble

Ph.D. education is fundamental to the University’s teaching and research mission. For an intellectual community of scholars to flourish, it is important to acknowledge the principles that underlie the compact between Ph.D. students, the faculty, and other members of the University community.

It is in this spirit that the Doctor of Philosophy Board, in collaboration with faculty and students from across the University, has articulated a statement of rights and responsibilities for doctoral students at Johns Hopkins. The principles described in this document are to be realized in policies established by the various Schools of the University; the Schools will also develop mechanisms to monitor and enforce such policies.

Rights

1. **Ph.D. students have the right to education, supervision and training.** This includes access to the classroom, laboratory and teaching opportunities necessary for completion of degree requirements, appropriate and regular faculty supervision consistent with the norms of the discipline, as well as appropriate research and/or clinical experiences.

2. **Ph.D. students have the right to full and regular access to information about the requirements for the degree.** This includes information regarding program requirements, assignment/selection/change of advisor, expected time to completion, graduation rates, and conditions of financial support.

3. **Ph.D. students have the right to conditions of learning, teaching and research that are appropriate and reasonable for their discipline.** This includes the right to information and ongoing consultation regarding their expected effort and specific duties, as well as clearly stated criteria for participation in collaborative work and/or research.

4. **Ph.D. students have the right to be treated in a respectful and professional manner by all members of the University community.** This includes freedom from discrimination and harassment as well as assurance of reasonable confidentiality in their communications, as governed by university policy.
5. **Ph.D. students have the right to receive, on a regular basis, written evaluation of their progress and to be informed of the criteria upon which the evaluation is based.** Students should also be provided with opportunities to discuss such evaluations with their advisor. Each program should make available their policies concerning academic probation, funding withdrawal, and dismissal; reasonable warning should be provided in advance of dismissal based on failure to make satisfactory academic progress.

6. **Ph.D. students have the right to appropriate recognition for their contributions to research and scholarship.** This will require discussion between the student, advisor and other relevant parties regarding expectations for student contributions and the nature of the recognition.

7. **Ph.D. students have the right to academic freedom.** This includes the right to express, without reprisal, independent opinions about scholarly issues (such as opinions regarding theoretical and methodological debates in their disciplines), opinions regarding matters of institutional policy, concerns about suspected research misconduct and personal opinions on public matters.

8. **Ph.D. students have the right to have their views represented in the development of policies that govern the Ph.D.** Student ideas and perspectives should be solicited and considered if substantive changes in the structure of a Ph.D. program are anticipated.

9. **Ph.D. students have the right to clearly defined policies regarding benefits and nonacademic issues pertinent to their student status.** These policies should cover (but not be limited to) such things as the provision of health care, recognition of family responsibilities, leave, vacation and other absences. These policies should acknowledge that students can, without reprisal, form clubs, associations or organizations around common interests, as long as these are consistent with general non-discrimination policies of the University.

10. **Ph.D. students have the right to accessible procedures for redress of their grievances.** Each School within the University must provide mechanisms to ensure that grievance procedures are fair and without reprisal. These procedures should include Ph.D. student representation, as appropriate.

**Responsibilities**

1. **Ph.D. students have the responsibility to inform themselves of the requirements of their programs.**
2. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to dedicate appropriate effort and time to meeting the requirements of their programs.

3. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to uphold the ethical responsibilities of their profession and discipline. This includes honesty in academic coursework and scholarship, integrity in the use of grant and fellowship funds, and the upholding of ethical norms in the conduct and reporting of research methods and results.

4. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to treat all members of the University community in a respectful and professional manner.

5. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to contribute to the intellectual life of the University and to the advancement of education and scholarship.

6. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to understand and fulfill their role in developing and maintaining a professional relationship with their faculty advisor(s). This includes the responsibility for communicating regularly with advisors, maintaining a mutually agreed upon schedule of meetings, and informing advisors of such things as: the current status of their degree work; any expected deviations from the agreed upon program of studies; and any unanticipated absences.

7. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to recognize the contributions to their research and scholarly publications made by their advisors and other colleagues. This will require communication and consultation with these individuals about the nature of the recognition.

8. Ph.D. students have the responsibility to fulfill their teaching, research and/or clinical commitments and duties in a responsible manner. This includes the responsibility to inform themselves of the requirements of these positions, to maintain the established ethical standards of interaction with students, faculty, patients and/or research participants, and to respect the privacy of information shared with them.

9. Ph.D. students have the responsibility for the appropriate use of university resources and equipment.

10. Ph.D. Students have the responsibility to abide by the established rules and policies of their program, school and the University.
Appendix C: Academic Standards, Academic Probation, Academic Dismissal

**Academic Standards**

[http://education.jhu.edu/academics/academic-catalog/academic-policies/academic-standards-2/](http://education.jhu.edu/academics/academic-catalog/academic-policies/academic-standards-2/)

The School of Education reserves the right to dismiss at any time a student whose academic standing or general conduct is considered unsatisfactory.

**Doctoral Students (EdD or PhD)**

In a doctoral program, a graduate student’s academic standing is considered unsatisfactory 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 degree or certificate program, and a student may be dismissed from the program.

- The student earns a second 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 (required courses) or replace the course (elective credits).

- The student’s cumulative grade point average falls below 3.25 (on a 4.0 point scale).

- The student fails to make adequate progress towards 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 or performing unsatisfactorily during an internship placement.
Academic Probation

http://education.jhu.edu/academics/academic-catalog/academic-policies/academic-policies-grading-system-and-academic-records/

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. The student's program must provide a letter explaining the terms of the probation and the clear requirements for reinstatement. 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/her faculty adviser (or the division director for PSL students) to develop a plan for reinstatement to good academic standing. Any courses taken during the probationary period must be approved by the student’s faculty adviser (or the division director for PSL students). If the student received an unsatisfactory grade in a required course, the student must repeat the course in which the unsatisfactory grade was earned. (See policies on Failure (F Grades) and Repeated Courses.) If the unsatisfactory grade was earned in a course that is not required, the student may take another course that meets with faculty adviser approval. The student will be released from probation once s/he has met the following conditions (where applicable): the student has 1) completed any required repeated course(s) with a satisfactory grade, 2) regained a cumulative grade point average of 3.0, as required for good academic standing, and 3) met all other conditions of probation set by his/her faculty adviser (or the division director for PSL students).
Academic Dismissal

http://education.jhu.edu/academics/academic-catalog/academic-policies/academic-standards-2/

Students will be automatically dismissed from their academic program, irrespective of his/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 within 12 credit hours of being placed on academic probation.
- Earns an additional 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 the same semester or cumulatively over the course of his/her entire program of study.
- Earns two or more C grades (C+, C, or C-) in the same semester or cumulatively over the course of his/her entire program of study.
- Earns an F grade and one C grade (C+, C, or C-) in the same semester or cumulatively over the course of his/her entire program of study.
- Fails to successfully pass comprehensive exams after two attempts.

Dismissal decisions based on grades 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 another degree/certificate program in the School of Education.
Description of the Doctoral Committee Oral (DCO)\textsuperscript{1} from the handbook:

If a majority of the Doctoral Studies Committee agrees that the comprehensive exam is complete and the study outlined within the dissertation prospectus is feasible, the student will begin developing a detailed Dissertation Proposal during their third year of coursework. After the student prepares a dissertation proposal, which includes a statement of problem and purpose, a comprehensive review of literature, and a detailed description of the data source and research method. Upon recommendation of his or her Doctoral Advisory Committee, a Doctoral Committee Oral (DCO) examination is scheduled for the student by the Director of the Ph. D. Program.

In addition to the three members of the students’ Doctoral Advisory Committee, the DCO will be conducted by the student’s Dissertation Committee, which must include at least two members from outside the candidate’s home department as required by the University. For most students, this committee will be an expansion of the Doctoral Advisory Committee. The Doctoral Studies Committee will select a committee member to be the chair of the committee. The purpose of the examination is to test the depth and breadth of the student’s knowledge and reasoning abilities. The scope of such an examination cannot and should not be sharply defined. The Dissertation Committee can determine the limits of the exam by reviewing the candidate’s formal coursework along with the requirements of the candidate’s school, group, department, or committee requirements (e.g., whether specific minor, as well as major, subjects are to be included). The exam will cover the student’s proposed dissertation topic and research plan, so examiners should have information about the dissertation proposal well ahead of the examination (at least two (2) weeks ahead of the examination date).

After the oral examination, the examiners will assign one of three outcomes: “unconditional pass,” “conditional pass,” or “fail.” Immediately after the examination, the chair of the examination committee should tell the candidate in person whether he or she passed or failed the examination, or received a conditional pass. If the candidate receives an unconditional pass (e.g., a majority of favorable votes), the examination committee is discharged. If the candidate receives a conditional pass, the exact terms of the condition are to be reported on the examination form, i.e., what course(s), if any, need be taken, in what time frame the conditions(s) should be met, and any other pertinent information that will point out clearly to both the student and faculty how to satisfy the condition(s). As soon as all conditions have been met, the chair of the examination committee must report the removal of the condition in writing to the PhD Program Director. The committee is then discharged.

If the candidate fails, the examination committee, through the chair, should recommend a course of further action:

- No further examination.
- Re-examine the candidate by the same committee at a later date. The candidate must receive a Pass or Conditional Pass on the second attempt. A second failure will lead to dismissal.

\textsuperscript{1} This was edited with the name change.
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- Re-examine the candidate by a different committee at a later date. Reasons should be given for the change in the committee membership. The newly formed committee must have representation from the previous committee. The candidate must receive a Pass or Conditional Pass on the second attempt. A second failure will lead to dismissal. The committee may recommend whatever action in its judgment seems desirable, taking into consideration the background of the student, previous performance, potential, and reaction to oral questioning. The Doctoral Studies Committee will be guided by these recommendations, but will assume responsibility for whatever action is taken.

At the conclusion of the examination, after a vote has been taken, the chair of the examination committee should record the results of the examination and have each committee member sign the form. The chair should also sign the form and fill in the date. The signed original must be returned to the Doctoral Studies Committee.

Upon passing the DCO Exam, the student qualifies for doctoral candidacy. Advancement to candidacy is a statement of approval issued by the Johns Hopkins University Doctor of Philosophy Board and the School of Education Doctoral Studies Committee indicating that the student possesses the necessary research skills and scholarly ability to proceed to the dissertation stage of doctoral study. Students will receive formal notification of their candidacy status from the chair of the Doctoral Studies Committee within two weeks of passing the DCO exam. Students who are not approved for candidacy will be dismissed from the PhD program.

Why a DCO?
To receive a PhD from Johns Hopkins University, students are required to do an oral examination with a committee of 5 members of the university faculty (committee makeup is outlined in a subsequent section). In the School of Education, this Doctoral Committee Oral (DCO) is currently completed as a defense of the dissertation proposal.

Purpose of the DCO
The overarching goal of the DCO is to determine whether the student has a viable research project for the doctoral thesis and the necessary skills and knowledge to become an expert on that thesis topic. To that end, the committee is charged with assessing all aspects of the dissertation proposal from the theoretical grounding to the detailed methods.

Committee Make-Up

---

2 A bit of historical context. The term Doctoral Committee Oral was previously named the Graduate Board Oral (GBO), the exam required by the Homewood Graduate Board. When the Schools came together under the Doctoral of Philosophy Board, the term GBO became the shorthand for the required oral examination requirements. Given that there is no Graduate Board governing our program, we have renamed our version of the university requirement the Doctoral Committee Oral.
University guidelines require a committee of at least 5 faculty members with two (2) members from outside of the student’s program or department. The chair of the meeting must be one of that outside members and be at the associate professor level or higher. Given our emphasis on interdisciplinary training, the School of Education has the added requirement that at least one member be from outside of the School. Given the unique situation at SOE where there are not clear topical departments serving different doctoral students, we are currently allowing the second external member to be from within the School of Education with approval of the PhD Program Director (with advice from the Doctoral Committee as needed). We anticipate that we may be able to clarify this process as the School continues to develop an appropriate organizational structure around areas of distinction. The additional three members will be from SOE, typically the student’s Doctoral Advisory Committee. However, given the interdisciplinary nature of our program, there may be alternative compositions. The final committee must be approved by the PhD Program Director.

Summary of Committee Membership:
1. CHAIR: Outside member at the associate level or higher.
2. Second outside member at any level.
3. Three SOE faculty.
4. Either #1 or #2 must be from outside SOE.

Procedures
Once a student has completed the three-step qualifying exam, the student and advisor should discuss a realistic timeline for completing a full proposal and begin discussing potential committee members. The advisor and student are strongly encouraged to communicate about what is likely to create the best situation and may seek advice from the PhD Program Director about committee makeup at any time. Students and/or advisors should reach out to potential committee members to gauge initial interest. (The official invitation to participate will come from the program.)

Once the approximate timing and committee make-up are determined, the following steps need to happen. Please note, these are working backward from an intended date for the meeting, so planning ahead is important.

1. At least four (4) weeks prior to intended meeting date: Fill out the attached DCO planning form with a proposed window for the meeting and as list of the suggested committee members (with contact info). Please provide any justification on the suggested committee members to help us verify that the composition is appropriate.
2. Three (3) weeks prior to the intended meeting date, Janet Mason will confirm the committee and the meeting date, time, and location. If there are problems with scheduling, these will be raised as soon as possible.
3. At least two (2) weeks prior to the scheduled meeting date, the student must submit the complete proposal to all committee members, to Janet Mason, and to the PhD Program Director. This can be done electronically, but the student/advisor should give
committee members the option of receiving a hard copy—to be delivered as soon as possible.

4. Two business (2) days prior to the scheduled meeting, Janet Mason will send a reminder to committee members and provide the chair with additional information about the forms.

5. At the meeting, the chair will be given the committee form to be signed. The student should be informed of the outcome and next steps.

6. Immediately following the meeting, the outcome will be returned to Janet Mason.

7. Within two (2) weeks of the meeting, the student will receive a letter outlining the formal decision and any subsequent steps.
Proposal Defense

Proposal to committee

2 weeks

Schedule meeting (Janet)

3-4 weeks

for approval (verify members)

Committee form submitted to program

4+ weeks

Include DBO or not

Determine whether proposal will

5+ weeks
Appendix D: Defense Timelines (Proposal & Thesis)

- 4+ weeks: Determine committee & submit committee form to Program for approval (verify members)
- 3-4 weeks: Schedule defense (Janet)
- 3 weeks: Proposal to readers & reader letter
- 2 Weeks: Reader & Thesis to Committee
- Thesis Defense