

**Handbook for the  
National College of Education  
Foster G. McGaw Graduate School  
Doctoral Program**

**National-Louis University  
122 S. Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60603**

**September 1999  
(Updated November 2002, July 2003 & April 2006)**

**Dr. Jerry A. Ligon, Associate Dean, Director of NCE Doctoral Programs  
847-947-5699, jligon@nl.edu**

**Shani Beth-Halachmy, Ph.D.  
Susan McMahon, Ph.D.**

**Director, Educational Psychology Program  
Director, Reading & Language Program**

**Patrick Roberts, Ph.D.  
Norman Weston, Ph.D.**

**Director, Curriculum & Social Inquiry Program  
Director, Educational Leadership Program**

## **STATEMENT OF NON-DISCRIMINATION**

National-Louis University admits students to all programs and activities, and administers all educational, employment, and other policies, without discrimination because of race, color, sex, religion, handicap, and national or ethnic origin.

National-Louis University affords reasonable accommodations to students with handicaps. Should a student with a handicap admitted to a doctoral program in the National College of Education believe that he or she is not being given a reasonable accommodation with regard to any aspect of the program, the student should immediately contact the Vice President for Human Resources who will endeavor to promptly resolve the issue.

**NCE DOCTORAL STUDENT HANDBOOK (SEPTEMBER 1999)**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Statement of Philosophy and Conceptual Framework.....	1
Governance .....	3
<b>CURRICULUM AND SOCIAL INQUIRY PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Course Requirements.....	4
Course Sequence.....	6
Qualifying Examination (formerly called Comprehensive Examination).....	7
<b>DISABILITY AND EQUITY IN EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Course Requirements.....	8
Course Sequence.....	8
<b>EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Admission Requirements.....	11
Course Requirements.....	11
Internship .....	12
Relation to Educational Specialist Program .....	13
Comprehensive Examination.....	13
<b>THE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY DOCTORAL PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>14</b>
School Psychology Course Requirements .....	14
Internship .....	16
Relation to Educational Specialist Program .....	16
Human Learning and Development Course Requirements .....	17
Minor Concentration.....	18
Internship .....	18

Course Sequence.....	19
Developing an Area of Research and Scholarly Interest .....	19
Pre-Dissertation Research Experience .....	19
Comprehensive Examination .....	19
<b>READING AND LANGUAGE DOCTORAL PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Program Prerequisites.....	20
Course Requirements.....	20
Internships .....	22
Electives .....	22
Course Sequence.....	22
Comprehensive Examination .....	24
<b>DOCTORAL PROGRAM POLICY AND SEQUENCE OF DOCTORAL EVENTS.....</b>	<b>26</b>
Admission .....	26
Application Deadlines.....	27
Transfer of Credit.....	27
Residency Requirement .....	27
Time Limit.....	27
Enrollment Requirements and Leave of Absence .....	28
Educational Specialist Degree Credit.....	28
Course Waivers .....	28
Doctoral Study Plan .....	28
Change in Doctoral Study Plan.....	29
Grade Policies/Credits.....	29
Pass/No Credit (P/N) .....	30
Withdrawal from Program .....	30
Probation .....	30
Policy on Academic Honesty .....	30

Student Change of Personal Information.....	31
<b>STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES.....</b>	<b>31</b>
Student ID.....	31
Library Resources .....	31
Registration.....	31
Financial Aid.....	31
Loan Programs.....	32
Placement Services .....	32
Advising Process.....	33
NLU Student Handbook.....	34
<b>COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS AND DISSERTATION.....</b>	<b>34</b>
Comprehensive Examinations .....	34
Dissertation Committee.....	34
Dissertation Requirements .....	36
<b>POLICY GOVERNING RESEARCH CONDUCT .....</b>	<b>36</b>
Research Involving Human Participants.....	36
Research Anonymity .....	37
Research Honesty.....	37
<b>DISSERTATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
Dissertation Proposals.....	38
Dissertation Proposal Approval.....	41
Dissertation Completion and the Role of the Committee .....	42
Dissertation Format Guidelines .....	43
Organization of Dissertation .....	44
Dissertation Abstract.....	44
Scheduling the Dissertation Approval Meeting .....	44

Dissertation Approval Meeting .....	45
Formal Completion of the Dissertation .....	46
Graduation.....	47
Dissertation Copies and Binding.....	47
Publication .....	48
Copyright.....	48
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>49</b>
Appendix A: Doctoral Study Plan .....	50
Appendix B: Graduate Study Plan Change Form .....	51
Appendix C: Request for Transfer of Credit Form .....	52
Appendix D: Appointment of Doctoral Committee Form .....	53
Appendix E: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Proposal Signature Page ..	54
Appendix F: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Signature Page .....	55
Appendix G: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Title Page.....	56
Appendix H: Recommendation for the appointment of Dean’s Representative on the dissertation committee.....	57
Appendix I: Proposal Approval Meeting Scheduling Form .....	58
Appendix J: Dissertation Approval Meeting Scheduling Form .....	59
Appendix K: Reading and Language Internship: Outline for Student Information.....	60
Appendix L: Proposal for Doctoral Internship Cover Sheet .....	62
Appendix M: Reading and Language Internship .....	63
Appendix N: Library Card Request Form.....	64
Appendix O: Petition to appoint an Outside Member to the Doctoral Committee .....	65
Appendix P: NLU Change of Personal Information Form .....	66
Appendix Q: NCE Doctoral Program Change of Personal Information Form.....	67
Appendix R: Request for a Leave of Absence .....	68
Appendix S: In-Progress Contract.....	69
Appendix T: IRRB Forms: NLU Policies & Procedures for Conducting Research .....	70

**Appendix U: IRRB Forms: Review of Student Research Form..... 83**  
**Appendix V: IRRB Forms: Informed Consent Documents: Guidelines & Checklist ..... 87**  
**Appendix W: IRRB Forms: Change of Status of Research..... 88**  
**INDEX..... 90**

## INTRODUCTION

The National College of Education of National-Louis University offers programs leading to the Doctor of Education degree in the following areas:

### **Curriculum and Social Inquiry**

### **Educational Leadership**

### **Educational Psychology**

School Psychology Concentration

Human Learning and Development Concentration

### **Reading and Language**

This handbook describes the policies and procedures that govern these doctoral programs.

### **Statement of Philosophy and Conceptual Framework**

The challenge of incorporating existing knowledge into school-based practices is not simply one of making knowledge available, but of continuously investigating the interrelationship between theory, research, and educational practice. This assumes that educational leaders are able to think critically, flexibly, and creatively about educational systems, learning environments, teachers, and learners. Such leaders can function effectively as leader practitioners, academic scholars, researchers, or policy makers. The doctoral program at the National College of Education is designed to prepare individuals for leadership in any of these areas.

A comprehensive self study and program review, conducted in the 1995/1996 and 1996/1997 academic years in preparation for an accreditation review by the National Council of Teacher Educators (NCATE), led to the development of a written conceptual framework for the National College of Education (NCE)'s doctoral program. The NCE doctoral program's conceptual framework states:

It is important to situate the doctoral program at the National College of Education in the recent shift both from within the disciplinary fields and the preparation of teachers, psychologists and administrators in higher education. Historically, the doctoral program has served to "bridge the gulf between theory and practice...through the development of educational leaders." In doing this, the primary focus has been on preparing practitioners capable of evaluating and applying "new theoretical knowledge about schools and education." At the current time, we see the doctoral program engaging students in a broad-based community of learners, comprised of students and faculty. We have carefully constructed learning environments that (1) initiate and sustain both students and faculty into a variety of

discourse communities, while (2) developing the grounds for a critique of knowledge and practice from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. We see such a conceptual orientation to doctoral studies as distinguishing our program locally and placing us at the cutting-edge nationally.

Our conceptual framework evolves around critical reflective thinking about three interconnected key domains: theory, research, and practice. Specifically, students and faculty in the doctoral program engage in critical reflection in these key domains, and explore their inter-relationships through course work, research, and writings. To this end, faculty and students form a diverse community of learners, in order to continuously examine each of following elements and their interconnections:

1. Creation of a community of learners who are knowledgeable about and active in a variety of discourse communities
2. Development of critical reflective perspectives
3. Exploring the complexities of issues and the problems which surface from a critical reflective orientation
4. Development of multiple and interdisciplinary perspectives
5. Building on previous undergraduate and graduate work
6. Exploring the implications of ideas from diverse individual, social, psychological, cultural, political, and historical perspectives
7. Interrogating multiple ways of knowing: raising epistemological and ontological questions
8. Building a capacity to consider and/or engage in social action in a variety of settings
9. Contributing to our knowledge/understanding in disciplinary fields
10. Developing habits of scholarship in a variety of areas: teaching, research, writing, publication, presentations, leadership in professional organizations, etc.

This conceptual framework is imbedded into each of the four doctoral programs, which further develop the above conceptual framework in accordance to the specific disciplinary perspective.

**Governance**

The doctoral programs offered by the National College of Education are governed by the Doctoral Program Committee. The committee consists of the Director of Doctoral Programs, the Program Directors of the individual doctoral programs, the Director of Doctoral Research, and faculty persons and doctoral students appointed by the Director of Doctoral Programs. The committee is responsible for (a) developing and approving policies and procedures for the doctoral programs, and (b) approving all substantive changes in program structure, format, requirements, and delivery of instruction.

THE NATIONAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION RESERVES THE RIGHT TO AMEND OR MODIFY ITS DOCTORAL PROGRAMS AND RELATED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, WHETHER DESCRIBED IN THIS HANDBOOK OR ELSEWHERE, AT ANY TIME WITHOUT PRIOR NOTICE, EXCEPT AS MAY RESULT IN UNDUE HARDSHIP TO STUDENTS CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN A DOCTORAL PROGRAM.

## CURRICULUM AND SOCIAL INQUIRY PROGRAM

The Curriculum and Social Inquiry Program is designed to prepare high level scholar practitioners to provide leadership in curriculum in school communities. The program emphasizes engagement in the processes of critical reflection about issues of curriculum in relation to the school, community, and society. Curriculum is viewed not simply as taking place within the classroom and schools, but as connected to larger social, cultural, political, and historical contexts. Processes of critical reflection are characterized by problem-finding and problematizing, valuing of personal experience, fluidity and complexity of issues, and a sense of teaching and curriculum as political struggle. Students are encouraged to see their work as combining theory and practice, and themselves as activists, effecting change within the school and beyond.

This program serves the needs of those people who are interested in influencing teachers and school communities. **Candidates for doctoral study in Curriculum and Social Inquiry must have experience with school settings and show evidence of leadership ability in education.**

### Course Requirements

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed below. This common core represents areas of knowledge, which the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the core and research requirements, students will complete two types of course requirements specific to the program: the Curriculum and Social Inquiry program core, and a minor area of concentration (for the Doctoral Study Plan form that must be completed by students see Appendix A on page 46).

<u>Doctoral Coursework Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
Curriculum and Social Inquiry Core	21
Minor Concentration	15
Total Degree Requirements	63

### *Doctoral Core*

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-

based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works which have wrestled with these perspectives.

Students admitted after May 1999 must take the new doctoral core (CCD610a CCD610b, and CCD610c) to meet doctoral core requirements. Students admitted prior to May 1999 may choose to complete their doctoral core requirements with the old doctoral core (CCD600, CCD601, and CCD602) or take the new core. However, the old doctoral core will not be offered after the 1999/2000 academic year. Students who were admitted to the doctoral program prior to May 1999 and who prefer to complete their core requirements with the old doctoral core, are therefore strongly advised to complete these courses during the 1999/2000 academic year. Students taking the new doctoral core must begin coursework in the Fall quarter and take the core in consecutive quarters.

***Research, Dissertation*** (Prerequisite ESR502, ESR507 or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytic Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytic Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR610, ESR612 and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

***Curriculum and Social Inquiry Core***

CSI600	Curriculum Theory: Historical, Philosophical, and Political Issues (3)
CSI601	Cultures of Schools and Communities (3)
CSI602	Curriculum Theory: Contemporary Issues and Practice (3)
CSI603	Curriculum Planning, Organization and Evaluation (3)
CSI605	Professional Development and School Change (3)
CSI693	Curriculum Seminar (6)

All of the above courses, except CSI693, include a one-semester-hour field application designed to bridge theory, research, and practice.

Doctoral students must take these as they are scheduled in the doctoral course listings published in the QUARTERLY. Non-doctoral students must appeal to the Program Director

of the Curriculum and Social Inquiry Doctoral Program to gain permission to take any of the courses in the Ed.D. Requirements.

### ***Minor Concentration***

Each student is to choose at least one minor area from the following: Educational Psychology, Reading and Language, Administration and Supervision, Superintendent Endorsement, Special Education, Mathematics Education, Science Education, or Technology in Education, and will complete at least 15 semester hours within the minor concentration. (See page 24 for transfer of credit policy.)

### **Course Sequence**

The program core courses in Curriculum and Social Inquiry are offered on a two-year cycle. Admitted students meet with an advisor to design their individual course sequences. The following sequence is a guide and the Quarterly must be consulted for course listings:

#### Odd Year (Beginning in fall 1999):

<i>Fall</i>	<i>Winter</i>	<i>Spring</i>
CSI600 (3) Curriculum Theory: Historical, Philosophical & Political Issues	CSI602 (3) Curriculum Theory: Contemporary Issues & Practice	CSI601 (3) Cultures of Schools and Communities
CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar	CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar	CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar

#### Even Year (Beginning in fall 2000):

<i>Fall</i>	<i>Winter</i>	<i>Spring</i>
CSI603 (3) Curriculum Planning, Organization, & Evaluation	CSI605 (3) Professional Development and School Change	CSI601 (3) Cultures of Schools and Communities
CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar	CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar	CSI693 (1) Curriculum Seminar

**Qualifying Examination (formerly called Comprehensive Examination)**

All students must successfully complete the qualifying examination in Curriculum and Social Inquiry prior to being advanced to candidacy for the Ed.D. degree and prior to beginning formal work on their dissertation. The purpose of the qualifying examination is to organize, integrate, synthesize, and reflect on concepts considered in doctoral course work. Students may schedule their qualifying examination after completing all core coursework (doctoral, program, and research) with the exception of the second research class in the focus sequence (Empirical/Analytical II OR Interpretive/Critical II). Students are encouraged to register for CSI 693 Curriculum Seminar, for one or two quarters, prior to beginning their qualifying examination as a forum within which to develop their examination.

The qualifying exam in Curriculum and Social Inquiry requires students to write a bibliographic essay on a topic of interest to them. This topic is usually one which relates to their area of scholarly interest and dissertation. In the essay students are expected to support their ideas with illustrations and examples drawn from the readings, discussions, and inquiry of doctoral program course work, as well as from before and beyond that course work (e.g., educational experiences and further readings and inquiry).

For specific course descriptions refer to the University Graduate Catalogue.

## DISABILITY AND EQUITY EDUCATION

The core value underlying the doctoral program in Disability and Equity in Education is the belief in justice and equity for people labeled disabled, and the recognition of the responsibility of educational leaders to provide opportunities and create social change that facilitates, supports, and enhances the lives, hopes, and dreams of people labeled disabled. The program is designed to prepare individuals who can provide leadership in a variety of professional and scholarly contexts related to disability or serving people labeled disabled. Active participation in the program allows students to gain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to disability that are needed to effect social change in teaching, policy, administrative leadership, and in any number of other roles.

### Admission Requirements

Candidates for the doctoral study in Disability and Equity in Education must have experience in an educational setting of some kind and must show leadership potential and the commitment to social change.

### Course Requirements

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed below. This common core represents areas of knowledge, which the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the core and research requirements, students will complete three types of course requirements specific to the program: the Disability and Equity core, and a minor area of concentration. Soon after admission, students should complete the Doctoral Study Plan form (Appendix A) and submit a copy to the NCE Doctoral Office.

<u>Doctoral Course Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
Disability and Equity Core	21
Minor Concentration	15
Total Degree Requirements	63

### *Doctoral Core*

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-

based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works, which have wrestled with these perspectives.

***Research, Dissertation*** (Prerequisite ESR502, ESR507, or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytic Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytic Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR610, ESR612, and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

***Disability and Equity in Education Core***

___601	Traditions, Assumptions, and Paradigms
___602	Disability Policy Analysis
___603	Activism, Education, and Disability
___604	Politics of Assessment
___605	History of Disability
___693	Disability Studies seminar

(The \_\_\_ indicates that the prefix for these course has not been determined at the time of this publication)

Doctoral students must take these as they are scheduled in the doctoral course listings published in the QUARTERLY. Non-doctoral LBSII students may also take these courses after the advice of their advisor and based on their graduate study plan. Doctoral students enrolled in an NCE doctoral program other than the Disability and Equity in Education Doctoral Program can enroll in these courses at the request of the Program Director and the Course Instructor.

***Minor Concentration***

Each student is to choose at least one minor area from a variety of possibilities. The student is to do this with the advisor and the minor concentration must be built into the student's Doctoral Study Plan. The minor concentration consists of at least 15 semester hours. Students who wish to earn an LDSII can do so for the minor concentration.

## FURTHER INFORMATION

Since this is a new program (official start date is Fall 2004), further information about this program will be made available when decisions are made. Questions can be answered by:

Dr. Terry Jo Smith (Evanston, ext. 2315)  
Dr. Paula Neville (Milwaukee & Wheeling, ext. 6212)  
Dr. Valerie Owen (Wheeling, ext. 5049)  
Dr. Susan Gabel (Evanston, ext. 2842)

## EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

The Educational Leadership Doctoral Program is designed to prepare individuals to serve in leadership roles in areas of administration and supervision. It is designed primarily, but not exclusively, for those who are practicing administrators or who have other significant leadership roles in school districts. By combining coursework and internship experiences, the program integrates theory, research, and practice into a cohesive plan of study for educational leaders. The program also meets Type 75 Superintendent Certification requirements.

### Admission Requirements

In addition to admission requirements set forth by the Foster G. McGaw Graduate School, applicants for doctoral study in Educational Leadership are to document evidence of at least two years of leadership in the educational field. During the admission interview, the applicant is asked to share his or her educational background, experience, research interests, career goals, and applicability of this program to his or her goals.

### Course Requirements

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed below. This common core represents areas of knowledge, which the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the core and research requirements, students will complete three types of course requirements specific to the program: the Educational Leadership core, and internship, and electives (for the Doctoral Study Plan form that must be completed by students see Appendix A on page 46).

<u>Doctoral Course Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
Educational Leadership Core	28
Internship	8
Total Degree Requirements	63

### *Doctoral Core*

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a

community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works which have wrestled with these perspectives.

Students admitted after May 1999 must take the new doctoral core (CCD610a CCD610b, and CCD610c) to meet doctoral core requirements. Students admitted prior to May 1999 may choose to complete their doctoral core requirements with the old doctoral core (CCD600, CCD601, and CCD602) or take the new core. However, the old doctoral core will not be offered after the 1999/2000 academic year. Students who were admitted to the doctoral program prior to May 1999 and who prefer to complete their core requirements with the old doctoral core, are therefore strongly advised to complete these courses during the 1999/2000 academic year. Students taking the new doctoral core must begin coursework in the Fall quarter and take the core in consecutive quarters.

***Research, Dissertation*** (Prerequisite ESR502, ESR507 or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytic Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytic Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR610, ESR612, and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

***Educational Leadership Core***

EDL601	School Financial Management (3)
EDL602	Leadership and Management Strategies (3)
EDL603	Educational Planning and Decision Making (3)
EDL604	Administrative Issues for Pluralistic Schools (3)
EDL696	The Art of Executive Leadership (3)
EDL620	School Leadership: Policies and Politics (3)
CSI603	Curriculum Planning, Organization, and Evaluation (3)
CSI605	Professional Development and School Change (3)
EDL693	Educational Leadership Seminar (4)

***Internship***

EDL690	Educational Leadership Internship (8)
--------	---------------------------------------

**Internship**

The internship is designed for individuals to develop professionally in administrative practice through the application of theory and research. The intern's responsibilities are defined by the cooperating administrator, intern, and academic advisor. The intern experience provides an opportunity for program planning, policy development, school improvement, community relations, board relations, and politics of governance and operations.

The internship is offered under three options:

- (1) Full-time for one academic year with a stipend paid by the cooperating organization.
- (2) Part-time for one academic year with one-half of the intern's time reserved for personal and professional commitments and the other half reserved for service in the cooperating organization, which provides a partial stipend.
- (3) Part-time for two academic years with the intern completing administrative projects assigned by the cooperating organization which minimizes conflicts with personal and professional commitments.

**Relation to Educational Specialist Program**

The Educational Leadership Doctoral Program may be reduced by up to 33 semester hours if a student has completed an Ed.S. degree in the Educational Leadership Department at National - Louis University. Students eligible for this option are to have course work applicable to the doctoral program approved by the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program Director.

**Comprehensive Examination**

The Educational Leadership comprehensive examination is to be passed by the student prior to formal work on the dissertation and advancement to candidacy for the Ed.D. degree.

## THE EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY DOCTORAL PROGRAM

The Educational Psychology Doctoral Program is designed to help students integrate theory, research, and practice in the field of psychology and education. Through critical reflection on the literature and the practices in these fields, students gain a deeper understanding of the growth processes of individuals as well as those of learning communities. The Educational Psychology Doctoral Program encompasses two program options: (1) Educational Psychology/School Psychology and (2) Educational Psychology/Human Learning and Development.

### Educational Psychology/School Psychology

The doctoral level School Psychology program subscribes to the Scientist-Practitioner model and prepares individuals to work as psychologists in schools and other educational settings, to engage in research, to pursue clinical work in schools or other clinical settings, and to pursue academic teaching posts. Individuals completing this option may be eligible to apply to sit for the Illinois Clinical Psychology licensing examination.

In addition to the doctoral level coursework described below, students must complete all coursework required for School Psychology certification. Please see the graduate catalog for additional information about the School Psychology professional training program and certification requirements.

### Course Requirements

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed below. This common core represents areas of knowledge that the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the core and research requirements, students will complete three types of course requirements specific to the program: the Educational Psychology/School Psychology core, internships, and minor areas of concentration (for the Doctoral Study Plan form that must be completed by students see Appendix A on page 46).

<u>Doctoral Course Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
School Psychology Core	14-15
Internship/School Psychology*	6
Internship/Educational Psychology*	3
Minor Concentration	12-13
Total Degree Requirements	63

\*Please see Internship section for a description of the two internships.

***Doctoral Core***

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works which have wrestled with these perspectives.

Students admitted after May 1999 must take the new doctoral core (CCD610a CCD610b, and CCD610c) to meet doctoral core requirements. Students admitted prior to May 1999 may choose to complete their doctoral core requirements with the old doctoral core (CCD600, CCD601, and CCD602) or take the new core. However, the old doctoral core will not be offered after the 1999/2000 academic year. Students who were admitted to the doctoral program prior to May 1999 and who prefer to complete their core requirements with the old doctoral core, are therefore strongly advised to complete these courses during the 1999/2000 academic year. Students taking the new doctoral core must begin coursework in the Fall quarter and take the core in consecutive quarters.

***Research, Dissertation*** (Prerequisite ESR502, ESR507, or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytical Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytical Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR610, ESR612, and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

***Educational Psychology/School Psychology Doctoral Core***

EPD662A	Doctoral Seminar I: History and Systems of Psychology (2)
EPD662B	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Self and Self Development (2)
EPD662C	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Relationships and Relational Development (2)

EPD662D	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Community and Community Development (2)
EPD663A	Doctoral Seminar II: Prevention Models and Community Development (1)
EPD663B	Doctoral Seminar II: Prevention Models and Relational Development (1)
EPD663C	Doctoral Seminar II: Prevention Models and Individual Development (1)
EPD664	Advanced Practicum in Educational Psychology (1-3)

### ***Minor Concentration***

Students take six semester hours in each of two minor concentrations, such as Neuropsychology, Human Development, Special Education, Reading and Language, or Curriculum and Social Inquiry. These minor concentrations are designed to provide breadth of knowledge in areas relevant to School Psychology. The minor concentration in neuropsychology is intended to provide school psychologists with sufficient breadth and depth to conduct neuropsychological assessment and to function as liaisons between medical and school professionals. It is not intended to qualify school psychologists as neuropsychologists.

### **Internship**

The internship experience is composed of two parts and requires a total of 9 semester hours. Of the 9 hours, 6 must be taken as part of the year-long School Psychology supervised internship in a school setting. This part of the internship must meet all state certification internship requirements.

An additional 3 hours of internship may include research, clinical or teaching experiences. Together with his or her program advisor, the student develops an additional internship experience designed to meet the student's professional and educational goals. The student can choose any Educational Psychology faculty member with whom to complete the internship. The student should contact the faculty member to discuss the specific internship and complete an internship proposal form. The faculty member will submit the proposal to the Program Director of the Educational Psychology Doctoral Program for approval.

### **Relation to Educational Specialist Program**

The Educational Psychology/School Psychology Doctoral Program may be reduced by up to 33 semester hours if a student has completed an Ed.S. degree in School Psychology at National-Louis University. Reduction of doctoral program requirements must be approved by the student's advisor, the director of the student's doctoral program, and the Director of Doctoral Programs.

## **Educational Psychology/Human Learning and Development**

The Educational Psychology/Human Learning and Development Program is designed to prepare individuals for leadership and research positions in a broad range of educational settings, universities, and continuing education programs for adults. Throughout the program, students critically reflect upon theory, research, and practice related to learning and development across the life span. Individuals whose undergraduate and masters degrees are not in psychology may be required to complete prerequisites in addition to the program requirements below.

### **Course Requirements**

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed on the following page. This common core represents areas of knowledge which the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the core and research requirements, students will complete four types of course requirements specific to the program: the Human Learning and Development core, an internship, minor areas of concentration, and electives (for the Doctoral Study Plan form that must be completed by students see Appendix A on page 46).

<u>Doctoral Course Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
Human Learning and Development Core	14-15
Internship/Educational Psychology	3
Minor Concentration	12-13
Electives	6
Total Degree Requirements	63

### ***Doctoral Core***

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the

seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works which have wrestled with these perspectives.

Students admitted after May 1999 must take the new doctoral core (CCD610a CCD610b, and CCD610c) to meet doctoral core requirements. Students admitted prior to May 1999 may choose to complete their doctoral core requirements with the old doctoral core (CCD600, CCD601, and CCD602) or take the new core. However, the old doctoral core will not be offered after the 1999/2000 academic year. Students who were admitted to the doctoral program prior to May 1999 and who prefer to complete their core requirements with the old doctoral core, are therefore strongly advised to complete these courses during the 1999/2000 academic year. Students taking the new doctoral core must begin coursework in the Fall quarter and take the core in consecutive quarters.

***Research, Dissertation*** (Prerequisite ESR502, EPS507 or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytic Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytic Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR 610, ESR612, and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

***Educational Psychology/Human Learning and Development Doctoral Core***

EPD662A	Doctoral Seminar I: History and Systems in Psychology (2)
EPD662B	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Self and Self Development (2)
EPD662C	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Relationships and Relational Development (2)
EPD662D	Doctoral Seminar I: Views of Community and Community Development (2)
Electives	(6)

**Minor Concentration**

Students take six semester hours in each of two minor concentrations, such as Neuropsychology, Special Education, Reading and Language, or Curriculum and Social Inquiry. These minor concentrations are designed to provide breadth of knowledge in areas relevant to Educational Psychology.

**Internship**

The internship experience requires a total of 3 semester hours, which may include research or teaching experiences. Together with his or her program advisor, the student develops an

internship experience designed to meet the student's professional and educational goals. The student may choose any Educational Psychology faculty member with whom to complete the internship. The student should contact the faculty member to discuss the specific internship and complete an internship proposal form. The faculty member will submit the proposal to the Program Director of the Educational Psychology Doctoral Program for approval.

## **Program Policies Applicable for Both Options**

### **Course Sequence**

Admitted students will meet with an advisor to design their individual course sequences. Those who already possess entry-level school psychology certification can immediately enter the doctoral, research, and school psychology core courses. Those who must complete certification requirements will do so concurrently with doctoral level course work.

### **Developing an Area of Research and Scholarly Interest**

Students are encouraged to begin exploring areas of research and scholarly interest early in their doctoral studies. Such examination may involve review of literature, attending scholarly talks, and discussions of theories, ideas, and research findings with their faculty advisors, other department and college faculty and peers.

### **Pre-Dissertation Research Experience**

Students who have not conducted research and written an empirical paper prior to being admitted to the doctoral program will need to do so before completing their comprehensive requirements. This must be completed no later than 3 years from their admission to the doctoral program.

### **Comprehensive Examination**

Students must complete the comprehensive examination in Educational Psychology prior to being advanced to candidacy for the Ed. D. degree and prior to beginning formal work on their dissertation. Upon completing all doctoral coursework (except ESR616 or ESR618 -- Research II; ESR604 – Dissertation Proposal Seminar; and Internship), students submit to the Director of the Educational Psychology Doctoral Program a written request to take the comprehensive examination. The comprehensive examination requirements include the following three components: (1) A written paper consisting of an integrated review and critique of the relevant theories and research in the student's area of inquiry. The paper should also contain an in depth discussion of the questions generated by the student's critical examination of their area. (2) Completion of a written research project (usually this is their master's thesis); and a written paper reflecting on and critiquing their own prior research work. (3) Following the submission and acceptance of the written papers, students schedule an oral discussion meeting with their committee. The oral discussion is designed to enable students to demonstrate in-depth knowledge in their area of inquiry and its relationship to the psychological and educational foundation areas.

## READING AND LANGUAGE DOCTORAL PROGRAM

The doctoral program in Reading and Language is designed to prepare graduates for school-based leadership positions, advanced clinical work, or college teaching. It is distinguished by a close blending of theoretical and practical courses and experiences so that graduates are to be prepared as professionals with the competence to make a difference in their jobs.

### Program Prerequisites

The Reading and Language Doctoral Program is designed to prepare advanced specialists in the areas of reading and writing. Prior coursework and teaching experience and/or certification are required for entry to the Reading and Language Program. If the student does not hold a master's degree in reading, graduate coursework in reading must be taken prior to enrollment in advanced reading and writing courses at the 600 level. Two graduate reading methods courses (beginning reading, comprehension, and/or content area) or equivalent are required and cannot be used for credit in the Reading and Language Doctoral Program. The following courses are also required and may be taken for credit as part of the doctoral program: children's or adolescent literature, reading and diagnosis and correction, a practicum, and language development or linguistics. These courses can be used as electives.

### Course Requirements

Each doctoral student is required to take doctoral core courses and research and dissertation courses. These required courses and their semester hour commitments are listed below. This common core represents areas of knowledge which the graduate faculty considers essential for all doctoral candidates in education. In addition to the doctoral core and research and dissertation requirements of the Graduate School, doctoral students in Reading and Language must complete four types of coursework: A core of five courses central to the study of reading and language (15 semester hours), an additional eight semester hours of 500 or 600-level reading and language courses, a variety of internships (6 semester hours), and elective courses (7 semester hours). Individualization of programs occurs in the design of appropriate internship experiences, in the selection of 500 and 600-level reading and language courses, and in the selection of electives. The course of study is planned by each student in accord with his or her needs and objectives in consultation with his or her program advisor, and with approval of the Reading and Language Doctoral Program Director (for the Doctoral Study Plan form that must be completed by students see Appendix A on page 46).

<u>Doctoral Course Requirements</u>	<u>Semester Hours</u>
Doctoral Core	6
Research/Dissertation	21
Reading and Language Core	23
Internship	6
Electives	7
Total Degree Requirements	63

**Doctoral Core**

CCD610a	Doctoral Core Seminar I (2)
CCD610b	Doctoral Core Seminar II (2)
CCD610c	Doctoral Core Seminar III (2)

The doctoral core, consisting of a total of 6 semester hours, was restructured for the 1999/2000 academic year. The new doctoral core seminar is designed to enable a broad-based interdisciplinary discourse. Students from the various doctoral programs form a community of learners to discuss and critique core literature related to a current issue (s) in education. Continuing National College of Education's rich historical tradition of progressive education, students engage in an in-depth study of the chosen issue(s) as it relates to perspectives of multiculturalism, equity, social justice, and democracy. The readings for the seminar are drawn from various disciplines and foundations of education, from multiple cultural, historical and philosophical traditions and perspectives, and from contemporary works which have wrestled with these perspectives.

Students admitted after May 1999 must take the new doctoral core (CCD610a CCD610b, and CCD610c) to meet doctoral core requirements. Students admitted prior to May 1999 may choose to complete their doctoral core requirements with the old doctoral core (CCD600, CCD601, and CCD602) or take the new core. However, the old doctoral core will not be offered after the 1999/2000 academic year. Students who were admitted to the doctoral program prior to May 1999 and who prefer to complete their core requirements with the old doctoral core, are therefore strongly advised to complete these courses during the 1999/2000 academic year. Students taking the new doctoral core must begin coursework in the Fall quarter and take the core in consecutive quarters.

**Research, Dissertation** (Prerequisite ESR502, ESR507 or equivalent)

ESR610	Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing (2)
ESR612	Empirical/Analytic Research I (3)
ESR614	Interpretive and Critical Research I (3)
ESR616	Empirical/Analytic Research II (3)
<b>or</b>	
ESR618	Interpretive and Critical Research II (3)
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar (2) (Prerequisites ESR 610, ESR612, and ESR614)
CCD699	Dissertation (8)

Students admitted prior to 1995 are not required to take ESR610. They may use CCD603 as a substitute course.

### ***Reading and Language Doctoral Core***

RLD600	Language, Linguistics and Literacy (3)
RLD601	Orthography and Word Recognition (3)
RLD602	Reading Comprehension: Research and Application (3)
RLD606	Instruction and Staff Development in Reading and Language (3)
RLD607	Theory and Research in Writing (3)
	Reading and Language Courses (500 and 600 levels) (8)

The fifteen semester-hour Reading and Language core provides basic knowledge concerning the history of reading research, current issues, and research methodology, with intensive study of such topics as language development, early reading acquisition and development, comprehension, writing, and staff development in a small seminar format. In addition, the student selects eight semester hours of 500 and 600-level Reading and Language courses.

### **Internships**

A total of six semester hours is required in internships, which may include clinical, teaching, staff development, publishing, and research experiences in such settings as the classroom, the school, the university, the reading clinic or the private sector. The internship provides the opportunities for students to acquire and apply knowledge about reading in a practical setting under close supervision.

In consultation with the student's program advisor, the student should discuss the kinds of internship experiences that would be useful to meet the student's goals. The student can choose any Reading and Language faculty member with whom to complete his or her internship. The student should contact the individual faculty member to discuss the specific internship. The student must fill out an internship form (see Appendices L and M on pages 58 and 59 respectively) describing the internship including goals, outcomes, and time period. The internship must be approved by the program advisor, the internship advisor, and the Reading and Language Doctoral Program Director. The internship will then be placed on file in the Reading Center by the Doctoral Reading and Language Program Director for faculty review.

### **Electives**

Elective courses will be selected on the basis of the student's professional goals.

### **Course Sequence**

Program core and research courses are offered every year. The Reading and Language Core Courses are offered every other year. The cycle appears as follows:

**Even Year**

RLD600	Language, Linguistics, and Literacy
RLD606	Instruction and Staff Development in Reading and Language

**Odd Year**

RLD601	Orthography and Word Recognition
RLD602	Reading Comprehension: Research and Application
RLD607	Theory and Research in Writing Development

Students should carefully plan the sequence of their course work. Students who do not have a master's degree in reading may need to take prerequisites in Reading and Language. These prerequisites should be met prior to enrolling in 600 level Reading and Language courses. Students who have met the prerequisite requirements should enroll in the 600 level reading and language courses as well as the Doctoral Core courses. Program and Doctoral Core courses must be completed prior to taking comprehensive examinations. The Research courses can be taken at any point in the program, but three courses, ESR610 Paradigms of Research: Alternative Ways of Knowing, ESR612 Empirical/Analytical Research I, and ESR614 Interpretive and Critical Research I, should be completed prior to enrolling in ESR604 Dissertation Proposal Seminar. If a statistical methods course has not been taken, the prerequisite, ESR502 Statistical Methods or ESR507 Empirical Analytical Research, should be completed early in the program. These courses are offered often and should be taken soon after being admitted to the doctoral program. Elective course work and internships can be completed as needed.

**Program Advising**

Admitted students will meet with the Reading and Language Program Director to receive initial course advising. Those who already possess a master's degree in reading and/or entry level prerequisites can immediately enter the Reading and Language doctoral courses and other doctoral level courses. Those who must complete prerequisites can do so concurrently with doctoral level course work.

During the first year of doctoral study, admitted students will be assigned a program advisor to assist in designing a Graduate Study Plan. This plan is submitted to the Registrar, program advisor, Reading and Language Program Director, and Director of Doctoral Programs by the end of the first year of doctoral study.

**Developing an Area of Research and Scholarly Interest**

Students are encouraged to begin exploring areas of research and scholarly interest early in their doctoral studies. Such examination may involve review of literature, attending scholarly talks, and discussions of theories, ideas, and research findings with their program advisor, other department and college faculty and peers.

## **Comprehensive Examination**

All students must complete the comprehensive examination in Reading and Language prior to being advanced to candidacy for the Ed.D. degree and prior to formal work on their dissertation. The purpose of comprehensive examinations is to organize, integrate, synthesize, and reflect on information acquired in doctoral and program course work. Reading and Language doctoral students may choose from three of the following experiences to meet this requirement:

### 1. Timed Examination

The first option is two days of exams focusing on four questions. These questions, developed by the Reading and Language faculty, cover the general and program core courses. The student has 3 hours to respond in writing to each question. The students' responses are evaluated by three Reading and Language faculty. Each response must receive two passes. Students may be asked to revise one or more questions in collaboration with a faculty member. If two or more questions are not successfully passed, the student may be asked to retake the comprehensives. Comprehensive examinations in Reading and Language are given each year during the summer. At the beginning of the spring quarter, the student should submit to the Program Director a letter of intent to take the examination.

### 2. Untimed Examination

The second option is to respond in writing to four questions, developed by the Reading and Language faculty, which cover the doctoral and program core courses. After the questions have been distributed, the student has a week to complete all three written responses. These questions are not available for preview. The responses should be well developed in final draft form, presenting a clear thesis statement or argument with specific support from research and theory, and succinctly stated (length should be approximately 4000 words per question). A bibliography should accompany each response. Three Reading and Language faculty members will evaluate the papers. Each response must receive two passes. Students may be asked to revise one or more questions in collaboration with a faculty member. If two or more questions are not successfully passed, the student may be asked to retake the comprehensives. Comprehensive examinations in Reading and Language are given each year during the summer. At the beginning of the spring quarter, the student should submit to the Program Director a letter of intent to take the examination.

### 3. Comprehensive Project

The third option is a project demonstrating the student's knowledge of the doctoral and program core courses. This project may be a scholarly paper or papers, oral presentation accompanied by a written text, or another project exhibiting synthesis, reflection, and integration about the topics presented in the doctoral and program core courses. The project time line will be developed in collaboration with three Reading and Language faculty selected by the student. The approved project and the standards for evaluating it will be

described in writing and submitted to the Program Director for the Reading and Language Doctoral Program. The project will be evaluated by the same three Reading and Language faculty members. To pass, all three faculty must award a pass.

## DOCTORAL PROGRAM POLICY AND SEQUENCE OF DOCTORAL EVENTS

### Admission

Admission decisions are made by a committee of faculty from the doctoral program to which the applicant is seeking admission. The committee considers the following information in the admission decision:

- \* completed application form, including the application essays
- \* applicant's academic record and professional experience
- \* letters of reference
- \* Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores
- \* writing sample
- \* admission interview

The process of admission occurs in two stages. First, the application, undergraduate and graduate transcripts, a resume that includes a description of professional experiences, letters of recommendations, and GRE scores are submitted to the Office of Graduate Admissions. In completing the application form, it is important that the applicant develop comprehensive application statements detailing his or her professional and educational goals, as these written statements are used along with other evidence in determining the applicant's potential for success in pursuing the Ed.D. degree. Individual programs may require additional materials. Applications are reviewed by faculty from the respective doctoral programs.

A grade point average of 3.25 or better in master's level courses is required for all applicants. Letters of reference are to be completed on the forms provided. Two of the four required letters should, if possible, be completed by persons associated with the applicant's recent graduate work, and two by persons supervising his or her professional work. All applicants to the doctoral program are required to take the General Aptitude section of the GRE prior to the admission deadline. Results from previously taken GRE tests are acceptable. Scores must be officially verified, either by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) or by the registrar of the college or university to which the scores were previously submitted.

Because of the limited size of the doctoral programs, only a small number of applicants are selected to participate in the second stage of the admission process, which consists of the writing sample and the interview. The structured writing assessment involves a choice of one among four or five essay questions. At least two faculty members, including one from the program area to which the application is made, read each essay and evaluate the applicant's organizational and writing skills.

Applicants are interviewed by faculty of the program to which the application has been made. The objectives of the interview process are: (1) to establish that applicants have clearly defined goals for pursuing doctoral study, (2) to determine that the applicants' goals may be met through the doctoral programs, (3) to gain further information about applicants, (4) to clarify any areas of concern, (5) to provide an opportunity for applicants to ask questions

about the program, and (6) to enable applicants to acquaint themselves with faculty in the programs.

### **Application Deadlines**

Applications for admission to the doctoral programs are considered twice a year. The deadlines for submitting all application materials, including GRE scores, are October 15 for winter and spring admission, and April 15 for summer and fall admission. Applicants are notified generally within a month of the admission deadline whether or not they have been selected for the second phase of the admission process, consisting of the interview and writing assessment. Applicants are informed generally within two months concerning their admission status.

### **Transfer of Credit**

Transfer credit for 12 semester hours of post-master's course work from National-Louis University or other institutions offering graduate degrees must be approved by the Director of the doctoral program in which the student is enrolled. Approval for transfer credit beyond 12 semester hours must be obtained through petition to the Graduate Admissions and Retention Council (A&R Council). Credit for courses taken more than six years prior to the time the student was admitted to the Doctoral program must also be approved through petition to the Graduate Admission and Retention Council. Courses used in a master's degree plan may not be used for credit toward the Ed.D. degree. Twelve semester hours of graduate level courses that have not previously been applied to a degree, or those from a second master's degree, may be applied to the Doctoral program with the approval of the Director of the student's doctoral program. These may apply either as transfer credit if completed within six years prior to admission to the Doctoral program, or as regular credit when taken while the student is enrolled in the Doctoral program. The Transfer of Credit form is shown on page 48.

### **Residency Statement: Becoming a member of a Community of Scholars and Learners**

The doctoral program view of residency is consistent with the values expressed in the doctoral program's conceptual framework (see page 1). Doctoral students become members of the NLU learning community, and the wider academic community, by continuously engaging in a variety of course work, such as the doctoral core, and other scholarly activities throughout their studies. Students reflect on their own current and previous educational practices through conversations and communications with faculty and peers concerning new and ongoing research. Each program determines other meaningful ways to involve students with faculty and to ensure that the spirit of residency is maintained.

### **Time Limit**

The doctoral degree must be completed in eight years from the date of admission. Within this time frame, students are expected to make regular and consistent progress, which is subject to periodic review.

## **Enrollment Requirements and Leave of Absence**

It is expected that doctoral students will be continuously registered until the completion of their degree. When unforeseen circumstances require a student to temporarily withdraw from their doctoral studies, the student must submit a Request for a Leave of Absence form in the first quarter of becoming inactive (see Request for Leave of Absence form in Appendix R on page 64). A leave of absence may be approved for up to one year. Please note that the eight-year time limit for completing doctoral studies remains the same even if a leave is granted. Students who are granted a leave of absence must still complete the program within the eight-year time limit.

Students who have been inactive for three consecutive quarters and are not on an approved leave will be considered withdrawn from the Doctoral program. Students desiring to be reinstated must submit a written petition stating the reason for the inactivity to the Graduate Admissions and Retention Council.

## **Educational Specialist Degree Credit**

The doctoral program requirements may be reduced by a maximum of 33 semester hours when a student has completed an Ed.S. degree and, as part of that program, has completed course and/or internship requirements that are also Ed.D. requirements. For students completing Ed.S. degrees at institutions other than NLU, the reduction must not exceed 18 semester hours. Eligible students must petition to the director of the doctoral program to which they have been admitted. Requests will be reviewed on a case- by- case basis to determine the number of semester hours by which the doctoral program requirements may be reduced. Credit for courses and/or internships taken more than six years prior to the time a student was admitted to the doctoral program must be approved through petition to the Graduate Admissions and Retention Council. Final approval for the program reduction must be obtained from the Director of Doctoral Programs and submitted with the Doctoral Study Plan to the Registrar.

## **Course Waivers**

Waivers and substitutions for program core courses must be approved by the student's advisor and the Doctoral Program Director. Waivers for doctoral core courses must be approved by the Director of Doctoral Programs; waivers for the research courses must be approved by the Representative of Doctoral Research. Final approval to waive Doctoral core and research courses must be obtained through petition to the Admissions and Retention Council.

## **Doctoral Study Plan**

Students need to complete a Doctoral Study Plan with their advisors soon after admission to the doctoral program. The Doctoral Study Plan specifies which courses and academic experiences are required for degree completion. At the completion of the program, the registrar uses the Doctoral Study Plan to conduct a final degree audit prior to granting the

degree. Once a student completes a plan, the student's advisor keeps a signed copy of the plan and sends a copy to the Program Director, the Director of Doctoral Programs, and the Registrar. For a sample of the Doctoral Study Plan see Appendix A on page 46.

### **Change in Doctoral Study Plan**

Changes in the plan can be made by filing a "Graduate Study Plan Change" form (see page 47). This must be done with the authorization of the student's advisor and the Doctoral Program Director. Changes in degree plan must conform to all doctoral program policies.

### **Grade Policies/Credits**

Any student who receives grade of "C" or lower in any program, research, or doctoral core course may be placed on probation until he or she successfully completes two other core courses with a grade of "B" or higher and maintains a grade point average of 3.0 or higher.

A student who receives two or more "Cs" or lower grades in the doctoral program, or research core courses will be withdrawn from the program. Students may appeal such decisions to the Graduate Admissions and Retention Council. See the section in the Graduate catalog on Academic Appeals.

Individual Doctoral Programs may also determine minimal grade point average for the program. Course grades with less than a "C" will not be awarded credit.

Grade reports for all courses are mailed four-to-six weeks after the end of each term. Students may obtain an official transcript from the Registrar's Office. Students who have incurred financial debt to the University may not have access to copies of their records until the financial debt has been settled.

### **'X', 'I', and 'W' for a Course**

When courses require more than one term to complete, a grade of 'X' is assigned until the course is completed. This grade signifies a deferred grade for courses designed to extend over a longer period than one term. The following are some examples of such courses:

CCD699	Dissertation
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar
XXX699	Internship

Other program courses, designed for delivery over extended time periods, may also assign an 'X' until the time all course requirements have been completed.

Students who are unable to complete course requirements on time because of unavoidable circumstance may request their instructor to issue them an in progress ('I') grade. Students must provide an explanation why they were unable to complete the course. Students requesting an 'I' grade need to complete an In-Progress Contract (see form on page 65)

and must complete the work by the end of the next term. Additional time of up to one academic year may be granted in unusual circumstances. An 'I' grade will change to an 'N' (no credit) if a student does not complete the course within the granted extension of time.

The grade 'W' indicates a voluntary withdrawal from a course. The course appears on the student transcript with a "W" in the grade place, signifying that the student did not earn credit for the course.

### **Pass/No Credit (P/N)**

Some courses will be awarded a pass/no credit rather than a letter grade. The following are some examples of such courses:

CCD699	Dissertation
ESR604	Dissertation Proposal Seminar
XXX699	Internship

Individual doctoral programs may have additional pass/no credit course grades.

### **Withdrawal from Program**

If a student wishes to withdraw from the doctoral program, he or she should submit a letter of intention to the Program Director and to the Director of Doctoral Programs.

### **Probation**

Any student who receives grade of "C" or lower in any program, research, or doctoral core course may be placed on probation until he or she successfully completes two other core courses with a grade of "B" or higher and maintains a grade point average of 3.0 or higher. Students may be placed on probation for other reasons as well.

### **Policy on Academic Honesty**

National-Louis University subscribes to the principle that academic quality and a productive learning environment are inextricably linked to academic honesty. Like other colleges and universities, National-Louis University has expectations regarding academic honesty on the part of students enrolled for course work, faculty and staff, and indeed, professional people at all levels of academic activity.

With respect to the academic honesty of students, it is expected that all material submitted as part of any class exercise, in or out of class, is actual work of the student whose name appears on the material or is properly documented otherwise.

The concept of academic dishonesty includes plagiarism as well as receiving improper assistance. Students found to have engaged in academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary action and may be dismissed from the University. When evidence of academic dishonesty is

discovered, an established procedure of resolution will be activated to bring the matter to closure. Please refer to the Student Guidebook for additional information.

### **Student Change of Personal Information**

If personal information changes for a student (such as address or last name) the University must be notified with updated information (see Appendix P on page 62). The NCE Doctoral Program office also needs to be notified of these changes. Please complete the Doctoral Program's Change of Personal Information form (see Appendix Q on page 63).

## **STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

### **Student ID**

An ID card is mailed to each student shortly after registration. The ID card serves as identification on campus and should, therefore, be carried at all times. It also serves as a library card. The ID's are normally mailed within the first two weeks of the term. Students who have not received an ID card more than two weeks after registration for the term should notify student services at (847) 256-5150 ext. 2842. Until the card is received, students should use their registration receipt as a temporary ID.

### **Library Resources**

Doctoral students are authorized to use facilities of National-Louis University libraries, which provide wide-range access to library resources both at the university, and other libraries. In addition, students may request library cards for access to Northwestern University Library facilities. Applications for a Northwestern Library Card (see Appendix N on page 60) must be completed and submitted to the Dean of National College of Education's office for approval.

### **Registration**

The School of Education's QUARTERLY is mailed to each student about two weeks prior to the start of each registration cycle. The QUARTERLY provides course schedules and calendars, as well as registration information and forms. Students may also obtain the QUARTERLY at all campuses from the Graduate Admissions Office. Students may register by mail or in person at the Chicago, Evanston, Wheeling, or Wheaton campuses.

### **Dropping Courses**

Students wishing to withdraw from a course need to submit to the Registrar's Office a withdrawal form. The form is available in the Registrar's Office.

## **Financial Aid**

Students admitted to the doctoral programs are eligible to apply for financial support. Because a major purpose of the doctoral program scholarship fund is to encourage students to take a year off from regular employment for full-time study, highest priority is given to students who plan to undertake doctoral study on a full-time basis for a given academic year. Such students may be eligible for full or half tuition scholarship for one academic year if need is demonstrated. In addition, teaching, staff development, clinical, and research opportunities may be available to full-time doctoral students.

Remaining scholarship funds are available for new and continuing doctoral students who register for a half-time course load (four semester hours) or more. The typical award covers half of the tuition during each of the three quarters. Because the size of the scholarship fund is limited, priority is given to doctoral students on the basis of need first, and then on the basis of merit.

## **Loan Programs**

Students who have been accepted by the Graduate School are eligible to apply for either a Subsidized Federal Stafford Loan (SFSL) or an Unsubsidized Federal Stafford Loan (UFSL). A Subsidized Federal Stafford Loan is a low-interest loan by a lender such as a bank, credit union, or savings and loan association. Students must demonstrate financial need to be eligible for the SFSL. Subsidized loans are available for up to \$8,500 per academic year. SFSL loans are to be used to help pay the costs of tuition, books, supplies, fees, and other education-related expenses. A loan must be repaid six-to-nine months after completion or discontinuation of academic studies.

Unsubsidized loans are available for up to \$18,500. Information regarding the application procedures for these loan programs may be obtained by contacting the National-Louis University Financial Aid Office.

Independent sources of financial aid: National-Louis University provides formal assistance toward securing financial aid through the various assistantships, fellowships, and loan programs. However, candidates are also referred to the variety of independent sources available for financial assistance of post-graduate studies.

## **Placement Services**

Doctoral students are encouraged to use the Career Development and Placement Office facilities of National-Louis University to build and update a professional credential file which documents their classroom, field work, and on-the-job experiences. Group seminars and personal advice on job seeking— writing resumes, interviewing, and follow-up techniques— are provided. Student records and credentials are circulated only upon request or consent of the student.

The Placement Office invites prospective employers to visit the campus and to correspond regarding available job opportunities. Employment opportunities are publicized and appointments are scheduled with qualified applicants.

### **Advising Process**

During the doctoral program, students may have two primary advisors. The first, the Program Advisor, assists the student in planning his or her program. The second, the Dissertation Chair, is selected by the student in consultation with the Program Director. Every effort is made to honor student requests regarding advisor selection. For more specific information about the Dissertation Chair, please see the section on “Dissertation Requirements” beginning on page 33.

Soon after being admitted, the student should make an appointment to meet with the Program Director. The student may then be assigned an advisor to assist him or her with planning throughout the program. The student should meet with the program advisor once a quarter or as necessary. The following are some of the advisor’s roles:

1. Provide the student with information regarding program requirements, time lines, and performance standards
2. Guide the student in devising a program of study consistent with his or her professional interests and objectives and University and School requirements for the Doctor of Education degree
3. Complete the Doctoral Study Plan (see Appendix A, p. 46)
4. Assist the student in making decisions about the minor area(s) of specialization
5. Complete Transfer of Credit forms and other similar forms when needed (See Transfer of Credit, Appendix C, p. 48)
6. Review that the subject matter of courses taken by the student is up-to-date and relevant, and that it is not redundant with the student’s prior education and experience. This includes identifying courses the student might have taken already and determining whether any of the required courses may be waived
7. Assist the student in identifying areas of research interest and pursuing these and other scholarly interests
8. Assist the student in selecting faculty to serve on the dissertation committee
9. Serve as an advocate for the student as needed
10. Ensure that the student meets all requirements for the completion of his or her degree in a timely fashion

11. Provide assistance to the student when needed
12. Assist the student in planning and arranging his or her internship experiences, when applicable

### **NLU Student Handbook**

Policies and procedures detailed in the NLU Student Handbook apply to all doctoral students. Students are strongly encouraged to pay particular attention to the Policy on Academic Appeals, the Policy on Academic Honesty, and the Policy on Sexual Harassment found in the Student Handbook.

## **COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS AND DISSERTATION**

### **Comprehensive Examinations**

All doctoral students must successfully complete a comprehensive examination prior to beginning formal work on their dissertation. Each of the doctoral programs determines the format and scope of the comprehensive exam (see the description of comprehensive examinations described under each of the programs). At least two faculty members and the Program Director of the respective program evaluate the exam. The Program Director notifies the student in writing concerning the results of the exam. The Program Director also sends copies of the letter to the Director of Doctoral Programs, the student's advisor, and the Registrar.

### **Dissertation Committee**

Following successful completion of comprehensive examinations, as the student begins to focus on a dissertation topic, he or she can select a faculty member who is willing to serve as his or her Dissertation Committee Chair. The student, in consultation with his or her Dissertation Chair, identifies two other faculty persons to serve on the dissertation committee. At least one member of the committee must be from within the student's department and program area and at least one member of the committee must be from outside the student's department and program area. Additionally, at least one committee member must have relevant research design and methodological expertise. No more than one committee member may be from outside the institution or have a part-time appointment.

Eligibility criteria for serving on dissertation committees:

- \* To serve as the Chair of a committee, a faculty member must be full time, have graduate faculty status, a terminal degree in his or her field, and must have co-chaired or chaired a dissertation committee before.
- \* To serve as a member of a committee, a faculty member must be full time, have a terminal degree in his or her field, and have graduate faculty status.

- \* A person from outside the institution, or a faculty member who works part time at the institution, may be eligible to serve on committees. In these cases, the student must petition for that person's inclusion, and the Committee Chair must submit to the Program Director and to the Director of Doctoral Programs documentation verifying that the person has a terminal degree and has relevant expertise in the content area of the dissertation. Please see Appendix O on page 61 for the form to request the inclusion of an outside member on a dissertation committee.

Students complete the form for Appointment of the Doctoral Committee (see Appendix D on page 49) and obtain committee members signatures. The student submits the form to the Program Director for review and to the Director of Doctoral Programs for formal appointment of the committee.

In the event a faculty member that serves on a student's Dissertation Committee leaves the institution or ceases to meet the criteria for serving on a committee (i.e., takes a leave of absence longer than a year), the Director of the student's doctoral program will consult with the student and the committee to determine if a new committee member need to be appointed. The decision whether to appoint a new member or not will partly depend how advanced is the student at the time the committee member becomes unavailable.

The following procedures will take place when a committee member is no longer able to serve on a committee and **the student has not had her or his Dissertation Proposal Meeting:**

The Director of the student's doctoral program, in consultation with the student, the student's committee chair and/or members, and the Director of Doctoral Programs, recommends a replacement for the faculty who cease to meet the criteria for eligibility to serve on the dissertation committee. In these situations, all efforts will be made to provide continuous support the student's dissertation work.

The following procedures will take place when a committee member has ceased to meet the criteria for serving on a dissertation committee **after the student passed her or his Dissertation Proposal Meeting and has made substantial progress toward completing the written document:**

The Director of the student's doctoral program, in consultation with the student's committee chair and/or members, and the Director of Doctoral Programs, will explore if the faculty is able to continue to serve on the dissertation. If the faculty is able to continue, and if the Dissertation Chair or Co-Chair continue to meet the criteria for serving on a committee, the committee can remain intact. In case that the faculty member who becomes unavailable has been a sole chair, one of the remaining members will assume the role of a co-chair. In all situations, at least one member of the committee must be a full time faculty who meets the above criteria.

In the event that a faculty is no longer able to serve on a committee and is replaced, a new form for Appointment of the Dissertation Committee must be completed and submitted to the Program Director and Director of Doctoral Programs.

### **Dissertation Requirements**

Students at NCE are encouraged to conduct research that is personally and professionally relevant to them. Subsequently, ways of formulating research proposals, problems, designs, methodologies, and conclusions will vary according to the particular research tradition in which it is grounded.

Students are expected to develop the following specialized and general skills historically associated with research: (a) the ability to formulate, pose and justify a researchable problem or issue, (b) the ability to theoretically frame and relate one's research within the existing relevant literature; (c) the ability to develop an appropriate research design and methodology; and (d) the ability to interpret, analyze, synthesize data, and discuss the assumptions, contributions and limitations of existing as well as one's own research.

### **POLICY GOVERNING RESEARCH CONDUCT**

In research, as in all other forms of practice, there are ethical dimensions—subtle impositions of power disguised as “voluntary” participation; deceptions as to purpose or outcome; breaches of confidentiality and anonymity; distortions of convenience. Whether the data is gathered from observations, interviews, research instruments, or from existing documents and records, your research might represent an intrusion into people’s lives. Your research can reproduce unquestioned power relationships, reinforce stereotypes, and foster economic and cultural inequities. While you may intend none of this, it is only through diligent reflection and preventative action that these unintended and possibly anti-democratic consequences of your research can be foreseen and minimized. It is important, therefore, to consider the ethical issues surrounding (a) the involvement of human participants; (b) anonymity; and (c) research honesty.

### **Research Involving Human Participants**

To assist you in examining the ethical implications of research involving human participants—and to protect both you and the university in matters of liability—the University has appointed an Institutional Research Review Board (IRRB). The IRRB ensures compliance with NLU's policies and procedures for conducting ethical research involving human participants (Appendix T) and with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' regulations governing human research protections (Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46).

All doctoral students conducting research involving human participants must file with the IRRB proper documentation prior to the start of data collection (see Appendix T). As part of this process, students, in consultation with the chair of their dissertation committee, must classify their research according to one of three designations, depending on the level of risk to human participants: 1) EXEMPT; (not requiring IRRB review); 2) EXPEDITED IRRB

review; 3) FULL IRRB review. The criteria for each designation are listed on the form in Appendix T. Research designated as requiring expedited or full review must receive formal IRRB approval before it can be conducted. **Regardless of classification, all research must include informed consent (see Appendix V).** All completed IRRB applications should be sent to: Provost's Office, NLU, 1000 Capitol Drive, Wheeling, IL 60090 (or through campus mail to Wheeling). Also, they may be faxed to: 847-465-5983.

#### **IRRB Procedures:**

- 1) In consultation with dissertation chair, researcher determines whether the proposed study is **exempt** from IRRB review or will require **expedited** or **full** review.
- 2) Researcher completes "Review of Student Research Involving Human Participants" form (Appendix U) and includes form and accompanying documentation (i.e. informed consent letters, surveys, etc.) in the appendix of dissertation proposal.
- 3) The dissertation committee reviews IRRB form and accompanying documentation and approves designation of research category as part of the dissertation proposal defense.
- 4) The chair of the dissertation committee signs the form and forwards it and all accompanying documentation to the doctoral program director.
- 5) The doctoral program director gives final approval to research designation by signing form and forwarding all documentation to IRRB office.
- 6) Research designated as **Exempt** is filed in IRRB office without review. Once all signatures have been obtained and the dissertation proposal is approved by the dissertation committee, the researcher can begin data collection.
- 7) Research requiring **Expedited** or **Full** review is forward to IRRB committee, which must grant approval before data collection can begin. A letter is sent to the researcher informing them of the timetable for IRRB review.
- 8) In the event there are changes to the nature and/or methods of data collection once the research has commenced, a Change of Status Research Form (Appendix W) must be completed and filed with the IRRB office. A change in status from **Exempt** to **Expedited** or **Full** will require IRRB review.

#### **Research Anonymity**

Access to research data is a privilege and the source of the data must be protected from harm due to unwarranted and uninformed disclosure. Thus, participants in research must have the right to remain anonymous. Source of data, should, therefore, be kept anonymous. In rare cases when anonymity may not be possible, it is the responsibility of the researcher to inform the participant of such possibility and to ensure that the source of the data is protected. Disclosure of the source of data used in a research study, and disclosure of any information about research participants gathered in the course of the research, without the express permission of the participants and, when applicable, their agencies, is highly unethical and represents grounds for dismissal from the program.

#### **Research Honesty**

Data from research studies are only valid to the extent that they are derived from carefully conducted observations or measurements. It is highly unethical to deliberately forge, fabricate, or alter such data. The deliberate forging, fabrication, and/or alteration of research data are serious offenses and are governed by the same policy and procedures governing academic dishonesty. This practice represents grounds for dismissal of the student from the program.

## DISSERTATION PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

### Dissertation Proposals

The purpose of the dissertation proposal is to present, discuss, and gain approval for a proposed research study. During the period of proposal development, students will work closely with their chair(s) and committee members to focus and plan the study. How one designs and proposes research varies among research traditions; however, all proposals can clearly: (a) **introduce** and explain the purpose of the research and present a rationale for the study; (b) explain how the proposed research fits into a theoretical context and relates conceptually to prior research and **literature** on the topic; (c) describe and justify the particular **research design and methods** to be used; and (d) Include the **references** that are cited in the Proposal. Therefore, proposals should include:

#### *An Introduction*

The purpose of this section of the proposal is to describe what problems, questions or issues one proposes to study and why these are worth studying. This section sets the conceptual stage for the research; it gives an overview of the main research questions, introduces the kind of study it will be, establishes a rationale, and foreshadows what the research proposes to accomplish and contribute.

Some research models and designs necessitate that research questions, problems and methods be specified concisely at the onset of research (e.g., descriptive, correlational, quasi-experimental, experimental designs). Other models and designs assume that specific questions and problems will be developed within the context and conduct of the research itself (e.g., ethnographic, biographical/narrative, action research). Therefore, the research proposal should describe, with the appropriate specificity, the research problems, questions or issues that will be researched.

In the **introductory section**, it is important to include a **purpose and rationale** for the study. One basis for the rationale might be derived from relevant research and literature which would then be elaborated more fully in the literature section of the proposal. In the introductory section, one would summarize the primary literature that justifies the study. Rationales and purposes for studies, however, may also emerge from one's personal and professional experiences and observations. Descriptions of these are also appropriate in a proposal. The introduction should also make clear what will be learned, better understood, or affected/effectuated in practice, as a result of this study.

#### *References to Literature*

A full review and synthesis of the relevant literature that informs a study might or might not be required as part of the proposal. This is determined by the committee. It is expected, however, that the Proposal contains sufficient literature to: (a) identify and establish the

theoretical approach that frames the research; and (b) ground and contextualize the study in relevant previous research and literature.

### ***Research Design and Methods***

A research design is an overall plan for most efficiently, credibly, and ethically accomplishing the research goals. It identifies the type of study planned and provides a road map of the methods and procedures to be followed for collecting and analyzing data, and developing conclusions. Given that there are always choices, it is important to include a rationale for the appropriateness and possible limitations of the particular design and methods selected.

Research designs vary tremendously. For example, they may be: experimental and quasi-experimental studies; case studies; ethnographies; Action Research; correlational; causal/comparative; quantitative descriptive; studies of instrument validity and reliability. Thus, what counts as data, and how data is collected, interpreted, analyzed and conveyed, will vary as will the researcher's role. Finally, different research traditions and designs reflect some different ways of establishing validity (or credibility) and representing their conclusions. Therefore, proposals should communicate these particulars by describing:

- \* Access to data: this includes any research samples, participants, sites, or programmatic interventions involved in terms of characteristics, selection, or nature of involvement
- \* Forms of data (e.g., qualitative: narratives or narrations, images, documents; quantitative: test scores, rating scales, observation record forms, questionnaires, rankings, categorizations)
- \* Methods of data collection (e.g., surveys, questionnaires, attitude/achievement tests, psychological measures, interviews, observations, focus groups, fieldwork). Any instruments that are student developed should be described. The reliability and validity of any instruments used should be discussed.
- \* Forms/perspectives utilized in summarizing, interpreting and analyzing data (e.g., coding schemes/thematic induction, narrative analysis, descriptive data, and inferential statistics, feminist)
- \* Forms of representing conclusions (e.g., traditional textual, non-traditional forms like visual, literary and dramatic)
- \* Any programs, materials, instruments or documents used and the appropriate means of gaining access, copyrights etc.
- \* The ethical issues and plans for assuring that participants: (a) have all necessary information in order to fully understand the research and voluntarily consent to participate, (b) consent in writing for participating in the study, (c)

are informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without incurring any negative consequences, (d) are protected from harm, and (e) are offered anonymity

### ***References***

The proposal should include references for everything cited. The format for references should follow the style guidelines in the latest edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, at this time it is the Fourth Edition, 1994.)

#### ***Suggested Additional References:***

American Psychological Association. (1994). Publication manual (4th edition). Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Davitz, J.R., & Davitz, L.L. (1996). Evaluating research proposals: A guide for the behavioral sciences. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maxwell, J.A. (1996). Qualitative research design: An interpretive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

## **Dissertation Proposal Approval**

Once a student and his or her committee agree that the proposal is satisfactorily completed, the following should occur:

1. The Chair of the committee notifies the Program Director and the Director of Doctoral Programs that the student is ready for scheduling the Dissertation Proposal hearing. The Chair of the committee, in consultation with the student, submits the Recommendation for Appointment of Dean's Representative form (see Appendix H on page 53) with the names of two faculty members recommended for serving on the Dissertation Committee as the Dean's Representatives. **A copy of the dissertation proposal draft must accompany the Recommendation for Appointment of Dean's Representative form.**
2. The Director of Doctoral Programs appoints the Dean's Representative and notifies the Chair of the committee who has been appointed.
3. The student completes the Proposal Approval Meeting Scheduling form (see Appendix I on page 54), listing the date and time (blocks of two hours) when he or she and the Dissertation Committee and the Dean's Representative can meet. **At least three weeks before the anticipated Proposal Approval Meeting**, the student sends the Program Director, the Director of Doctoral Programs and the Dean's Representative the final copy of the proposal. The Director of Doctoral Programs schedules a room for the meeting and sends out a notice of the meeting to the Dissertation Committee, the student, the Dean's Representative, and the Doctoral Program Directors.
4. The proposal may be approved at the meeting, or suggestions may be made for further refinements that need to be incorporated before the proposal is approved. The Dean's Representative sends a written report to the Director of Doctoral Program and the Dissertation Chair regarding the outcome of the meeting.
5. Within two weeks of the time when the proposal is approved, the faculty serving on the dissertation committee and the Dean's Representative sign the cover sheet and send it to the Program Director and the Director of Doctoral Programs for their signatures (see Appendix E on page 50). The Director of Doctoral Programs sends copies of the completed signature page to the Program Director, the dissertation's Chair, the student, and the Registrar.

### ***The Proposal Approval Meeting***

The Chair of the Dissertation Committee chairs the dissertation proposal meeting. During the meeting, the responsibilities of the Chair include:

- \* Facilitating the meeting and determining the scope and character of the discussion
- \* Inviting the student to present a summary of her or his proposed study, including the background of the study and, the underlying theoretical, conceptual and research literature, and the proposed design, procedures, and ethical considerations
- \* Inviting the Committee, including the Dean's Representative, to present questions and discussion of the proposal
- \* Reviewing ethical issues related to the participants' involvement in the study. This may include but are not limited to (a) written informed consent to participate in the study, (b) protection of participants' anonymity, (c) assessment of risks to participants
- \* Facilitating the final discussion of the proposal (the Chair may ask the student to leave during this discussion). Record the decision and recommendations
- \* Reporting the results to the student, the Program Director, and the Director of Doctoral Programs

The responsibilities of the Dean's Representative include:

- \* Reading the proposal prior to the hearing and communicating with the Dissertation Committee Chair prior to the hearing about the proposal, especially if he or she has concerns
- \* Attending and participating in the dissertation proposal hearing
- \* Writing a brief report to the Director of Doctoral Programs on the outcome of the hearing

Once all committee members and the Dean's Representative approve the proposal, the student may undertake the proposed research.

### **Dissertation Completion and the Role of the Committee**

A central role of the Dissertation Committee is to provide students guidance, support, and mentorship on each aspect of the dissertation. The committee can serve in that role only if the student maintain close contact and on-going contact with them. Students are therefore encouraged to keep in close contact with their committee throughout their dissertation. Students may periodically request individual or full committee meetings. Students are also encouraged to communicate with committee members personally or via email to appraise the committee of their progress and to discuss methodological issues or questions or problems

they may have. It is suggested that students submit to their committee a rough draft of each chapter for review and feedback. A final hearing of the dissertation can be scheduled once the full committee agrees that the student has completed the study and is ready for the final hearing. The Director of the Doctoral Program reviews the final draft and may request additional revisions in content, format, tables, or figures before final typing.

### **Dissertation Format Guidelines**

The writing style for the dissertation should conform to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, Fourth Edition* (1994). Particular attention must be paid to the format of writing the references within text and at the end, tables and figures, and headings and levels of headings.

The manuscript should be prepared in the following way so as to meet National-Louis University standards and be appropriate for dissemination through *Dissertation Abstracts International* (Bell and Howell Dissertation Services, formerly University of Microfilms International):

- \* The title should be a meaningful description of the content of the manuscript. The signature page and title page must conform to the sample on pages 51-52
- \* Use heavy white bond paper 20 lb., 8 ½ by 11 inches. Erasable paper is not acceptable
- \* A clean copy is required. Type size should 12-point
- \* It is acceptable to reproduce a dissertation using word processing software as long as the final copy is produced on a letter quality printer (this excludes dot matrix printers)
- \* Generally all textual material should be double-spaced (this includes spaces between sections). However, single-spacing may be used in setting off long quotations (40 or more words)
- \* The left-hand margin must be large enough for binding (1½ inches); a 1-inch margin should be used on the remaining sides of the page
- \* Preliminary pages carry Roman numerals. Arabic numerals begin with the first chapter. Certain pages, such as the title page, are counted without the number actually appearing on the page. Page numbers should be placed on the bottom middle of each page
- \* Tables, figures, and footnotes should be incorporated at the appropriate point in the text: short tables on a page with text, long tables and figures on separate pages inserted immediately after the table or figure is first mentioned

- \* For table and figure format, consult the *APA Manual* (1994)
- \* For headings, subheadings, and levels of headings consult the *APA Manual* (1994) and the members of your committee

### Organization of Dissertation

- a) Two copies of the Approval Sheet (Signature Page; see page 51)
- b) Title Page (see page 52)
- c) Two copies of the Abstract
- d) Acknowledgements
- e) Table of Contents, with page references
- f) List of Tables, with titles and page references
- g) List of Figures
- h) Body Manuscript
- i) References
- j) Bibliography
- k) Appendices

Deleted: Illustrations, with titles and page references

### Dissertation Abstract

An abstract, which is no more than about 120 words, should clearly summarize the problem, method, results, and conclusions.

### Scheduling the Dissertation Approval Meeting

Once the student's committee agrees that the dissertation is satisfactorily completed and is ready for a final hearing, the following will occur:

1. The Chair of the committee notifies the Program Director and the Director of Doctoral Programs that the student is ready for scheduling the final hearing. In the event that the Dean's representative is no longer available to serve as such at the final hearing, the Chair of the committee, in consultation with the student, requests the Director of Doctoral Programs that another Dean's representative be appointed
2. The student completes the Form to Schedule the Dissertation Approval Meeting (see Appendix J on page 55), listing the date and time (blocks of two hours) when he or she and the Dissertation Committee and the Dean's Representative can meet
3. The student delivers the completed form and copies of the final draft of the dissertation to the Program Director, the Director of Doctoral Programs and the Dean's Representative. This should occur **at least three weeks** before the anticipated dissertation approval meeting

4. **Students wishing to participate in June graduation ceremonies must get the approval of their committee's Chair to schedule a final hearing prior to April 9. The Form to Schedule Dissertation Approval Meeting and a copy of the manuscript must be submitted to the Director of Doctoral Programs by April 9. To participate in June graduation ceremony, the final hearing must take place prior to May 1.** Students who have their final hearing after April 30 participate in the graduation ceremonies the following year
5. Students planning to complete all doctoral requirements prior to the August, December, or March graduation dates, adhere to the following time-line: **Final dissertation hearing must take place no less than four weeks prior to the graduation deadline.** Students obtain approval from the committee to schedule the final hearing, submit the Form to Schedule Dissertation Approval Meeting, and submit a copy of the final document to the Director of Doctoral Program and the Dean's Representative, **no less than three weeks** prior to the final hearing date. Students should therefore plan to complete a final draft of the dissertation and obtain approval for scheduling a final hearing no less than seven weeks prior to the graduation date.
6. The Director of Doctoral Programs will schedule a room for the meeting and send a notice of the meeting to the Dissertation Committee, the student, the Dean's Representative, and the Doctoral Program Directors. The Final Dissertation Hearing is open for others to attend, and notices are sent to faculty and posted on bulletin boards.

### **Dissertation Approval Meeting**

The Chair of the Dissertation Committee chairs the Dissertation Approval Meeting. During the meeting, the responsibilities of the Chair include:

- \* Facilitating the meeting and determining the scope and character of the discussion
- \* Inviting the student to present a summary of her or his completed study, with a specific focus on the research questions, process, findings, and interpretation/discussion of the findings. The student's presentation may be from twenty to thirty minutes
- \* Inviting the Committee, including the Dean's Representative, to present questions and discussion of the dissertation
- \* Facilitating the Committee's final discussion of the Dissertation (the Chair may ask the student to leave during this discussion). Record the Committee's decision and recommendations
- \* Reporting the results to the student, the Program Director, and the

### Director of Doctoral Programs

The responsibilities of the Dean's Representative include:

- \* Reading the dissertation prior to the hearing and communicating with the Dissertation Committee Chair prior to the hearing about the dissertation, especially if he or she has concerns
- \* Attending and participating in the Dissertation Approval Meeting
- \* Writing a brief report to the Director of Doctoral Programs on the outcome of the hearing

### **Formal Completion of the Dissertation**

Within two weeks of when the dissertation is approved, the following steps are taken:

- a) The Chair of the Dissertation Committee gives to the student two copies of the title page signed by all members of the Committee, including the Dean's Representative
- b) The student's Doctoral Program Director sends a completed grade change form to the Registrar (the student informs the Director in which quarter he or she registered for dissertation hours and how many dissertation hours the student registered for in each of the quarters)
- c) The student submits a copy of the approved dissertation with the two signed title pages and two copies of the abstract to the Doctoral Program Director and requests to schedule an exit interview. The Doctoral Program Director reviews the dissertation draft, notes additional changes if necessary, and obtains the signature of the Dean of National College of Education
- d) The Director of Doctoral Programs sends copies of the completed signature page to the Program Director, the dissertation's Chair, the student, and the Registrar
- e) The Director of Doctoral Programs invites the student for an exit interview. The interview consists of a review and discussion of the dissertation, and a general interview with the students about their experiences in doctoral studies at National-Louis University
- f) The student completes any further revisions, if necessary, and submits the dissertation for binding
- g) The student returns the bound copy with the original signature page to the Director of Doctoral Programs who sends it to the library for cataloguing

- h) A copy of the title page and abstract are retained in the student's file at the Doctoral Program Office
- i) The registrar places the title of the dissertation on the student's transcripts and issues the student a diploma

## **Graduation**

The University holds one commencement ceremony a year, usually in the second weekend in June. Doctoral students are the first to receive their diplomas in the commencement ceremony. Students sit in the front row, and are invited to the stage together with their Dissertation Chair, one at a time. On the stage, the Chair places the doctoral hood over the student's shoulder and the student receives a cover of a diploma from the University's President (the original diploma is mailed to the students within a few weeks).

To participate in the graduation ceremony, students must apply for graduation before the deadline (usually in February, but students should consult the Fall or Winter QUARTERLY for exact dates, procedures and fees). Students who apply for graduation will be provided information about the details of the ceremony, including gown purchase or rental, through the mail.

To participate in the graduation ceremony, students must also complete the Final Dissertation meeting by April 30<sup>th</sup>, and submit the completed approved dissertation to the Director of Doctoral Programs by June 1<sup>st</sup>. Students who complete their Final Dissertation meeting after April 30<sup>th</sup>, or who submit the completed approved dissertation to the Director of Doctoral Programs after June 1<sup>st</sup> will be invited to participate in the commencement ceremony the following year.

## **Dissertation Copies and Binding**

Students make copies of the printed and signed dissertation and take it to A&H Bindery, 2600 Lexington Street, Broadview, IL 60155 (708-344-3300 or 312-421-6900) for binding. Students can call the bindery for alternative email options. If you choose to email your dissertation to the bindery, you may be required to hand deliver your original signature page. When calling the bindery, students should identify themselves as graduates of the National College of Education, National-Louis University. The cost of the binding is approximately \$38 for each copy. The charge depends on the number of copies and length of the manuscript. The color of the cover for the doctoral dissertation is royal blue. Binding takes approximately two weeks. Arrangements can be made for mailing the bound copies.

Students submit a bound copy of the dissertation with the original signed title page to the doctoral program so it can be sent to the library for cataloging. It is customary for students to provide bound copies to each member of the Dissertation Committee. An additional bound copy may be submitted to the Director of Doctoral Programs.

## Publication

Students are encouraged to submit their study for oral presentation at a convention, symposium, workshop, or other gathering of professionals. Students are also encouraged to convert their dissertation for submission as a journal article or a book. Pages 321-330 of the 2001 *APA Publication Manual* discuss aspects related to converting dissertations for publication or presentations in conferences.

Deleted: 36

Students may also be interested in submitting their dissertation to Eric and to Dissertation Abstract International. The address for ERIC is:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility  
 Acquisitions Department  
 Operated for the U.S. Dept. of Education by Computer Sciences Corporation  
[4483-A Forbes Boulevard, Lanham, MD 20706](#) ERIC or (800) 799-3742  
[ericfac@inet.ed.gov](mailto:ericfac@inet.ed.gov)

Deleted: 1100 West Street 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

Deleted: ¶  
 . Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Deleted: ¶  
 . (800) 7

Field Code Changed

The address for the *Dissertation Abstracts* is:

Bell and Howell Dissertation Services  
 Formerly University Microfilms International (UMI)  
 300 North Zeeb Road  
 P.O. Box 1346  
 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106-1346  
 (313) 761-4700  
 (800) 521-0600 ext. 7020

## Copyright

A copyright notice should be included on the bottom of the title if statutory copyright in the work has been or is to be claimed. Essential components of the copyright include: copyright symbol (©), full legal name or author, year in which copyright is secured by publication. The copyright notice may take the following form:

Copyright © by Carole S. Fine, 1994  
 All Rights Reserved

If registration of a copy is desired, this notice should appear and the student should request University Microfilms International to file an application on his or her behalf.

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Doctoral Study Plan**  
**Doctoral Study Plan**  
**National College of Education**

| [Contact the doctoral program office for a copy of this form \(800\) 443-5522 ext. 2730](#)

**Appendix B: Graduate Study Plan Change Form**

[Contact the doctoral program office for a copy of this form \(800\) 443-5522 ext. 2730](#)

**Appendix C: Request for Transfer of Credit Form**

Contact the doctoral program office for a copy of this form (800) 443-5522 ext. 2730

**Appendix D: Appointment of Doctoral Committee Form**

**APPOINTMENT OF DOCTORAL COMMITTEE**

The following have agreed to serve on the Doctoral Committee of:

(Student's Name)	(Program)	(Date)
(Address)		(Telephone work/home)

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS:**

Chair:            Co-Chair: (Circle one)

(Faculty Name) (Program)	(Signature)	(Date)
--------------------------	-------------	--------

Co-Chair:        Member: (Circle one)

(Faculty Name) (Program)	(Signature)	(Date)
--------------------------	-------------	--------

Member:

(Faculty Name) (Program)	(Signature)	(Date)
--------------------------	-------------	--------

**APPROVAL:**

(Director, Doctoral Programs)	(Program Director)
-------------------------------	--------------------

Copies to:    Student  
                   Dissertation Chair  
                   Director, Doctoral Programs  
                   Program Director  
                   Advisor

**Appendix E: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Proposal Signature Page**

Dissertation Proposal

BREAKING OUT OF THE EGG CRATES:  
REDESIGNING PROFESSIONAL ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

Carole S. Fine  
Instructional Leadership Doctoral Program

Submitted for Approval

December 9, 1994

Approved:

_____	_____
Chair/Co-Chair, Dissertation Committee	Program Director

_____	_____
Co-Chair/Member, Dissertation Committee	Director, Doctoral Programs

_____	_____
Member, Dissertation Committee	Dean's Representative

\_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved

Copies to:    Student  
                  Dissertation Chair  
                  Director, Doctoral Programs  
                  Program Director

**Appendix F: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Signature Page**

BREAKING OUT OF THE EGG CRATES

REDESIGNING PROFESSIONAL ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

Carole S. Fine

Instructional Leadership Doctoral Program

Approved:

Chair/Co-Chair, Dissertation Committee	Program Director

Co-Chair/Member, Dissertation Committee	Director, Doctoral Programs

Member, Dissertation Committee	Dean, National College of Education

Dean's Representative	Date Approved

Copies to:    Student  
                   Dissertation Chair  
                   Director, Doctoral Programs  
                   Program Director

**Appendix G: Dissertation Forms: Sample of Dissertation Title Page**

BREAKING OUT OF THE EGG CRATES  
REDESIGNING PROFESSIONAL ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

Carole S. Fine

Instructional Leadership Doctoral Program

Submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements of

Doctor of Education

in the Foster G. McGaw Graduate School

National College of Education

National-Louis University

December, 1994



**Appendix I: Proposal Approval Meeting Scheduling Form**

**PROPOSAL APPROVAL MEETING  
SCHEDULING FORM**

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
(as it will appear on dissertation)

Student's Address \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Doctoral Program \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Committee: \_\_\_\_\_ Chair Co-Chair  
(Circle one)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Member Co-Chair  
(Circle one)  
\_\_\_\_\_ Member

Dean's Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Proposal Title:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Times (2 hours) when the Student, Committee and Dean's Representative are available to meet:

Day \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Preferred meeting place: Evanston\_\_ Wheeling\_\_ Chicago\_\_ Wheaton\_\_ Elgin\_\_ Other : \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix J: Dissertation Approval Meeting Scheduling Form**

**DISSERTATION APPROVAL MEETING  
SCHEDULING FORM**

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_  
(as it will appear on dissertation)

Student's Address \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

Doctoral Program \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Committee: \_\_\_\_\_ Chair Co-Chair

(Circle one)

\_\_\_\_\_ Member Co-Chair

(Circle one)

\_\_\_\_\_ Member

Dean's Representative \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Title:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Times (2 hours) when the Student, Committee and Dean's Representative are available to meet:

Day \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Preferred meeting place: Evanston\_\_ Wheeling\_\_ Chicago\_\_ Wheaton\_\_ Elgin\_\_ Other : \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dissertation Chair's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Note: Please submit a copy of the dissertation with this form**

## **Appendix K: Reading and Language Internship: Outline for Student Information**

### **RLD690 Doctoral Internship Outline for Student Information**

Overview: The internship is an advanced course designed to provide students with an opportunity to define an educational problem in the field of Reading and Language and to plan and execute a solution in diverse and educational settings.

Hours Required: 6 hours of internship are required of each doctoral student. Normally this will be accomplished through two 3-hour internships. However, other arrangements are possible. Two internship categories must be represented within the 6 hours.

#### Internship Categories:

1. Clinical procedures and practices
2. Staff development
3. Research
4. Teaching
5. Visiting scholar/researcher
6. Instructional design
7. Publication
8. Other

#### Description of Categories:

1. Clinical procedures and practices—intern will participate in the direction of a clinical program. This may include work with student, work with tutors, parents and administrative staff.
2. Staff development—intern will participate in the carrying out of an existing research project or will design and execute a new one. This may include conceptualization of a study, design, data collection and analysis as well as the reporting of results.
3. Teaching—intern will define a problem that involves teaching. For college teaching—intern will participate in college instruction in one of two ways: in a mentored internship working to execute a previously designed class; in an advised internship with primary responsibility for course design and execution.
4. Visiting scholar/researcher—intern may participate in one of the above, or a specifically designed activity, on another site.
5. Instructional design—intern will participate in the design of instructional programs or materials. Whenever applicable, such an internship should be reported under the categories 1-5.
6. Publication

7. Other possibilities for internships may exist and should be discussed with your program advisor.

**Credit Determination:** A 3-hour internship suggests that a student is devoting approximately 18 hours per week to the internship project combining meetings, on-site work, preparation, reading, and writing. Internship work related to paid positions must be work beyond that normally required by the job description.

**Planning and Internship:** All internships need to be reviewed by the department. The steps are:

1. Contact your program advisor and discuss options.
2. Meet with internship director and draft your proposal (see below).
3. Submit internship proposal to program advisor and internship director and receive their approval.
4. Submit internship proposal to the Director of the Reading and Language Program.

The Director will place the proposal on file in the Reading and Language Department for faculty review. The faculty will review the proposal at the next department meeting. The student can check with the internship director for any feedback from the faculty.

**Time Line:** Because of the steps involved in the approval process, your proposal should be submitted in the quarter prior to the beginning of your internship. The submitted proposal (step 3 above) should be in the Program Director's hands by the **fifth week of the quarter preceding the proposed internship date.**

**Appendix L: Proposal for Doctoral Internship Cover Sheet**  
**PROPOSAL FOR DOCTORAL INTERNSHIP IN READING**  
**COVER SHEET**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Internship \_\_\_\_\_

Location (in other than NCE) \_\_\_\_\_

Hours of Credit \_\_\_\_\_

**Approval**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Advisor                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internship Director                      Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Director                      Date

## **Appendix M: Reading and Language Internship**

### **PROPOSAL FORMAT**

The proposal should be 2-4 pages in length covering the following points:

1. Purpose of internship including the problems to be addressed (if research internship, the hypotheses to be examined might be discussed).
2. The manner in which the intern will address the problem including a proposed time line of activity (if research, include suggested methodology). This section should be the major part of the proposal and should indicate how the intern will spend his/her time during the internship.
3. Anticipated way of evaluating and reporting outcome (paper, report, article, set of materials, etc).
4. Examples of internship proposals can be found in the file cabinet of the Reading and Language Department.

## Appendix N: Library Card Request Form

### NORTHWESTERN LIBRARY CARD REQUEST FORM

Directions: Fill out this request form and return it to Trish Rios, Evanston Campus. Do NOT take this form directly to the Northwestern Library.

Date of request \_\_\_\_\_

Category: \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty \_\_\_\_\_ Doctoral Student

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Check the quarter(s) requested:

\_\_\_\_\_ Fall      \_\_\_\_\_ Spring  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Winter      \_\_\_\_\_ Summer

(Print or type) Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Soc. Sec. # \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (work) \_\_\_\_\_ (home) \_\_\_\_\_

(Authorization)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Dean, National College of Education

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

**This form is not valid without authorization signature.**

**Appendix O: Petition to Appoint an Outside Member to the Doctoral Committee**

**PETITION FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN OUTSIDE MEMBER TO THE DOCTORAL COMMITTEE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Student's Name) (Program) (Date)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Student's Address) (Phone)

I would like to request that the following individual serve as a member on my Dissertation Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name) (Title/Degree) (Institution and Program)

Reason for the request (must indicate whether the individual holds a doctoral degree in the area related to the dissertation, and has additional relevant expertise in research and in the area of the student's dissertation):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVAL:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dissertation Committee Chair/Co-Chair Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Doctoral Programs Program Director

If denied, give reasons for denial: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Director, Doctoral Programs Date

- Copies to: Student  
Dissertation Chair  
Director, Doctoral Programs  
Program Director

**Appendix P: NLU Change of Personal Information Form**

NLU/Transcript Department- CHANGE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM

Social Security Number: \_\_\_\_\_

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
Last First Middle (Maiden)

( ) Check if new name

Name was: \_\_\_\_\_

( ) Check if new address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street

\_\_\_\_\_  
City State Zip Code

( ) Check if new phone number

Home Phone #: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone #: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ Ext. \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

=====

Office use only:

DP \_\_\_\_\_

Ledger \_\_\_\_\_

Brides' File \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix Q: NCE Doctoral Program Change of Personal Information Form**

**NCE DOCTORAL PROGRAM  
CHANGE OF PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM**

(Students must also complete Appendix P: NLU Change of Personal Information Form)

Please send this form to:  
National-Louis University  
Doctoral Program Office  
2840 Sheridan Road  
Evanston, IL 60201

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
                     First                                    Middle                                    Last

Social Security Number \_\_\_\_\_

Check if new name

Name formerly was: \_\_\_\_\_

Check if new mailing address

\_\_\_\_\_  
Street

\_\_\_\_\_  
City  State  Zip Code

Check if new contact number

Home Phone #: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

Work Phone #: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_ Ext. \_\_\_\_\_

Alternate Phone #: (\_\_\_\_) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix R: Request for a Leave of Absence

### REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

It is expected that doctoral students will be continuously registered until the completion of their degree. When unforeseen circumstances require a student to temporarily withdraw from their doctoral studies, the student must submit a Request for a Leave of Absence form in the first quarter of becoming inactive. Leave of absence may be approved for up to one year. Please note that the eight-year time limit for completing doctoral studies remains the same even if a leave is granted. Students who are granted a leave of absence must still complete the program within the eight-year time limit.

To request a leave of absence, please complete this form and submit it your Doctoral Program Director and to the Director of Doctoral Programs.

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Address \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Telephone \_\_\_\_\_

I am requesting a leave of absence from my doctoral program in \_\_\_\_\_  
(program title)

From \_\_\_\_\_ To \_\_\_\_\_  
(date) (date)

Please explain the reason for requesting a leave:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Student's Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Decision:

Doctoral Program Director:

Please circle: Approve / Deny (explain if request is denied) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Doctoral Program Director Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Director of Doctoral Programs:

Please circle: Approve / Deny (explain if request is denied) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Director of Doctoral Programs Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Appendix S: In-Progress Contract**

**Contact the doctoral program office for a copy of this form (800) 443-5522 ext. 2730**

## Appendix T:

# National-Louis University

## Institutional Research Review Board

### Policies and Procedures for Conducting Research

October 2001

**Do No Harm**

In research, as in all other forms of practice, there are ethical dimensions—subtle impositions of power disguised as “voluntary” participation; deceptions as to purpose or outcome; breaches of confidentiality and anonymity; distortions of convenience. Your research might represent an intrusion into people’s lives. Will you intervene, disrupt the lifeworld and appropriate thoughts and feelings of others as building blocks for your own project? Because of hegemony, your research can reproduce unquestioned power relationships, reinforce stereotypes, and foster economic and cultural inequities. While you may intend none of this, it is only through diligent reflection and preventative action that these unintended and possibly anti-democratic consequences of your research can be foreseen and minimized.

To assist you in examining the ethical implications of your work—and to protect both you and the university in matters of liability—the University has appointed an Institutional Research Review Board (IRRB) which can review your plans for the involvement of others in generating data for your research. Specific information on the procedures for the human participants review is contained within this document.

**Ethical Principles and Guidelines\***

Scientific research has produced substantial social benefits. It also has posed some troubling ethical questions. As less ethnocentric models of awareness evolve, demands have increased for rigorous codes of ethics for interaction (especially with oppressed, formerly marginalized groups of people), and for conducting and reporting research. Public attention has been drawn to abuses of human participants in biomedical experiments and in affronts to human dignity in ethnic and social characterizations of various groups of people. Most recently, media attention and academic scrutiny has been drawn by the published accusations of Patrick Tierney in his book *Darkness in Eldorado* concerning anthropological research with the Yanomami of Brazil and Venezuela. Currently, an American Anthropological Association task force is addressing the allegations concerning fieldwork practices, representations and portrayals that may have

---

\* The following material has been freely adapted with some additions from *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Participants of Research*. This public document, issued on April 18, 1979, was prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

had a negative and harmful impact on Yanomami welfare, and biomedical research and other activities by anthropologists, scientists, and journalists that may have contributed to malnutrition, disease and disorganization. The task force has evidence to refute many of the allegations, and note as well the evolution of codes of ethics that may have provided different sets of guidelines for research historically. Many writers of ethnographies—especially of pre-literate (in terms of the written word) peoples—did not consider that those about whom they were writing would ever read what was written about them. Inadvertently, ethnocentricity may have provided a lens producing a less than accurate and distorted picture. Since the 1970's, more rigorous guidelines have been emerging about the protection of groups under study and about voice, multiple perspective, and personal reflections before developing depictions of individuals or groups or advancing theories from these depictions.

Historically, abuses of participants in biomedical experiments abound. The infamous Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment was allowed, in the name of science, to persist from 1932 until 1972. The United States Public Health Service conducted this forty-year study in Macon County, Alabama for the purpose of determining the “natural” course of syphilis. Participants selected for the study were 600 African American males, 399 of whom were in the final stage of syphilis and 201 of whom were not infected. These men lived in the rural south and typically were receiving inadequate health care because of racism. Some ethical issues in this study are as follows:

- Participants were not informed as to the purpose of the study
- Participants were not informed that they had syphilis or that the condition was in the final stage;
- Researchers purposefully told lies to the participants (so they would continue to be in contact with medical personnel) about receiving treatment for various disorders such as rheumatism; and
- Treatment was deliberately withheld, even when penicillin was discovered, resulting in the death of over 100 men and the infection of women (wives and girlfriends) and children.

As PHS researchers published and presented numerous papers at conferences and in medical journals between 1932 and 1972, obviously the medical community as a whole knew of this study, but were silent, presumably because of the still held view of the larger society that African Americans are members of a racially inferior group. The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare finally ended the experiment only because an employee informed the Associated Press. Other abuses of human participants include the injection of live cancer cells into elderly and senile patients at Jewish Chronic Hospital in Brooklyn, New York in 1963. Also, in 1966, students at the Willowbrook State School were exposed to hepatitis without their knowledge.

The atrocities of World War Two biomedical experimentation include the well-known and not so well known. Nazi ideology and social Darwinism led to theories of racial hygiene which saw some groups as inferior and provided an ideological excuse for

physicians and scientists to harm people for the state.<sup>1</sup> While it is unlikely that ethically violations of this scale and magnitude will occur again, it is instructive that ethical violations in research utilizing human participants continue to occur. These include: 1. U.S. military radiation experiments on soldiers in the 1950s; 2. Use of investigative drugs on U.S. soldiers during the Gulf War in 1991; and 3. Use of physicians in executions by lethal injection. In the United States, Quakers, because of their conscientious objectors status, were drafted as participants in medical research. In Europe, the physicians and scientists who conducted experiments on concentration camp prisoners drew international attention. During the Nuremberg War Crime Trials, the Nuremberg code was drafted as a set of standards for judging those physicians and scientists who knowingly conducted experiments on involuntary participants who were considered inferior. This code became the prototype of many later codes<sup>2</sup> intended to assure that research involving human participants would be carried out in an ethical manner.

The codes consist of rules, some general, others specific, that will guide you in your work. Such rules often are inadequate to cover complex situations and at times they come into conflict, are frequently difficult to interpret or apply. Broader ethical principles, however, will provide you with a basis on which specific rules may be formulated, criticized and interpreted.

Three principles, or general prescriptive judgments, that are relevant to research involving human participants are identified in this document. Other principles may also be relevant. These three are comprehensive, however, and are stated at a level of generalization that should assist you in understanding the ethical issues inherent in research involving human participants. These principles cannot always be applied so as to resolve beyond dispute particular ethical problems. The objective is to provide an analytical framework that will guide you in the resolution of ethical problems arising from your research.

The following sections will discuss the distinction between research and practice, three basic ethical principles, the application of these principles to your work as a researcher, and documentation required to demonstrate that these principles have been appropriately applied in your research.

---

<sup>1</sup> One German physician at the Nuremberg trial argued that they were no more guilty of ethical violations than U.S. scientists who had conducted malaria experiments on prisoners during World War II at Stateville prison in Illinois. The justification for this argument was based on “biological thinking,” i.e., human subjects are merely objects and should receive no consideration at all.

<sup>2</sup> Since 1945, various codes for the proper and responsible conduct of human experimentation in medical research have been adopted by different organizations. The best known of these codes are the Nuremberg Code of 1947, the Helsinki Declaration of 1964 (revised in 1975), and the 1971 Guidelines (codified into Federal Regulations in 1974) issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Codes for the conduct of social and behavioral research have also been adopted, the best known being that of the American Psychological Association, published in 1973.

## Boundaries Between Practice and Research

It is important to distinguish between research and experimental practices in order to know what activities ought to undergo review for the protection of humans in research. The distinction between research and practice is blurred partly because both often occur together (as in research designed to evaluate an innovation), partly because notable departures from standard practice often are called "experimental," and partly because practitioner research/ teacher research/ action research consists of research undertaken specifically with an eye toward change—often of practice and/or structure.

For the most part, the term “practice” refers to interventions that are designed solely to enhance the well being of others and that have a reasonable expectation of accomplishing the goals you set. While research may be necessary before such interventions are undertaken, the two (research and practice) are not synonymous. By contrast, the term “research” designates an activity which might be designed to test an hypothesis, permit conclusions to be drawn, shed light on an articulated problem, develop or contribute to knowledge that might be generalized or context specific, or to create or enlarge upon theory. Research usually is described in a formal protocol that articulates a problem or sets forth an objective and a method or set of procedures designed to investigate the problem or to reach an articulated objective.

When you depart in a significant way from standard or accepted practice, your innovation does not, in and of itself, constitute research. The fact that your pedagogy is “experimental,” in the sense of new, untested or different, does not automatically place it in the category of research. Although it should be noted, radically new pedagogies should probably be made the object of formal research at an early stage.

Research and practice may be carried on together when research is designed to evaluate the safety and efficacy of an intervention. This need not cause any confusion regarding whether or not the activity requires review; the general rule is that if there is any element of research in your innovative practice, that practice should undergo review for the protection of human participants.

## Basic Ethical Principles

The expression “basic ethical principles” refers to those general judgments that serve as a basic justification for the many particular ethical prescriptions and evaluations of human actions. Three basic principles, among those generally accepted in our cultural tradition, are particularly relevant to the ethics of research involving human participants: the principles of respect of persons, beneficence and justice.

### ▲ *Respect for Persons*

Respect for persons incorporates at least two ethical convictions: first, that individuals should be treated as autonomous agents, and second, that persons with diminished autonomy are entitled to protection. The principle of respect for persons thus divides into two separate moral requirements: the requirement to acknowledge autonomy and the requirement to protect those with diminished autonomy.

An autonomous person is an individual capable of deliberation about personal goals and of acting under the direction of such deliberation. To respect autonomy is to give weight to autonomous persons' considered opinions and choices while refraining from obstructing their actions unless they are clearly detrimental to others. To show lack of respect for an autonomous agent is to repudiate that person's considered judgments, to deny an individual the freedom to act on those considered judgments, or to withhold information necessary to make a considered judgment, when there are no compelling reasons to do so.

However, not every human being is capable of self-determination. The capacity for self-determination matures during an individual's life, and some individuals lose this capacity wholly or in part because of illness, mental disability, or circumstances that severely restrict liberty. Respect for the immature and the incapacitated may require protecting them as they mature or while they are incapacitated.

Some persons are in need of extensive protection, even to the point of excluding them from activities that may harm them; other persons require little protection beyond making sure they undertake activities freely and with awareness of possible adverse consequence. The extent of protection afforded should depend upon the risk of harm and the likelihood of benefit. The judgment that any individual lacks autonomy should be periodically reevaluated and will vary in different situations.

In most cases of research involving human participants, respect for persons demands that participants enter into the research voluntarily and with adequate information. In some situations, however, application of the principle is not obvious. The involvement of prisoners as participants in research provides an instructive example. On the one hand, it would seem that the principle of respect for persons requires that prisoners not be deprived of the opportunity to volunteer for research. On the other hand, under prison conditions they may be subtly coerced or unduly influenced to engage in research activities for which they would not otherwise volunteer. Respect for persons would then dictate that prisoners be protected. Whether to allow prisoners to "volunteer" or to "protect" them presents a dilemma. Respecting persons, in most hard cases, is often a matter of balancing competing claims urged by the principle of respect itself.

### ▲ **Beneficence**

Persons are treated in an ethical manner not only by respecting their decisions and protecting them from harm, but also by making efforts to secure their well-being. Such treatment falls under the principle of beneficence. The term "beneficence" is often understood to cover acts of kindness or charity that go beyond strict obligation. In your research, beneficence should be understood in a stronger sense—as an obligation. Two general rules have been formulated as complementary expressions of beneficent actions in this sense: do not harm and maximize possible benefits and minimize possible harms.

The Hippocratic maxim "do no harm" has long been a fundamental principle of medical ethics. Claude Bernard extended it to the realm of research, saying that one should not injure one person regardless of the benefits that might come to others. However, even

avoiding harm requires learning what is harmful; and, in the process of obtaining this information, persons may be exposed to risk of harm. Further, the Hippocratic Oath requires physicians to benefit their patients “according to their best judgment.” Learning what will in fact benefit may require exposing persons to risk. The problem posed by these imperatives is to decide when it is justifiable to seek certain benefits despite the risks involved, and when the benefits should be foregone because of the risks.

The obligations of beneficence affect you as researcher and society at large, because they extend both to particular research projects and to the entire enterprise of research. In the case of particular projects, you and supporting members of your institution are obliged to give forethought to the maximization of benefits and the reduction of risk that might occur from the research investigation. In the case of research in general, members of the larger society are obliged to recognize the longer term benefits and risks that may result from the improvement of knowledge and from the development of innovative educational and other social interventions.

### ▲ *Justice*

Who ought to receive the benefits of research and bear its burdens? This is a question of justice, in the sense of “fairness in distribution” or “what is deserved.” An injustice occurs when some benefit to which a person is entitled is denied without good reason or when some burden is imposed unduly. Another way of conceiving the principle of justice is that equals ought to be treated equally. This requires explication. Who is equal and who is unequal? What considerations justify departure from equal distribution? Almost all commentators allow that distinctions based on experience, age, deprivation, competence, merit and position do sometimes constitute criteria justifying differential treatment for certain purposes. It is necessary, then, to explain in what respects people should be treated equally. There are several widely accepted formulations of just ways to distribute burdens and benefits. Each formulation mentions some relevant property on the basis of which burdens and benefits should be distributed. These formulations are

- to each person an equal share,
- to each person according to individual need,
- to each person according to individual effort,
- to each person according to societal contribution, and
- to each person according to merit.

Questions of justice have long been associated with social practices such as punishment, taxation and political representation. Until recently these questions have not generally been associated with scientific research. However, they are foreshadowed even in the earliest reflections on the ethics of research involving human participants. For example, during the 19th and early 20th centuries the burdens of serving as research participants fell largely upon poor ward patients, while the benefits of improved medical care flowed primarily to private patients. We have previously discussed the horrendous examples of research undertaken by the Nazis during World War II and the Tuskegee syphilis study.

Against this historical background, it can be seen how conceptions of justice are relevant to research involving human participants. For example, the selection of your research

participants needs to be scrutinized in order to determine whether some classes (e.g., welfare recipients, particular racial and ethnic groups, or persons confined to institutions) are being systematically selected simply because of their easy availability, their compromised position, or their manipulability, rather than for reasons directly related to the problem being studied. Finally, whenever research supported by public funds leads to the development of new beneficial services and practices, justice demands both that these not provide advantages only to those who can afford them and that such research should not unduly involve persons from groups unlikely to be among the beneficiaries of subsequent applications of the research.

## **Applications**

Applications of the general principles to the conduct of your research leads to consideration of the following requirements: informed consent, risk/benefit assessment, and the selection of participants for research.

### **▲ Informed Consent**

Respect for persons requires that the participants in your research, to the degree that they are capable, be given the opportunity to choose what shall or shall not happen to them. This opportunity is provided when adequate standards for informed consent are satisfied. Informed consent means the knowing consent of an individual (or of a legally authorized representative when a vulnerable or dependent person is to be involved) to his or her participation in a research activity without coercion or undue influence.

While the importance of informed consent is unquestioned, controversy prevails over the nature and possibility of an informed consent. Nonetheless, there is widespread agreement that the consent process can be analyzed as containing three elements: information, comprehension and voluntariness.

*Information.* Most codes of research establish specific items for disclosure intended to assure that participants are given sufficient information. These items generally include: the research procedure, their purposes, risks and anticipated benefits, alternative procedures (where interventions are involved), and a statement offering the participant opportunity to ask questions and to withdraw at any time from the research. Additional items have been proposed, including how participants are selected, the person responsible for the research, etc.

However, a simple listing of items does not answer the question of what the standard should be for judging how much and what sort of information you should provide. You might want to consider a standard of “the reasonable volunteer:” the extent and nature of information should be such that persons, knowing that their involvement in your project is neither necessary for them nor perhaps fully understood, can decide whether they wish to participate in the furthering of knowledge. Even when some direct benefit to them is anticipated, the participants should understand clearly the range of risk and the voluntary nature of participation.

A special problem of consent arises where informing participants of some pertinent aspect of the research is likely to impair the validity of the research. In many cases, it is sufficient to indicate to participants that they are being invited to participate in research of which some features will not be revealed until the research is concluded. In all cases of research involving incomplete disclosure, such research is justified only if it is clear that

- Incomplete disclosure is truly necessary to accomplish the goals of the research;
- There are no undisclosed risks to participants that are more than minimal; and
- There is an adequate plan for debriefing participants, when appropriate, and for dissemination of research results to them.

Information about risks should never be withheld for the purpose of eliciting the cooperation of participants, and truthful answers should always be given to direct questions about the research. Take care to distinguish cases in which disclosure would destroy or invalidate your research from cases in which disclosure would simply inconvenience you, the investigator.

A specific consent form should usually be developed for each research project. This form would contain the following:

- A statement that the study involves research, an explanation of the purposes of the research and what is being asked of the participants;
- A description of any benefits or reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to the participants (see below);
- A statement describing whether and how confidentiality of records identifying the participants will be maintained;
- An explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research participants' rights; and
- A statement that participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the participant is otherwise entitled, and the participant may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which the participant is otherwise entitled.

*Comprehension.* The manner and context in which you convey information is as important as the information itself. For example, presenting information in a disorganized and rapid fashion, allowing too little time for consideration or curtailing opportunities for questioning, all may adversely affect a participant's ability to make an informed choice.

Because the participant's ability to understand is a function of intelligence, rationality, maturity and language, it is necessary to adapt the presentation of the information to the participant's capacities. You are responsible for ascertaining that the participant has comprehended the information.

You should express that information—orally or in written form—verbally and in a language which is understandable to the participant or the participant’s representative. The text of a consent form should not involve any exculpatory language through which the participant is asked to waive any legal rights, including release of you or your institutional sponsor from liability for negligence. All participants or their authorized representatives should be given a copy of any consent document that they have completed.

*Voluntariness.* An agreement to participate in research constitutes a valid consent only if voluntarily given. This element of informed consent requires conditions free of coercion and undue influence. Coercion occurs when an overt threat of harm is intentionally presented by one person to another in order to obtain compliance. Undue influence, by contrast, occurs through an offer of an excessive, unwarranted, inappropriate or improper reward or other overture in order to obtain compliance. Also, inducements that would ordinarily be acceptable may become undue influences if the participant is especially vulnerable.

Unjustifiable pressures usually occur when persons in positions of authority or commanding influence—especially where possible sanctions are involved—urge a course of action for a participant. A continuum of such influencing factors exists, however, and it is impossible to state precisely where justifiable persuasion ends and undue influence begins. But undue influence would include actions such as manipulating a person's choice through the controlling influence of a close relative or threatening to terminate employment.

### ▲ **Assessment of Risk and Benefits**

The assessment of risks and benefits requires a careful array of relevant data, including, in some cases, alternative ways of obtaining the benefits sought in the research. Thus, the assessment presents both an opportunity and a responsibility to gather systematic and comprehensive information about your proposed project. For you, it is a means to examine whether your research is properly designed. For prospective participants in your research, the assessment will assist them in determining whether or not to participate.

The requirement that research be justified on the basis of a favorable risk/benefit assessment bears a close relation to the principle of beneficence, just as the moral requirement that informed consent be obtained is derived primarily from the principle of respect for persons. The term “risk” refers to a possibility that harm may occur. However, when expressions such as “small risk” or “high risk” are used, they usually refer (often ambiguously) both to the chance (probability) of experiencing a harm and the severity (magnitude) of the envisioned harm.

The term “benefit” is used in the research context to refer to something of positive value related to health or welfare. Risk is properly contrasted to probability of benefits, and benefits are properly contrasted with harms rather than risks of harm. Accordingly, so-called risk/benefit assessments are concerned with the probabilities and magnitudes of possible harm and anticipated benefits. Many kinds of possible harms and benefits need

to be taken into account. There are, for example, risks of psychological harm, physical harm, legal harm, social harm and economic harm and the corresponding benefits. While the most likely types of harms to participants of research in the social sciences are those of psychological pain or injury, other possible kinds should not be overlooked.

Risks and benefits of research may affect the individual participants, the families of the individual participants, and society at large (or special groups of participants in society). Previous codes and Federal regulations have required that risks to participants be outweighed by the sum of both the anticipated benefit to the participant, if any, and the anticipated benefit to society in the form of knowledge to be gained from the research. In balancing these different elements, the risks and benefits affecting the immediate research subject will normally carry special weight. On the other hand, interests other than those of the participant may on some occasions be sufficient by themselves to justify the risks involved in the research, so long as the participants' rights have been protected. Beneficence thus requires that we protect against risk of harm to participants and also that we be concerned about the loss of the substantial benefits that might be gained from research.

It is commonly said that benefits and risks must be “balanced” and shown to be “in a favorable ratio.” The metaphorical character of these terms draws attention to the difficulty of making precise judgments. However, the idea of systematic, non-arbitrary analysis of risks and benefits should be emulated insofar as possible. This ideal requires you to be thorough in the accumulation and assessment of information about all aspects of your research, and to consider alternatives systematically. This procedure renders the assessment of your research more rigorous and precise, while making communication with IRRB members less subject to misinterpretation, misinformation and conflicting judgments. Thus, there should first be a determination of the validity of the presuppositions of the research; then the nature, probability and magnitude of risk should be distinguished with as much clarity as possible. The method of ascertaining risks should be explicit, especially where there is no alternative to the use of such vague categories as small or slight risk. It should also be determined whether your estimates of the probability of harm or benefits are reasonable, as judged by known facts or other available studies.

### ▲ *Selection of Participants*

Just as the principle of respect for persons finds expression in the requirements for consent, and the principle of beneficence in risk/benefit assessment, the principle of justice gives rise to moral requirements that you use fair procedures and attain fair outcomes in the selection of your research participants.

Justice is relevant to the selection of participants in research at two levels: the social and the individual. Individual justice in the selection of participants would require that you exhibit fairness: thus, you should not offer potentially beneficial research only to persons who are in your favor or select only “undesirable” persons for risky research. Social justice requires that distinction be drawn between classes of participants that ought, and ought not, to participate in any particular kind of research, based on the ability of

members of that class to bear burdens and on the appropriateness of placing further burdens on already burdened persons. Thus, it can be considered a matter of social justice that there is an order of preference in the selection of classes of participants and that some classes of potential participants (e.g., the institutionalized mentally infirm or prisoners) may be involved as research participants, if at all, only on certain conditions.

Injustice may appear in the selection of participants, even if individual participants are selected fairly and treated fairly in the course of research. This injustice arises from social, racial, sexual and cultural biases institutionalized in society. Thus, even if you treat your research participants fairly, and even if the IRRB takes care to assure that participants are selected fairly within a particular institution, unjust social patterns may nevertheless appear in the overall distribution of the burdens and benefits of your research. Although you may not be able to resolve a problem that is pervasive in your social setting, you can consider distributive justice in selecting research participants.

One special instance of injustice results from the involvement of vulnerable participants. Certain groups, such as racial groups, the economically disadvantaged, the very sick, and the institutionalized may continually be sought as research participants, owing to their ready availability in settings where research is conducted. Such groups may, in the past, have cooperated with researchers in the mistaken belief that academic research would lead to an improvement of the social or economic conditions under which they live. Given their dependent status and their frequently compromised capacity for free consent, they should be protected against the danger of being involved in research solely for academic ends, or because they are easy to manipulate as a result of their political or socioeconomic condition.

### **Status of Research Projects**

There are three categories used in evaluating research projects: projects requiring full review, projects requiring an expedited review, and projects exempt from IRRB review. It is assumed that all research will require the full review of the IRRB unless that research meets criteria specified below.

#### **▲ Exempt from Review**

When the involvement of human participants in research falls only in one of the following categories, such research is exempt from the Federal Human Subject Review Policy. Determination of exemption for student research is made by the committee chair or advisor *and* the program director or department chair on the basis of documentation submitted by the researcher(s). The declaration of exemption, together with accompanying documentation, is filed with the IRRB.

**Categories (one of the following):**

- Research in common educational settings, involving normal or special educational practices. (46.101b 1)<sup>3</sup>
- Research involving educational tests, surveys, interviews, or observation unless confidentiality cannot be maintained or disclosure places the participants at risk. (46.101b 2)
- Research involving elected or appointed public officials or candidates for office, even when confidentiality cannot be maintained or disclosure places the participants at risk. (46.101b 3)
- Research involving the study of existing data either publicly available or recorded by the researcher(s) in a manner that maintains confidentiality. (46.101b 4)
- Institutional or organizational research designed to improve service or benefits when approved by the agency's head. (46.101b 5)

**▲ Expedited Review**

Expedited review by the IRRB Chair or a designated member of the IRRB will suffice for research proposals meeting either of two criteria AND falling into one of the categories below:

**Criteria (either of the following):**

- Research involves no more than minimal risk. (46.110b 1)
- Minor changes are proposed in previously approved research. (16.110b 2)

**Categories:**

- The collection of biological specimens or data for research purposes by noninvasive means. (63 FR 60364-60367F 1-4)
- Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (63 FR 60364-60367F 5-6)
- Research employing survey, interview, program evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from review.) (63 FR 60364-60367F 7)

**Documentation**

To document the way you have attended to these criteria you will need to write a brief summary of your project, describing in non-technical terms what will happen in relation to the participants of your inquiry. Describe any benefits and any potential risks to them. To the best of your ability, give anticipated numbers of participants you will involve as

---

<sup>3</sup> Numbers refer to the *Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Public Welfare, part 46, Protection of Human Participants* (revised October 1, 1997).

sources, with attention to race, gender, class and age. Also specify how participants will be recruited and what procedures you propose to obtain informed consent.

Complete a copy of the form included at the end of this document—the Review of Research Involving Human Participants—and attach to that form any relevant documentation, for example any forms you will use related to “informed consent.” Sign the Review form along with your co-researchers, if any.

Documentation should be given to your department head or program director for an initial determination of status. If it is necessary for your project to receive full review by the IRRB, the department head or program director will inform you of this. You will receive written notification in either case indicating the decision of the reviewing body. The collection of data can only begin after your project has been reviewed and approved by a department head or program director (if the project is Exempt) or by the IRRB.

**Appendix U:**  
**Review of Student Research Involving Human Participants**  
**October 2001**

*Note: Please complete this form and attach brief responses to the issues raised, keeping in mind that the primary concern is the potential risk—physical, emotional, or other—to the participants, as well as the protection of their rights. Provide copies of all surveys, questionnaires, consent forms or other documents to be used in the inquiry. The Institutional Research Review Board (IRRB) must have enough information about the transactions with the participants to evaluate the risks of participation. Assurance from you, no matter how strong, will not substitute for a description of the transactions.*

<b>Name(s):</b>	<b>College:</b>
<b>Address:</b>	<b>Phone:</b>
<b>E-Mail Address:</b>	
<b>Research Title:</b>	
<b>Data Collection Start Date:</b>	
<p><i>Note: Unless designated "Exempt" at the program and department level, this project must receive formal clearance in the form of an approval letter from the IRRB chair prior to the start of data collection. Projects designated exempt must still be submitted to the IRRB within two weeks of that determination.</i></p>	

**It is assumed that all research requires the full review of the IRRB unless it meets criteria specified on page 3 of this form.** Using the guidelines on page 2 and the criteria on page 3, address the each of the following explicitly and separately in an attached narrative:

***For all projects:***

- Briefly describe the purpose of your study and, in non-technical terms, what will the participants be asked to do, what are the processes and procedures for data collection. Append relevant instruments (protocols, questionnaires, surveys, etc.).
- Describe any potential risks or benefits (emotional, physical, social, or political) to your participants.
- Give the anticipated ages, sex, and number of participants, and explain how and where they will be recruited.
- Describe the procedures for obtaining informed consent as provided for the Code of Federal Regulations, section 46.116. Append any forms used.

***For Non-Exempt Projects Only:***

- If minors are involved, describe the procedures for obtaining consent to participate from the minors capable of giving consent, as well as the procedures to obtain parental or guardian consent.
- If risk is involved, explain how the knowledge to be gained and/or the benefits to the research participants from the proposed research justify any risks the participants might incur.
- Explain what, if any, support services will be provided in the event of harm to a participant.

### **Guidelines: IRRB Criteria for Ethical Research**

The following requirements for the approval of research is based upon the *Code of Federal Regulations, Title 45, Public Welfare, Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects (revised Oct 1, 1997)*. If your research falls under one of the “Exempt from Review” categories, you still must submit your proposal and documentation to your committee chair or advisor and the program director or department chair for determination of Exempt from Review status. The scope and interpretation of this checklist are determined by reference to that original document.

#### **Requirements of All Research:**

- Risks to participants, where they exist, will be minimized and are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits. (46.111a 1-2)
- Participants will be equitably chosen, especially in the case of vulnerable populations—children, persons with disabilities, the homeless, etc. (46.111a 3)
- Documentation of informed consent will be obtained from each participant or participant's legal representative. (46.111a 4-5; see Required Elements for Informed Consent below)
- Measures will be taken to monitor data collected to insure the safety and privacy of the participants. (46.111a 6-7)
- In the case of vulnerable populations, additional safeguards will be included to prevent coercion or undue influence by the researcher. (46.111a 8)

#### **Required Elements for Informed Consent:**

- The consent form provides a clear and non-technical explanation of the research project—sufficient to inform a participant's decision to participate or not. (46.116a 1)
- The consent form describes any foreseeable risks or discomforts, as well as possible benefits to the participant. (46.116a 2-3)
- The consent form informs the participant of the extent to which confidentiality will be maintained. (46.116a 5)
- The consent form identifies a person to contact should questions regarding the research or the participant's rights arise. (46.116a 7)
- The consent form provides a statement that participation is voluntary and that refusal to participate or termination of participation will result in no harm to the participant. (46.116a 8)
- Note: When obtaining consent for minors to participate in research studies.
  - an agreement to participate in research constitutes a valid consent only if voluntarily given. Informed consent requires conditions free of coercion and undue influence. (See the section on *Voluntariness*, page 9 of the IRRB monograph for a definition of coercion and undue influence.) It is important that the voluntary nature of agreement continue throughout the research.
  - regardless of the age of the minors (participants who are not yet eighteen years old), parental or guardian consent is required to participate in a study. Describe the procedures to obtain parental or guardian consent.
  - in addition to obtaining the consent of parents or guardians, if the minors participating in the study are able to give their consent, describe the procedures for obtaining their consent to participate. If you do not obtain the consent of minors, please explain why you do not consider them able to provide it.
  - all minors and/or their parents or guardians should be given a copy of any consent document that they have completed.

When appropriate, the following should also be included:

- If relevant, the consent form describes any alternative treatments being withheld by the researcher that might be advantageous to the participant. (46.116a 4)
- The consent form explains any compensation to be provided should harm to the participant occur. (46.116a 6)

## **Exemption and Expedited Review**

### **Exempt from Review**

When the involvement of human participants in research falls only in one of the following categories, such research is exempt from the Federal Human Subject Review Policy. Determination of exemption for student research is made by the committee chair or advisor and the program director or department chair on the basis of documentation submitted by the researcher(s). The declaration of exemption, together with accompanying documentation, is filed with the IRRB.

#### **Categories (one of the following):**

- Research in common educational settings, involving normal or special educational practices. (46.101b 1)
- Research involving educational tests, surveys, interviews, or observation unless confidentiality cannot be maintained or disclosure places the participants at risk. (46.101b 2)
- Research involving elected or appointed public officials or candidates for office, even when confidentiality cannot be maintained or disclosure places the participants at risk. (46.101b 3)
- Research involving the study of existing data either publicly available or recorded by the researcher(s) in a manner that maintains confidentiality. (46.101b 4)
- Institutional or organizational research designed to improve service or benefits when approved by the agency's head. (46.101b 5)

### ***Expedited Review***

Expedited review by the IRRB Chair or a designated member of the IRRB will suffice for research proposals meeting either one of two criteria AND falling into one of the categories below:

#### **Criteria (either of the following):**

- Research involves no more than minimal risk. (46.110b 1)
- Minor changes are proposed in previously approved research. (16.110b 2)

#### **Categories:**

- The collection of biological specimens or data for research purposes by noninvasive means. (63 FR 60364-60367F 1-4)
- Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) collected solely for non-research purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (63 FR 60364-60367F 5-6)
- Research employing survey, interview, program evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from review.) (63 FR 60364-60367F 7)

**Signature Page****Certification**

I certify that I have read and understand the policies and procedures for research projects that involve human participants and that I intend to comply with University Policy. I understand that all non-exempt projects require annual review. Significant changes in the study protocol need to be submitted on a Change Form for review prior to those changes being put into practice.

**Researcher(s)****Date:**

**Check one of the following, indicating the category into which this research falls according to Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46:**

- Project is exempt. **Cite exempt category:**
- Project is referred for expedited review. **Cite expedited category:**
- Project is referred for full IRRB review.

**\*Committee Chair/Primary Advisor****Date****\*Department Chair/Program Director****Date**

*\*If one individual holds both positions, the Chair/Advisor of committee should request another Director or senior faculty member to review and sign this certification.*

## Appendix V:

### NLU Institutional Research Review Board INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENTS: GUIDELINES AND CHECKLIST

A specific consent form should be developed for each data collection activity that involves the use of Human Participants, i.e., interviews, focus groups, observations, etc.

**PLEASE NOTE:** Before collecting your data, you should secure two copies of the signed consent form (a copy for you and the participant), and a letter of agreement from the cooperating institution or organization, if applicable.

1. \_\_\_ A statement identifying the researcher's affiliation with National-Louis University, if appropriate.
2. \_\_\_ A clear and concise description of the purpose of the study in language that the participant can understand.
3. \_\_\_ An identification of the anticipated risks (physical, emotional, social, political, economic) and benefits to the participant.
4. \_\_\_ A description of the procedures you will follow: what is expected of participants, what they will be required to do, what data will be collected and how it will be used, and the time required for participation.
5. \_\_\_ A statement regarding the voluntary nature of participation and the right to withdraw at any time.
6. \_\_\_ An explanation of how confidentiality will be protected.
7. \_\_\_ A statement regarding the protection of the audio and visual recordings of the participant and field notes. Identify who, if anyone, will have access to the tapes, transcripts and field notes.
8. \_\_\_ An offer to make available the results of the research in some form.
9. \_\_\_ An explanation of whom to contact for answers to questions about the research project and participant rights. This should include the name, title, address and telephone number of the researcher and, if the researcher is a student, the primary advisor/program chair.

**Appendix W:  
Change of Status of Research**

*Please Complete and Return to the Institutional Research and Review Board*

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Researcher(s): _____
Name of Study: _____
Original Classification of Research: <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt <input type="checkbox"/> Expedited <input type="checkbox"/> Full Review
Department and College: _____
Advisor's Name & Signature (req'd only for students): _____
Program Director's Name & Signature (req'd only for students): _____
Researcher's Signature : _____
Phone: _____
E-mail: _____
Date Study Originally Approved : _____

**Indicate in which way(s) your Research Project has changed since the time your application was approved by checking the appropriate box(es) below. Please describe changes in detail and include relevant forms and instruments in attachments to this application. Include samples of Informed Consent documents.**

**1. Essential Research Element(s) Has/Have Changed:**

- The purpose of the study has changed
- Processes/procedures or instruments for data collection have changed
- Potential risks/benefits/justification have changed
- Participant demographics have changed
- Procedure and forms for informed consent have changed
- Minors and other vulnerable populations are now included in the study
- Support services made available to participants have changed
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Research Categor(ies) Has/Have Changed (Expedited or Full categories will require a review):**

- Category has changed from the original Exempt, Expedited or Full review status
- Research design or purpose has changed
- Research setting has changed
- Demographics of participants have changed
- Support services have changed
- Data source has changed
- Data collection procedures or instruments have changed
- Confidentiality of data has changed
- The purpose for data collection has changed
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**3.  An extension in Time for Data Collection is Needed: (please specify):**

\_\_\_\_\_



## Index

### A

Admission, 26  
 Advising Process, 33  
 Anonymity, 37  
 Appendices, 49  
 Application Deadlines, 27  
 Application Form, 26  
 Appointment of Doctoral Committee Form, 53

### C

Chair of The Dissertation Committee, 41  
 Change in Doctoral Study Plan, 29  
 Change of Personal Information Form, 66, 67  
 Comprehensive Examinations, 34  
 Copyright, 48  
 Course Waivers, 28  
 Curriculum and Social Inquiry, 4

### D

Dean's Representative, 41, 42  
 Dean's Representative Recommendation Form, 57  
 Disability and Equity in Education, 8  
 Dissertation, 34  
 Dissertation Abstract, 44  
 Dissertation Abstracts, 44  
 Dissertation Approval Meeting, 41  
 Dissertation Approval Meeting Scheduling Form, 59  
 Dissertation Binding, 47  
 Dissertation Chair, 34  
 Dissertation Committee, 34  
 Dissertation Completion, 42  
 Dissertation Copies, 47  
 Dissertation Format Guidelines, 43  
 Dissertation Process And Procedures, 38  
 Dissertation Proposal Approval, 41  
 Dissertation Proposal Development, 38  
 Dissertation Proposal Signature Page, 54, 55  
 Dissertation Requirements, 36  
 Dissertation Title Page, 56  
 Doctoral Program Policy, 26  
 Doctoral Program Scholarship Fund, 32  
 Doctoral Study Plan, 28, 50  
 Dropping Courses, 31

### E

Educational Leadership Core, 12  
 Educational Leadership Program, 11  
 Educational Psychology Doctoral Program, 14  
 Educational Psychology/Human Learning and  
 Development, 17  
 Educational Psychology/Human Learning and  
 Development Doctoral Core, 18  
 Educational Psychology/School Psychology, 14  
 Educational Psychology/School Psychology Doctoral  
 Core, 15

Educational Specialist Degree Credit, 28  
 Enrollment Requirements, 28  
 ERIC Processing and Reference Facility, 48

### F

Financial Aid, 32  
 Formal Completion of the Dissertation, 46

### G

Governance, 3  
 Grade point average, 26  
 Grade Policies/Credits, 29  
 Graduate Admissions and Retention Council, 27  
 Graduate Record Examination, 26  
 Graduate Study Plan Change Form, 51  
 Graduation, 47

### H

Human Participants, 36

### I

In Progress, 69  
 Independent Sources of Financial Aid, 32  
 Institutional Research Review Board for Human  
 Subjects, 36  
 Institutional Research Review Board Form: Change of  
 Status of Research, 88  
 Institutional Research Review Board Form: Informed  
 Consent Guidelines & Checklist, 87  
 Institutional Research Review Board Form: Policies &  
 Procedures for Conducting Research, 70  
 Institutional Research Review Board Form: Review of  
 Student Research Involving Human Participants, 83  
 Interview, 26  
 Introduction, 38  
 Introductory section, 38

### L

Leave of Absence, 28  
 Letters of Reference, 26  
 Library Card Request Form, 64  
 Library Resources, 31  
 Loan Programs, 32

### N

NLU Student Handbook, 34

### O

Organization of Dissertation, 44

## P

Pass/No Credit, 30  
 Payment for Mail Registration, 29 (?) - can't find this  
 Petition to Appoint an Outside Member to the  
 Doctoral Committee, 65  
 Placement Services, 32  
 Policies & Procedures for Conducting  
 Research, 70  
 Policy Governing Research Conduct, 36  
 Policy on Academic Honesty, 30  
 Probation, 30  
 Program Advisor, 33  
 Program Committee, 3  
 Proposal Approval Meeting, 41, 42  
 Proposal Approval Meeting Scheduling Form, 58  
 Proposal for Doctoral Internship Cover Sheet, 62  
 Publication, 48  
 Purpose and Rationale, 38

## R

Reading and Language Core, 22  
 Reading and Language Doctoral Program, 20  
 Reading and Language Internship, 22, 60, 61, 62, 63  
 References, 40  
 References to Literature, 38  
 Registration, 31  
 Request for Leave Of Absence, 68  
 Request for Transfer Of Credit, 52  
 Research Design and Methods, 38, 39  
 Research Honesty, 37

Residency Statement, 27  
 Responsibilities of the Dean's Representative, 42

## S

Sample of Dissertation Proposal Signature Page, 54  
 Sample of Dissertation Signature Page, 55  
 Sample of Dissertation Title Page, 56  
 Scheduling the Dissertation Approval Meeting, 44  
 Scholarship Funds, 32  
 Signature Page, 54, 55, 87  
 Student Change of Personal Information, 31  
 Student ID, 31  
 Student Support Services, 31

## T

Time Limit, 27  
 Transfer of Credit, 27

## U

University Microfilms International, 48

## W

Withdrawal from a course, 30  
 Withdrawal from Program, 30  
 Writing sample, 26

## X

X, I, and W for a Course, 29





