

College of Information Studies | University of Maryland, College Park

The Handbook of the Ph.D. in Information Studies Program

Academic Year 2019-2020



COLLEGE OF
INFORMATION
STUDIES

Revised: 2019-06-26

Table of Contents

I	Introduction	1
	<i>Relationship between the Handbook and the University's Graduate Catalog</i>	1
	<i>Application of the Different Versions of the Doctoral Program Handbook</i>	1
	<i>Process for Updating the Doctoral Program Handbook</i>	1
II	Program Overview	2
	<i>Goals of the Doctoral Program</i>	2
	<i>Milestones of the Doctoral Study</i>	2
	<i>Sample Program of Study</i>	3
	<i>Timelines</i>	4
	<i>Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments</i>	5
	<i>Residency</i>	5
	<i>Program Administration</i>	5
III	Applying to the Program	6
	<i>Requirements and Deadlines</i>	6
	<i>Review of Applications</i>	6
	<i>Financial Support</i>	7
	<i>Admission Decisions</i>	7
IV	Academic Integrity	8
	<i>Code of Academic Integrity</i>	8
	<i>Honor Pledge</i>	8
	<i>Penalties for Violations of Academic Integrity</i>	9
V	Advising	10
	<i>Advisor</i>	10
	<i>Plan of Study</i>	10
	<i>Advising by the Dissertation Committee</i>	10
	<i>Resolving Tensions in Advising</i>	10
	<i>Changing Advisors and Feedback on Advising</i>	11
	<i>Peer Mentoring</i>	11
VI	Course Work	12

<i>Basic Statistics Requirement</i>	12
<i>Required Doctoral Courses</i>	12
<i>Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area</i>	14
<i>Grades</i>	14
<i>Designation of Full-Time and Part-Time Status</i>	15
VII First Year Review and Annual Review	17
<i>Timing of First Year Review</i>	17
<i>First Year Review Committee</i>	17
<i>Portfolio for the Review</i>	17
<i>Process and Outcome of the Review</i>	18
<i>Annual Review</i>	19
VIII Integrative Paper	19
<i>Academic Standing before Beginning the Integrative Paper</i>	20
<i>Deadline for Acceptance of the Integrative Paper</i>	20
<i>Submission Guidelines</i>	21
<i>Research Involving Human Subjects</i>	22
<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>	22
<i>Suggestions on Successfully Completing the Integrative Paper</i>	23
<i>Review Outcome</i>	24
IX Admission to Candidacy	25
<i>Candidacy</i>	25
<i>Continuous Registration</i>	25
X Dissertation Proposal	26
<i>Dissertation Examining Committee</i>	26
<i>Doctoral Committee's Approval of Dissertation Examining Committee</i>	27
<i>Preparing the Dissertation Proposal</i>	27
<i>Dissertation Proposal Defense</i>	27
XI Dissertation	29
<i>Eligibility</i>	29
<i>Research Assurances</i>	29
<i>Graduate School's Approval of Dissertation Examining Committee</i>	29

<i>Dissertation Defense</i>	29
<i>Outcome of the Defense</i>	31
<i>Submission and Publication of the Dissertation</i>	31
XII Financial Assistance	33
<i>Assistantships and Fellowships</i>	33
<i>Travel Funding</i>	34
<i>External Fellowships</i>	34
<i>Other Funding Resources</i>	34
XIII Support, Organizations, and Opportunities	35
<i>Student Organizations</i>	35
<i>Student Offices</i>	35
<i>Research Labs and Centers</i>	35
<i>Writing and Publishing</i>	37
<i>Ombuds Office</i>	37
<i>Graduate Student Legal Aid Office</i>	37
XIV Campus Safety Resources	38
XV Questions and Comments about the Handbook	40
Appendix A Maryland's iSchool Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments	A-1
<i>Annual Review</i>	A-5
<i>Integrative Paper</i>	A-11
<i>Dissertation Proposal</i>	16
<i>Dissertation</i>	20
Appendix B Doctoral Student Travel Support Application Form	B-1

I Introduction

This handbook serves the doctoral students, faculty, and staff at the College of Information Studies (iSchool) at the University of Maryland, College Park. The handbook contains both an overview of policies and procedures and specific suggestions to help guide students through each stage of the Ph.D. in Information Studies program. This handbook covers the most important and common issues that doctoral students encounter, but it is not meant to be exhaustive. For any issues not covered in the handbook, students should consult their advisors, the Doctoral Program Director, the Student Services Office, and/or university policies, as appropriate.

Relationship between the Handbook and the University's Graduate Catalog

This Doctoral Program Handbook is an iSchool-specific application of the policies established in the University of Maryland Graduate Catalog (www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog). All regulations enforced by the Graduate School are updated in this handbook on an annual basis. However, in cases where there is a discrepancy between the handbook and the Graduate Catalog in the wording of a policy enforced by the Graduate School, the Graduate Catalog supersedes this handbook.

Application of the Different Versions of the Doctoral Program Handbook

When students enter the doctoral program, they are required to follow the current version of the iSchool Doctoral Program Handbook as of the year that they enter. Students have the option of choosing to follow a newer version of the iSchool Doctoral Program Handbook, with three stipulations: 1) students must follow all aspects of the selected version of the handbook; it is not possible to pick and choose policies from different versions of the handbook; 2) following a selected handbook also includes following the accompanying version of the University of Maryland Graduate Catalog (the same year for the Graduate Catalog as the handbook); and 3) students changing to a newer version of the handbook cannot change back to any earlier version of the handbook.

Process for Updating the Doctoral Program Handbook

The Doctoral Program Handbook is updated annually by the iSchool Doctoral Committee. Requests for changes to the handbook can be sent to the Doctoral Program Director at any time, but the handbook is only updated on an annual basis.

II Program Overview

The Ph.D. program at Maryland's iSchool offers an interdisciplinary approach to research and teaching provided by leading faculty at this highly respected public research university. Small classes and wide-ranging research projects enable students to work closely with faculty mentors to gain experience in identifying knowledge gaps, investigating both theoretical and practical solutions, evaluating results, and creating and disseminating new knowledge. A range of required research courses, doctoral seminars, and electives chosen by the students and their faculty mentors provide both the structure necessary for individuals to become successful researchers and the flexibility that allows them to pursue the research areas about which they are most passionate.


Maryland's iSchool is at the center of groundbreaking research in the fast-moving field of Information Studies. With a multidisciplinary faculty studying such diverse topics as Information Policy, Public and School Libraries, Digital Curation, Human-Computer Interaction, Social Computing, Citizen Science, Information Technology Innovations, and Health Informatics, the iSchool cultivates doctoral students from a wide range of backgrounds. The PhD program offered at the iSchool is an interdisciplinary program that provides students with training in theory, research, and pedagogy as preparation for original research in the field of Information Studies.

The iSchool's location near Washington, DC, the information capital of the world, offers unparalleled opportunities for students to pursue research and employment opportunities. Students have opportunities to work on research projects that lead to published papers, as well as benefit from one-on-one mentoring relationships with faculty members. Graduates of the program have accepted positions at leading universities and research institutions around the world.

Goals of the Doctoral Program

The Ph.D. degree is an academic degree, providing a background in pedagogy, theory, and research that will prepare graduates for careers in conducting research and teaching in Information Studies. In order to complete the program, students must demonstrate high attainment in scholarship and critical thinking, as well as the ability to carry out independent scholarly research.

Milestones of the Doctoral Study



Students must complete a minimum of 27 graduate credit hours while matriculated at the University of Maryland (or 30 hours if a basic statistics course has not been taken before matriculation). Course work is taken in three areas: Information Studies (6 credit hours); Research Methods and Design (12 credit hours) and specialized area(s) (9 credit hours).

All students have a First Year Review at the close of their first full year in the program. Students prepare

a portfolio that self-evaluates progress. The portfolio may include papers written for course work or research, a presentation on a research topic, and/or reviews by previous course instructors. A committee comprised of at least three faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the iSchool faculty, reviews the work and informs the student of the results.

Students do not take comprehensive exams, but instead write an Integrative Paper that synthesizes and applies knowledge from broad areas of the information field. A committee comprised of at least three faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the iSchool faculty, approves the topic and abstract of the paper, and certifies its successful acceptance, judged by professional standards. The paper is typically written after the completion of course work or equivalent experience (e.g., extensive work in a research environment) and must be completed and accepted before admission to candidacy.

Upon successful completion of the Integrative Paper, the student must identify a faculty member who will serve as the chair of his/her dissertation committee. Typically, this person is the student's pre-candidacy advisor; however, a new faculty member may be designated. The student, in consultation with his/her committee chair, selects a dissertation committee, which must be approved by the Doctoral Committee. The student must submit a dissertation proposal to the dissertation committee. This proposal includes a literature review, research plan, research methods to be used, research goals and objectives, timelines for the work, potential limitations, and any other elements deemed appropriate by the committee. The chair and the committee work with the student to determine the format and content of the proposal and the type of proposal defense. Before the student can move past the proposal stage, a written proposal must be unanimously approved by the committee and the student must pass his/her dissertation proposal defense. Any changes to the goals, objectives, methods, plan, or other major element of the dissertation work must be approved by the chair in consultation with the other members of the committee.

The final milestone is the completion and defense of the dissertation. The purpose of the dissertation is to demonstrate the ability to successfully conduct original and meaningful research that contributes to the scholarly discourse. It must be finished and defended in no less than six months and no more than four years from admission to candidacy.

During any academic year when the student does not achieve a formal milestone (first-year review, Integrative Paper, dissertation proposal, or dissertation defense), the student will have an Annual Review. This is a formal check-in during which the student's advisor (and perhaps other faculty member/s) assess the student's progress in the program, identify any problem areas and develop strategies for moving forward, and establish a timeline of milestones to ensure continued progress. At the advisor's discretion, one or more faculty members may be included in the Annual Review. At the conclusion of the review, an Outcomes Assessment report is filled out and submitted to the student and to the PhD Program staff.

In addition, the college provides options for a Ph.D. student to attain teaching experience through teaching assistantships in the iSchool or a 3-credit unpaid, mentored co-teaching experience, "Individualized Teaching Experience" (INST 809).

Sample Program of Study

Below is a **sample** schedule for Ph.D. students. This is meant purely as an example and is not a replacement for advising. Students must work closely with their advisors to develop a course program that best addresses their needs and interests.

Fall Semester, Year I:	
(INST 888) Doctoral Seminar I	3 credit hours
(INST 800) The Engaged Intellectual: An Introduction to Research and Academic Work	3 credit hours
Relevant graduate course for specialized area	3 credit hours
Basic statistics course (if not taken previously)	3 credit hours
Spring Semester, Year I:	
(INST 888) Doctoral Seminar II	3 credit hours
Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods course	3 credit hours
Relevant graduate course for specialized area	3 credit hours
FIRST YEAR REVIEW	
Fall Semester, Year II:	
(INST 810) Individual Research Experience	3 credit hours
Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods course	3 credit hours
Relevant graduate course for specialized area	3 credit hours
Spring Semester, Year II:	
(INST 898) Pre-Candidacy Research	6 credit hours
INTEGRATIVE PAPER & ADVANCE TO CANDIDACY	
Fall Semester, Year III:	
(INST 899) Doctoral Dissertation Research	6 credit hours
Spring Semester, Year III:	
(INST 899) Doctoral Dissertation Research	6 credit hours
DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEFENSE	
Fall Semester, Year IV:	
(INST 899) Doctoral Dissertation Research	6 credit hours
Spring Semester, Year IV:	
(INST 899) Doctoral Dissertation Research	6 credit hours
DISSERTATION DEFENSE	

Program content varies according to each student’s previous educational experiences, areas of interest, and goals in the Ph.D. program. An individual program of study is usually designed with the student’s advisor in accordance with program guidelines.

Timelines

While individual educational goals and experiences shape the timeline of the program, students should plan to complete their Ph.D. in a period of four to five years as full-time students (see designation of full-time and part-time status in Section VI: “Course Work”). Students must successfully complete their course work and their Integrative Papers to advance to candidacy within a maximum of five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least six months before the date on which the degree is conferred. After admission to candidacy, the Graduate School requires that every student seeking the

Ph.D. degree satisfactorily complete a minimum of 12 semester hours of dissertation credits (INST 899) before the dissertation defense.

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments

There are four milestones during the doctoral program: (1) first-year review, (2) Integrative Paper, (3) dissertation proposal, and (4) dissertation. There will also be an annual review at the end of any academic year during which the student has not achieved one of the four milestones. The college has adopted a policy to assess each student's achievement of designated learning outcomes at each of these milestones. The details, including assessment schedule, procedures, and rubrics, are in Appendix A of this handbook. A committee is formed to conduct each review for each student. The Student Services Office administers the assessment reviews and records the outcomes of these reviews.

Residency

The university paperwork includes a form used to determine whether the applicant is an in-state or out-of-state resident. Regardless, all students enrolled in the doctoral program must remain on campus during the period when taking courses in the program.

The University System of Maryland Board of Regents has developed policies and procedures that define a Maryland resident for tuition and charge-differential purposes. This information is maintained on the website of Residency Reclassification Services: <http://registrar.umd.edu/resreclass.html>.

Program Administration

The doctoral program is administered according to standards and regulations established by the Graduate School under the jurisdiction of the Graduate Council of the University of Maryland.

Within the college, the doctoral program is led by the Doctoral Program Director and Associate Director in consultation with the Doctoral Committee, which is comprised of faculty representatives, one representative of the doctoral students, the Director of the Student Services Office as a voting ex officio member, and the college's Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs as non-voting ex officio members. The meetings of the Doctoral Committee are open to anyone interested in participating. However, due to legal requirements related to privacy, meetings or portions of meetings where the Doctoral Committee addresses issues pertaining to individual students or applicants to the college are not open to students.

The Doctoral Program Director leads the Doctoral Committee to perform the following tasks:

- Oversee administration of the program;
- Define, evaluate, and modify principles on which the program is based;
- Make admission and funding decisions about applicants to the program;
- Review and vote on doctoral student travel requests and other support when relevant; and
- Review and vote on committees for individual doctoral students.

The Student Services Office offers doctoral students assistance with registration, billing, and university-required paperwork.

III Applying to the Program

Requirements and Deadlines

New doctoral students enter the college at the beginning of the fall semester. Those seeking admission to the doctoral program must submit an online application to the University of Maryland Graduate School at <http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/admissions>. The application and all accompanying documents must be submitted by the deadline. The graduate school publishes specific application information about the Ph.D. in Information Studies program, including the deadline, in the Graduate Catalog: <http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/programs/infs.htm>.

Each application must include the following items:

- The Graduate School application form including a non-refundable application processing fee
- One official copy of each transcript from each academic institution attended sent directly from the institution
- Maryland in-state tuition form, if applicable
- Three recommendations sent directly by the student's references (It is preferable to request at least one letter from a former professor who is able to give an in-depth evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the applicant's academic work.)
- Current résumé
- Personal statement of no more than 1,500 words in response to the following questions:
 - What is the specific area of your research interest? How have you developed your interest in this area?
 - What skills and/or prior experience that you have can help you pursue your research interest?
 - Which faculty members at Maryland's iSchool would you be interested in working closely with, and why?
 - What are the goals you would like to achieve in your doctoral study at Maryland's iSchool? What is your plan to achieve your goals?
 - What kind of career would you like to develop after earning your Ph.D.?
- Official scores of the General Test of the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), sent directly to the College of Information Studies - UMCP from the Educational Testing Service. Our institution code is 5814 and our "department and major field" code for all programs at iSchool is 4701 (Library and Information Science). The GRE test score is required, and the test must have been taken within the five years preceding the application deadline. The doctoral committee may consider waivers of the GRE requirement on a case-by-case basis.

Admitted students must also submit the required immunization records in accordance with university policy prior to enrollment. Inquiries concerning admission should be directed to the Student Services Office at 301-405-2038 or ischooladmission@umd.edu.

Review of Applications

Applications for the doctoral program are reviewed by the Student Services Office, the Doctoral Program Director, the Doctoral Committee, and members of the faculty whose expertise is most relevant to each candidate. Final admission decisions based on these reviews are made by the Doctoral Committee.

For international students, applications can only be reviewed after being cleared by the university's International Student & Scholar Services (ISSS). After all application materials have been received,

international applications are sent to the ISSS for evaluation. The ISSS reviews international academic credentials, financial certification, and English proficiency certification. The College of Information Studies cannot make an admission decision on an international application unless it has been first evaluated by the ISSS. Thus, it is important for international applicants to complete their applications before the published application deadline.

Financial Support

The college provides the most promising applicants with financial support, either in the form of assistantships or fellowships. While both types of awards include a stipend, benefits, and tuition remission, an assistantship includes work responsibilities for the student, while a fellowship does not. All awards are made on an annual basis, and consideration for future awards will be based on evaluations of the student's work in the program. Students should indicate on their applications the desire to be considered for these awards. More information about financial support is in Section XII: "Financial Assistance" and at <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/policies-graduate-assistantships/> and <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/student-fellowships/>.

Admission Decisions

Once admission decisions have been made, applicants will be promptly notified of the admissions and any decisions regarding financial support. Formal admission to the University of Maryland is offered only by the Graduate School. Applicants admitted to the Graduate School will receive a written offer of admission from the Dean of the Graduate School. To accept or decline the offer, applicants must notify the Graduate School by the first day of classes of the semester for which the applicant was accepted or the offer becomes void. Immediately following written acceptance, applicants should contact the Student Services Office for registration information. Applicants who are unsuccessful in gaining admission are also notified in writing by the Graduate School. Letters of funding offers specify the deadline for acceptance, and notifications of acceptance must be received by the specified deadline.

The offer of admission is extended to the applicant only for a specified semester. If an admitted student wishes to change the semester of entry, he/she must petition the Graduate School in writing. The Graduate School allows one (1) semester change requested by the program, and one (1) requested by the admitted student, contingent upon the approval of the Doctoral Program Director. Any further changes will require a new application.

IV Academic Integrity

The university is an intellectual community. Its fundamental purpose is the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Like all other communities, the university can function properly only if its members adhere to clearly established goals and values. Essential to the fundamental purpose of the university is the commitment to the principles of truth and academic honesty. The Code of Academic Integrity is designed to ensure that the principle of academic honesty is upheld. While all members of the university community share this responsibility, the Code of Academic Integrity (www.president.umd.edu/policies/iii100a.html) is designed so that special responsibility for upholding the principle of academic honesty lies with students. The Graduate School's academic integrity policies are available at <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/academic-record/#text>.

The college takes issues of academic integrity extremely seriously and has a *zero tolerance* policy for academic dishonesty. As part of their preparation to be scholars and educators, doctoral students must be extremely conscious about adhering to principles of academic integrity, as they will need to follow these principles throughout their entire careers and model the principles to their own students and colleagues.

Code of Academic Integrity

The university's Code of Academic Integrity states that any of the following acts, when committed by a student, shall constitute academic dishonesty:

- CHEATING: intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.
- FABRICATION: intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.
- FACILITATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY: intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this Code.
- PLAGIARISM: intentionally or knowingly representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise.

The college encourages the faculty and students to explore useful strategies and resources about academic integrity. For example, some advice on how to avoid plagiarism is available here: <https://lib.guides.umd.edu/c.php?g=848037&p=6064494>.

Honor Pledge

On each examination, paper, or other academic exercise not specifically exempted by the instructor, a student may be requested to write by hand and sign the following pledge:

I pledge on my honor that I have not given or received any unauthorized assistance on this examination.

Failure to sign the pledge is not an honors offense, but neither is it a defense in case of violation of this Code. Refusal to sign must be explained to the instructor. Signing or non-signing of the pledge will not be considered in grading or judicial procedures. Material submitted electronically should contain the pledge – submission implies signing the pledge.

On exams, no assistance is authorized unless given by or expressly allowed by the instructor. On other assignments, the pledge means that the assignment has been completed without academic dishonesty,

as defined in the Code of Academic Integrity.

The pledge is a reminder that at the University of Maryland students carry primary responsibility for academic integrity because the meaningfulness of their degrees depends on it. Faculty members are urged to emphasize the importance of academic honesty and of the pledge as its symbol.

Penalties for Violations of Academic Integrity

Engaging in any academic dishonesty will result in consequences in line with university policies. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, cheating, buying work, multiple submissions of the same paper, forging signatures, submitting fraudulent documents, and facilitating the academic dishonesty of others.

Students who are found to have falsified, fabricated, or plagiarized in any context, such as course work, laboratory research, archival research, or thesis/dissertation writing, are referred to the Office of Student Conduct (<https://www.studentconduct.umd.edu/>). The Office of Student Conduct determines the penalties for violations of the university's standards of academic integrity, but the normal sanction for a graduate student found responsible for a violation of academic integrity is dismissal (suspension or expulsion) from the university. The college pursues the maximum penalties applicable in cases where a doctoral student engages in academic dishonesty.

V Advising

Throughout the duration of study at the iSchool, students receive advising and guidance from the faculty.

Advisor

Upon admission to the program, each student is assigned a provisional advisor based on his/her interests. All efforts are made to assign the student the advisor who is best equipped to provide guidance in the planned area of study as indicated on the application materials.

The advisor works with the student to develop his/her plan of study from the beginning of the doctoral study. The advisor plays a key role in helping the student select classes, plan research and teaching activities, refine areas of interest, and prepare for the Integrative Paper and candidacy. In many cases, the advisor involves the student directly in his/her research projects or helps the student to find ways to become engaged with the research life of the College.

Should a student's advisor take a sabbatical or leave of absence, the student and the advisor must establish in advance the ways in which the student will receive continued guidance. They may identify another faculty member who will serve as a primary source of guidance on campus while the advisor is away.

Plan of Study

At the beginning of the first semester in the program, each doctoral student works with his/her advisor to draft a Plan of Study. The plan should be reassessed and revised if necessary at the beginning of each academic year. The plan is also revisited and examined during the First Year Review.

Advising after Candidacy

Once a student has advanced to candidacy, the student must identify the chair of his/her dissertation committee. This chair advises the student through the process of researching, writing, and defending the dissertation proposal and the dissertation. Typically, the chair is the student's pre-candidacy advisor. However, a new faculty member may be designated. The chair must be a tenured or tenure-track member of the iSchool faculty, unless special permission is granted by the Dean and approved by the Graduate School.

The student and the chair work together to identify the members of the dissertation examining committee (see the requirements for committee membership in Section X: "Dissertation Proposal"). Working with other faculty members on collaborative research projects and taking a range of courses from different faculty members are good ways to identify potential committee members. Once the committee is established, members of the committee will also serve in a mentoring role to the student, particularly regarding issues within their areas of expertise related to the dissertation.

The chair and the committee members may mentor the student in preparation for seeking employment in academia or industry.

Resolving Tensions in Advising

In cases where tensions are present between advisors/committee chairs and students; committee members and students; or advisors/committee chairs and committee members, the first step should

typically be to try to resolve the tension between the concerned parties directly. Advisors should have an open door policy of willingly and professionally listening to student concerns, ensuring that students understand that it is safe and most appropriate to approach them directly with any concerns that they might have.

In the unusual circumstance where there is compelling evidence that it is not feasible to fully achieve the resolution of tensions internally, any concerned party may contact the Doctoral Program Director or any member of the Doctoral Committee with its concerns. The Doctoral Program Director and the Doctoral Committee should have an open door policy of willingly and professionally listening to any concerns, and where necessary and when approved by the concerned party, they may take the concern to the Doctoral Committee as a whole. Finally, the ultimate authority within the college on such matters is the Dean or the Dean's designee. All members of the college ensure that all individuals are treated fairly and justly. Finally, on the rare occasion that such tensions might have legal implications, concerned parties should bring their concerns to the relevant campus or other authorities.

Changing Advisors and Feedback on Advising

Over the course of a student's studies, circumstances of many types might warrant a change in advisor. There are some natural times to consider changing advisors, such as after the first year review and the Integrative Paper. Advisor changes can be made at any time, and there is no limit on the number of times a student might change advisors (although some continuity should be sought). Before changing advisors, the student should receive confirmation that the new advisor is willing to enter this relationship, and the previous advisor should be notified of the change. The student is also responsible for notifying the PhD Program Director in writing of any advisor change.

Peer Mentoring

Peer mentoring may be another effective way to gain useful advice when used as a supplement to and in consultation with a student's faculty advisor/committee chair. Peer mentoring may be organized (e.g., through the iSchool doctoral student organization) or informal, and may be provided on an ongoing or as-needed basis. Peer mentoring is a useful source of advice, but it is important to understand that each student's situation is different and the most important advising is expected to be the advising provided by a student's faculty advisor/committee chair. While often useful, peer mentoring should not serve as a substitute for advising from a faculty advisor/chair. The college ensures that all students have access to advising and other resources necessary to be successful within the doctoral program.

VI Course Work

The courses in the doctoral program are designed to both introduce students to the research and scholarship in Information Studies and prepare students to pursue their own research.

Basic Statistics Requirement

The doctoral program requires students to take a basic statistics course as a part of the foundation for doctoral study. If a student has already taken a basic statistics course during his/her undergraduate or graduate work, this requirement can be waived. It should be noted that most of the graduate level research methods courses offered on campus have explicit prerequisites in the form of prior course work and/or have an expectation of some level of math achievement based on the discipline. Therefore, all such prerequisites must be met or waived. In addition, a student may find the need to take more advanced statistical course work if it is a core part of his/her research focus in the doctoral program.

If a student matriculating in the program has not yet taken a basic statistics course, he/she must complete one early in the doctoral study. Recommended statistics courses include:

- EDMS 451 Introduction to Educational Statistics
- EDMS 645 Quantitative Research Methods I
- GVPT 622 Quantitative Methods For Political Science
- PSYC 601 Quantitative Methods I
- PLCY 610 Quantitative Aspects of Public Policy
- PLCY 611 Quantitative Analysis of Policy Issues
- SOCY 601 Statistics For Sociological Research I
- SURV 615 Statistical Modeling I

Students should work with their advisors to determine which statistics course is most appropriate to their research interests. Students also need to contact the specific programs that offer the statistics courses in order to enroll in the courses.

Required Doctoral Courses

Students must complete a minimum of 27 graduate credit hours while matriculated at the University of Maryland (or 30 hours if a basic statistics course has not been taken before matriculation). Course work is taken in three areas: Information Studies (9 credit hours); Research Methods and Design (9 credit hours); and specialized area(s) (9 credit hours).

Students should work with their advisors to select a specific basic statistics course (if needed), quantitative, qualitative, and/or mixed research methods courses, and specialized area(s) courses. Several doctoral courses are required and should be completed in the early phase of a student's doctoral study. These courses include:

- **INST 800: The Engaged Intellectual: An Introduction to Research and Academic Work (3 credit hours) Counts toward the Information Studies requirement**
This course explores a series of issues that confront academics who work in research universities. The course is an "Introduction to Research," but the process of research is more than a recipe of rote analytical procedures. The course examines academic life with a particular focus on what it means to undertake research, teaching, and service. By the conclusion of the course, students will have a better understanding of what tenure-track faculty do and how they

work in academia and of how they intend to structure their own professional careers.

- INST 810: Individual Research Experience (3 credit hours)
Counts toward the Research Methods & Design requirement
This is an independent study course in which a student develops and implements a research project with an iSchool faculty mentor. A student reports research results in a paper and an oral presentation at the end of the semester.
- INST 888: Doctoral Seminar (6 credit hours)
Counts towards the Information Studies requirement
This course is offered in two semesters, covering the main areas of the Information Studies field: information, people, environments, and systems. These doctoral gateway seminars provide an integrative exploration of the field, emphasizing connections among ideas and research across elements of the field. Specific topics and readings to be covered will be determined by individual instructors.

In addition, students must take at least two quantitative, qualitative, and/or mixed research method courses, beyond the basic statistics requirement. Typically, students take one quantitative methods course and one qualitative methods course, but students may also substitute a mixed-methods course for either or both of these requirements.

Acceptable quantitative methods courses include, but are not limited to, the following:

- COMM 600 Empirical Research in Communication
- INST 627 Data Analytics for Information Professionals
- INST 735 Computational Linguistics I
- INST 736 Computational Linguistics II
- INST 808 Seminar in Research Methods and Data Analysis
- EDMS 626 Instrumentation
- EDMS 645 Quantitative Research Methods I
- EDMS 646 General Linear Models I
- EDMS 651 General Linear Models II
- GVPT 622 Quantitative Methods For Political Science
- HLTH652 Quantitative Research Methods I in Public health
- PSYC 601 Quantitative Methods I
- PSYC 602 Quantitative Methods II
- PLCY 610 Quantitative Aspects of Public Policy
- PLCY 611 Quantitative Analysis of Policy Issues
- SOCY 601 Statistics For Sociological Research I
- SOCY 602 Statistics For Sociological Research II
- SURV 615 Statistical Modeling I
- SURV 616 Statistical Modeling II

For students who are required to take a graduate statistics course, different courses are required to fulfill the graduate statistics and quantitative research methods requirements; that is, the same course cannot be used to fulfill both requirements. However, students may elect to take a two-course sequence offered in many programs (e.g., EDMS 645/646, PSYC 601/602, SOCY 601/602, or SURV 615/616) or may take any two different courses from the respective lists.

Acceptable qualitative methods courses include, but are not limited to, the following:

- ANTH 606 Qualitative Methods in Applied Anthropology
- ENGL 601 Literary Research and Critical Contexts
- HLTH625 Community Assessment through Qualitative Methods
- INST 808 Seminar in Research Methods and Data Analysis
- TLPL762 Phenomenological Inquiry I
- TLPL788B Special Topics in Education; Critical Perspectives in Ethnographic Research Methods
- TLPL791 Qualitative Research I: Design and Fieldwork

Specialized area(s) courses serve several important functions, including exposing students to new perspectives, introducing students to faculty with whom they may later conduct research, and enabling acquisition of foundational knowledge. To support these goals, students are required to take electives that support them in their area(s) of research specialization. These credit hours can be in the form of courses and/or independent study hours. Depending on the area of specialization, the specialized courses can be in the iSchool or in other units on campus.

In summary, INST 888 taken in two semesters will satisfy the requirement of 6 credit hours in Information Studies; INST 800, INST 810, and the two additional research methods courses will satisfy the requirement of 12 credit hours in Research Methods and Design; and the three additional courses will satisfy the requirement of 9 credit hours in specialized areas.

Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area

The University of Maryland is a member of the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area (www.consortium.org). Other institutions currently associated with the consortium include American University, The Catholic University of America, the University of the District of Columbia, Gallaudet University, George Mason University, Georgetown University, George Washington University, Howard University, Marymount University, Trinity University, the National Defense University, The Joint Military Intelligence College, and Southeastern University. Students enrolled in any one of these institutions are able to attend certain classes at the other institutions and have the credit considered "residence" credits at their own institutions. Grades in these courses are included in the calculation of the student's GPA. Tuition remission awarded to graduate assistants and fellows may not be used to pay for courses at other consortium universities. Graduate assistants and fellows must pay for any courses that they take under the consortium arrangement. Students from schools in the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area may register for University of Maryland courses on a space-available basis beginning with the first day of classes.

Grades

The grade of A+ or A is calculated at 4 quality points, A- at 3.7 quality points, B+ at 3.3 quality points, B at 3.0 quality points, B- at 2.7 quality points, C+ at 2.3 quality points, and C at 2.0 quality points, and C- at 1.7 quality points. Students do not earn credit toward the degree for courses in which they receive a grade of D or F. For graduate students, all courses taken that are numbered 400 and above (except 500-level courses, those numbered 799, 898, or 899, and those graded with an S) are used in the calculation of the grade point average.

In order to maintain good academic standing, every graduate student must maintain a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 for all courses taken at the university. A student may repeat a course in an

effort to earn a better grade. Whether higher or lower, the most recent grade is used in computing the grade point average. Grades for graduate students remain a part of the student's permanent record. Changes in previously recorded grades may be made if timely (within one semester) and if the original instructor certifies that an actual mistake was made in determining or recording the grade. The change must be approved by the Dean of iSchool and the Dean of the Graduate School. Graduate credit transferred from another institution is not included in the calculation of the grade point average.

An incomplete grade is an unusual mark that an instructor may give to a student whose work in a course has been qualitatively satisfactory, but who is unable to complete some portion of the work required because of illness or other circumstance beyond the student's control. In awarding the mark of "I" for graduate courses other than 899, instructors must fill out a "Graduate School Incomplete Contract" <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/academic-record/#text>. The contract specifies the work remaining to be completed. It must be signed by the instructor and the student and then maintained by the program offering the course. The student is responsible for providing a copy of the contract to the Doctoral Program Director.

The mark of incomplete in 500-, 600-, 700-, and 800-level courses does not automatically roll-over to letter grades. Normally, students are expected to complete courses in which they have received an "I" by a date no more than twelve months from the beginning of the semester in which the course was taken. The mark of incomplete in 400-level courses is governed by the rules for awarding incompletes to undergraduate students, including the provision of automatically converting an "I" to a letter grade.

Advisors should stay current with their students in urging completion of incomplete grades, and programs should review the status of incompletes in their reviews of students' progress toward their degrees. Students remain in good standing despite marks of incomplete if the courses are not required for their degrees. For courses required for graduation, students are considered to be making satisfactory progress only if they fulfill the conditions of any outstanding incomplete contracts in a timely manner.

A student whose cumulative grade point average falls below 3.0 will be placed on academic probation by the Graduate School. Permission of the academic advisor and the Director of Student Services are required for a student on probation to register for courses. Probation will be lifted when the student achieves a cumulative GPA of 3.0. A student on probation who has completed fewer than 15 credits must raise their GPA to 3.0 or above by the end of the semester in which the student completes 15 credit hours or he/she will be dismissed from the Graduate School. A student who has completed 16 or more hours of course work and whose cumulative GPA falls below 3.0 will be placed on probation and will have one semester in which to raise his or her cumulative GPA to a 3.0 or he/she will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

A graduate student's academic record (transcript) is intended to serve as a complete history of the student's academic progress at the University of Maryland. Under no circumstances will academic records be altered because of student dissatisfaction with a grade or other academic accomplishment.

Designation of Full-Time and Part-Time Status

The Graduate School uses a unit system in making calculations to determine full-time or part-time student status. Please note that graduate units are different from credit hours. The number of graduate units per credit hour is calculated in the following manner:

Courses in the series: 400-499 carry 4 units per credit hour.

Courses in the series: 500-599 carry 5 units per credit hour.

Courses in the series: 600-897 carry 6 units per credit hour.

Pre-candidacy Doctoral Research courses: INST 898 carries 18 units per credit hour.

Doctoral Dissertation Research: INST 899 carries 18 units per credit hour.

To be certified as full-time, a graduate student must be registered for a combination of courses equivalent to 48 units per semester. Graduate assistants holding regular appointments have full-time status if they are registered for at least 24 units in addition to the assistantship. Holders of half-time assistantships are considered full-time if registered for 36 units. Audited courses do not generate graduate units and cannot be used in calculating full-time or part-time status. All doctoral candidates must pay the flat candidacy tuition for semesters during which they are registered for six credit hours of INST 899. This registration defines all currently registered doctoral candidates as full-time.

VII First Year Review and Annual Review

Each student (full-time or part-time) undergoes a First Year Review at the end of his/her first year. For most students, this means that their First Year Review occurs at the end of their first spring semester in the program. After the first year, each student needs to complete an Annual Review if he/she does not reach any new milestone of the program (Integrative Paper, dissertation proposal, and dissertation) during each academic year.

Timing of First Year Review

The review must occur **no later than the last day of the semester** (last day of final exams), while the materials must be available for faculty viewing no later than **two weeks before the review**. However, a review cannot be conducted before the mid-point of the semester to ensure that sufficient work has been completed during the second semester.

The First Year Review should occur with all members of the committee and the student present. Under extraordinary circumstances (i.e., faculty sabbatical, extreme illness, family emergency, and other circumstances detailed in the Leave of Absence section of the Graduate School Registration Policies (<https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/registration-policies/#text>), the timing of the First Year Review can be altered. Otherwise, the First Year Review must be completed on time for the student to remain in the doctoral program. The advisor and the student will coordinate the time and location of the review, as well as identify the appropriate other faculty members to participate in the review.

First Year Review Committee

A committee comprised of at least three and no more than five full-time faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the College faculty, conduct the review. The student's advisor and the other faculty members on the student's committee review the student's work, meet with the student to discuss his/her portfolio, and write a report of the discussion and any recommendations made. In certain circumstances, a faculty member from another unit at the university may be included in the review. The reviewers may also solicit input from other faculty members who have taught or worked with the student.

In addition, each First Year Review Committee must ensure that the student is meeting all university requirements in terms of academic performance (e.g., sufficient GPA), course selection for completion of program requirements, and any other issues of administrative or academic standing.

Portfolio for the Review

During the Spring semester, the student prepares a portfolio for the review. The materials assembled for the review are meant to represent a self-evaluation of the student's progress made during the first year. The portfolio materials must be made available to the advisor and other committee members either through email, a website created by the student, or other means agreed upon by the advisor and the student.

The review materials may include papers written for course work or research, other course materials, a PowerPoint presentation on a research topic, reviews by previous course instructors, and/or any publications from the first year in the doctoral program. The student and the committee determine which materials are most appropriate to include.

The materials in the review are not intended to include everything a student has done during the year. The materials in the portfolio should represent what the student believes to be their best work in the program. The student should also include a list of courses taken in the doctoral program and the grades received in each course.

In order to ensure sufficient meaningful work for the committee to consider, students in their first year should work with their advisors to select a number of courses with requirements that include writing substantive papers. As the goal of this review is to ascertain the abilities of the student to successfully complete the doctoral program, work demonstrating potential as a scholar is essential to the review.

Process and Outcome of the Review

The first part of the review involves a discussion of the student's progress to date, including the student and all members of the First Year Review Committee. The goal of this portion is to ask questions that help the committee to evaluate the student's progress in the program, including the student's course work, research direction, and ability to successfully complete the doctoral program, including the Integrative Paper and dissertation requirements. Once the Committee feels that it has enough information to deliberate, the student is excused from the room and the Committee then discusses the student's progress in the program. Following this discussion, the committee votes. While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee votes to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student. The student is then invited back into the room and informed of the outcome of the review. In cases where the student passes the review, the review committee should also discuss the student's advising and committee membership. This discussion should include both a retrospective analysis of the past year and possible next steps for future advising and committee membership. This discussion should be constructive and professional. The goal of this discussion should be to ensure that the student has access to advising from an advisor and committee members who can effectively advise the student. After the review meeting, the committee produces a report based on the review and sends it to the PhD program coordinator for placement in the student's file. In addition, the First-Year Review assessment form for Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments (see Appendix A) needs to be completed and submitted to the PhD program coordinator.

If two or more members of the review committee vote to fail the student, the review committee will choose one of the following two outcomes:

1. (default) The review committee can schedule a second meeting to occur no later than the end of the next semester (not including Summer). Two weeks before the second meeting, the student will submit a revised portfolio to all review committee members. As part of the review committee's report of the original FYR meeting, it should specify its expectations for the revised portfolio (e.g., revising specific pieces in the original portfolio, adding new content for the portfolio, expectations for quality level of new material, etc.). If two or more members of the review committee vote to fail the student at the second meeting, the Doctoral Committee will discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program.
2. If the review committee feels that the student should not continue in the program, they can ask the Doctoral Committee to discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program.

At the end of the semester in which the review occurs, the Student Services Office reviews the student's grades (including the grades for that semester) and other materials to ensure that the student is meeting all university requirements in terms of academic performance (e.g., sufficient GPA), course

selection for completion of program requirements, and any other issues of administrative or academic standing. Upon completion of this administrative review, the student and the committee members will receive a letter summarizing the results of the First Year Review and the subsequent administrative review.

Annual Review

After the first year, if a student does not reach any new milestone of the program during an academic year, he/she must complete an annual review. The timing, committee, and format of the annual review should be decided by the student and his/her advisor, but the portfolio for review needs to reflect the student's most current work and accomplishments. If the student's advisor believes that the student is making good progress, the advisor may meet with the student without other committee members to do the annual review. After each review, the Annual Review assessment form for Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments (see Appendix A) needs to be completed and submitted to the PhD program coordinator.

If the review committee determines that the student has not made satisfactory progress since the last milestone, the review committee will choose one of the following two outcomes:

1. (default) The review committee will provide a report to the student detailing its expectations for the student's progress in the near future. The review committee and the student will schedule a follow-up meeting to occur no later than the end of the next semester (not including Summer). At least two weeks before the second meeting, the student will submit work to the review committee that accomplishes the expectations that were provided at the prior Annual Review. If two or more members of the review committee vote to fail the student at the follow-up meeting, at its next meeting, the Doctoral Committee will discuss whether the student should be dismissed from the program.
2. If the review committee feels that the student should not continue in the program, they can ask the Doctoral Committee to discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program.

VIII Integrative Paper

Upon completion of their course work, students will complete an Integrative Paper before advancing to candidacy. The Integrative Paper requirement of the doctoral program has two objectives: (1) to provide an early assessment of the potential ability of a doctoral student to successfully complete a doctoral dissertation, and (2) to improve the research capabilities that the doctoral student brings to his/her dissertation.

In an Integrative Paper, a student synthesizes and applies knowledge from three broad areas within the information field: (1) a “core” area, with focal topics chosen from the gateway doctoral seminars; (2) a “research methods” area, with focal topics chosen from quantitative and/or qualitative research methods; and (3) a “specialization” area, with focal topics chosen from the courses taken and the topics researched through the projects in which the student has been engaged. The Integrative Paper is written after completion of course work.

Academic Standing before Beginning the Integrative Paper

Prior to the first day of the semester in which the student intends to complete the Integrative Paper requirement, the Student Services Office will verify student completion of all course work requirements and confirm whether the student is in good academic standing based on the grade requirements detailed in the university’s Graduate Catalog (http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/academic_policies.htm). The Student Services Office will convey the results of this review to the Doctoral Committee.

Timeline for Completion of the Integrative Paper

The Integrative Paper should be completed in one or two semesters after the student has completed the required course work (for full-time and part-time students, respectively), and the semester preceding the Integrative Paper must not be comprised entirely of independent study hours.

Under extraordinary circumstances (i.e., extreme illness, family emergency), the timing of the Integrative Paper can be altered. Otherwise, the Integrative Paper must be accepted: 1) during the semester in which the student registers for INST898 to do the Integrative Paper; and 2) within the timeframe in the program as noted above for the student to remain in the doctoral program. The advisor and the student coordinate the timing of the review and the availability of the materials.

Full-Time Students

Full-time students should have the Integrative Paper accepted by **no later than the end of the fall semester of their third year**. Full-time students should plan to complete the Integrative Paper in one semester.

The student must register for **six credit hours** of INST 898: Pre-Candidacy Research and should not enroll in any other courses during the same semester. The Integrative Paper must be accepted, including any revisions requested by the committee, during the semester in which the student signs up for the Integrative Paper. Extensions may be available in line with the extenuating circumstances detailed in the Leave of Absence section of the Graduate School Registration Policies (<https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/registration-policies/>).

Part-Time Students

Part-time students should have the Integrative Paper accepted by **no later than the end of the fall semester of their fourth year**. Part-time students should plan to complete the Integrative Paper in two semesters.

For each of the semesters spent on the Integrative Paper, the student must register for **three credit hours** of INST 898: Pre-Candidacy Research and should not enroll in any other courses during the same semester. The Integrative Paper must be accepted, including any revisions requested by the committee, during the second semester in which the student signs up for the Integrative Paper. Extensions may be available in line with the extenuating circumstances detailed in the Leave of Absence section of the Graduate School Registration Policies (<https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/registration-policies/>).

Submission Guidelines

In preparing the Integrative Paper, the student is encouraged to work closely with a faculty member throughout the Integrative Paper project. Interaction with his/her advisor and other faculty on the paper (e.g., discussing preliminary ideas, critiquing drafts, etc.) is highly desirable, both for increasing the quality of the research and for building student-faculty ties. As explained below, however, there are only specific ways in which faculty can provide feedback on Integrative Papers.

The Integrative Paper is to be submitted to the committee members in a format (paper or electronic) as agreed upon by the student and the committee members. The paper must be double-spaced. The maximum length, including abstract, tables, figures, and appendices, but not references, is 7,500 words. Thus, the paper should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages or, equivalently, 600 lines of 12 point type with 1" margins.

Excessive length is often an indication that the student has not been able to integrate and refine his/her findings and knowledge. In other matters of style and format, the paper, including its footnotes and bibliography, should be of a quality consistent with that of an article about to be submitted to a professional journal or conference. The cover page should include the paper's title, author's name, and an abstract of no more than 150 words. Papers that exceed 7,500 words or fail to comply with formatting guidelines may be returned to the student without review.

Each paper is read and evaluated by a committee who will provide feedback to the student. This committee is comprised of at least three, and no more than five, faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the iSchool faculty, and must include the student's advisor. Experts from other units on campus or outside the university may be invited to serve on the committee.

Before the student submits the paper, his/her Integrative Paper committee must be approved by the Doctoral Committee. The student should email the membership of their committee to the Doctoral Program Director, who will seek the approval of the Committee. Unlike the dissertation examining committee, which must be approved by both the Doctoral Committee and the Graduate School, the Integrative Paper committee does not need to be approved by the Graduate School.

The committee must have at least two weeks to review the paper, as well as an additional two weeks to review any revised versions. Students should allot time accordingly while writing the paper.

Co-authored papers of any sort may not be submitted as Integrative Papers. The submitted work must be entirely the work of the individual student. After the paper is accepted, however, the student may collaborate with others to develop the paper further.

International students may seek editing and grammatical assistance from campus organizations that provide such help. The Graduate School offers an English Editing for International Graduate Students (EEIGS, <http://www.english.umd.edu/academics/writingcenter/graduate/international>) program for whom English is not their first language, yet who must present their works in English. The EEIGS program is free, and is staffed by volunteer editors from the Volunteer Service Corps, the Golden ID program, and the community. Students may also contact the Office for Diversity Initiatives (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/admissions/choose-maryland/diverse-campus-community>) for information on this program. Further, the Maryland English Institute (MEI, <http://mei.umd.edu/>) also offers assistance through the MEI Writing Center for International Graduate Students.

If a student seeks assistance from any of these programs on his/her Integrative Paper, the program must provide the student with a letter detailing the grammatical and editing assistance provided, and this letter must be submitted with the Integrative Paper.

Research Involving Human Subjects

If a research project in which a doctoral student participates involves social-behavioral human research (including surveying, interviewing, audio or video taping human subjects or doing experiments on human subjects), then compliance with the University of Maryland policy for human subjects research is necessary. The student needs to apply and obtain an approval or an exemption for the research from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB). More information is available at www.umresearch.umd.edu/IRB.

Students planning to conduct human subject research should consult with their faculty advisors before applying to IRB for approval or exemption. They need to complete the required IRB electronic training program available through the university IRB website. The college has an IRB liaison responsible for advising on IRB preparation and submission. The IRB liaison needs to review and sign an IRB application before it is submitted to the university's IRB.

Evaluation Criteria

A paper is judged to satisfy the Integrative Paper requirement if it provides strong evidence that the doctoral student is capable of completing a satisfactory dissertation. The review of the Integrative Paper is very much like the editorial process at a leading professional journal or conference. There are at least three independent readings of the paper, followed by an overall recommendation. The requirements for clarity of expression, quality of work and methodology, and originality are at the level of a research journal. The standard for acceptance on initial submission is that the paper be comparable to articles published in respectable academic journals or conferences. However, in evaluating empirical papers which involve primary data collection, allowance will be made for smaller sample sizes. Papers that do not meet this standard will be returned for revision.

With respect to specific criteria, the Integrative Paper reviewers consider three distinct questions:

- *Has the student developed and clearly stated the research question?* Satisfying this criterion can take many forms; the essential requirement is that the student generates findings and ideas that represent a new contribution to the literature.

- *Has the student developed and defended a reasonable and appropriate method of inquiry for resolving the research question?* This criterion depends quite heavily on the doctoral student's field of specialization, the particular research question, and the particular expertise which he or she brings to the subject. However, it should include the selection of data sources, research samples, models and their underlying assumptions, and the appropriate use of inference-drawing procedures.
- *Was the student able to use appropriate research methodology and bring the research project to a logical conclusion?* This criterion includes a clear description of the methods used and their application, an exploration of both the limitations and implications of the study, a summary of the contributions of the study, and an ability to analyze and report the research findings in a readable, clear, and concise manner.

Suggestions on Successfully Completing the Integrative Paper

Many doctoral students want to submit empirical papers to meet the Integrative Paper requirement. Such research may utilize either secondary or primary sources of information. Equally acceptable is a paper which provides a new perspective for viewing the literature and/or developments in a field. Such a paper, however, must provide new insights in its synthesis of the field. A survey of the scholarly literature by itself is not appropriate. Theoretical papers are also acceptable, as long as they break new ground or significantly amplify existing theory. Regardless of the method employed, the paper must represent a contribution of new ideas and findings to the literature.

Dissertation proposals are not appropriate to submit as Integrative Papers no matter how competently they are written, since evidence of research capability must be demonstrated by completing a research project as well as designing one properly. Such proposals can usually be developed into pilot studies, a write-up of which could readily become an Integrative Paper.

The most frequent and severe shortcomings in Integrative Papers often concern their beginnings and endings. All too often students feel the paper should principally demonstrate their knowledge of methodology. While occasional instances of misused statistics, conceptual inconsistencies, and inappropriate research tools have been discovered, a more general problem appears to exist, namely the failure of doctoral students to clearly state what the paper is to accomplish or what was learned and substantiated when the research was completed. Furthermore, organization, reporting style, and clarity of expression are often in need of improvement.

In addition, students should not consider the Integrative Paper as a second dissertation. Therefore, it is equally important not to fall into the trap of doing “too much” for this paper. The goal of an Integrative Paper is to prepare students for the dissertation experience in a manner that shortens the time to graduation, not lengthens it.

The evaluation process is like the refereeing process employed by leading scholarly conferences or journals. The critiques rendered by the Integrative Paper reviewers provide critical and questioning evaluation as part of the learning process. Frequently, written response by the student—potentially including additional writing, some form of revision, or rewriting the entire paper—is necessary.

An Integrative Paper submitted to the committee is presumed to offer clear evidence of the doctoral student's ability to complete work toward his/her Ph.D. degree. The paper must be entirely original work by the student. The student signs a statement asserting that he/she has sole authorship of the paper.

Students are strongly encouraged to seek feedback from their advisors before submitting the paper. However, the advisor's comments cannot constitute anything beyond suggestions. Further, such feedback is purely advisory and represents no guarantee that the student will pass the requirement when the paper is formally submitted. Faculty can provide general guidance but are not required or expected to provide feedback about the potential outcome of the review process.

Review Outcome

The range of evaluations of the Integrative Paper follows standard reviewing practices. The potential designations a faculty member may give to a paper are:

- **Accept as is.** This indicates passage of the requirement with no further work on the part of the student. Such a designation is assigned if the paper is on a level with those that might be accepted in a refereed journal or conference.
- **Accept with minor revisions.** This indicates that a few small changes are required on the part of the student. Upon completion of these small changes, which should be enumerated by the faculty reviewer, the paper will be on a level with those that might be accepted in a refereed journal or conference.
- **Revise and resubmit.** This indicates that major work is still needed from the student, but the paper has potential to be acceptable. Upon completion of major revisions, which should be enumerated by the faculty reviewer, the paper may reach the level of acceptability.
- **Reject.** This indicates a major failing to meet the requirements of the paper.

The student's advisor and other members of the committee review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then meet to discuss the evaluations. A defense-like presentation of the Integrative Paper is *optional*, depending on the student's and/or committee's preference. When the committee reaches a decision regarding the grade assigned to the paper. Each faculty reviewer assigns one of the above grades to the Integrative Paper under review. The advisor writes a report of the discussion and the recommendations made, which includes all of the comments from the committee and the grade assigned by the committee.

To meet the Integrative Paper requirement, a student must receive a passing grade from every reviewer of the paper. If the student receives a report of "accept with minor revisions" or "revise and resubmit," the student has a chance to meet the concerns of the reviewers. The revised paper is then reviewed by the same faculty committee to determine if the necessary changes have been made. If so, the student passes the requirement.

If the outcome of an Integrative Paper is "Revise and Resubmit," and the review committee deems the resubmission unacceptable, the review committee will choose one of the following two outcomes:

1. The student will be allowed to attempt a second round of revisions, with parameters and date specified in writing by the review committee. If the committee votes to reject the second round of revisions, the review committee will ask the Doctoral Committee to discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program due to lack of satisfactory progress.
2. The review committee can ask the Doctoral Committee to discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program due to lack of satisfactory progress.

If the outcome of the Integrative Paper is "Reject," the Doctoral Committee will discuss at its next meeting whether the student should be dismissed from the program due to lack of satisfactory progress.

IX Admission to Candidacy

After successful completion of course work and the Integrative Paper, all requirements for the degree other than the dissertation proposal and the dissertation will have been completed and the student will advance to the status of doctoral candidate. For information about Graduate School Academic Policies on Doctoral Degrees, please see: <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/doctoral-degrees-policies/>.

Candidacy

A student must be admitted to candidacy for the doctorate within five years after admission to the doctoral program and at least six months before the date on which the degree will be conferred. **It is the responsibility of the student to submit an application for admission to candidacy when all the requirements for candidacy have been fulfilled.** Applications for admission to candidacy are made by the student and submitted to the Student Services Office for further action and transmission to the Graduate School. Application forms may be obtained at the Graduate School, Room 2123, Lee Building, or http://gradschool.umd.edu/sites/gradschool.umd.edu/files/uploads/application_for_admission_to_candidacy.pdf. Paperwork must be received by the Graduate School **prior to the 25th of the month** in order for the advancement to become effective the first day of the following month.

Continuous Registration

A doctoral candidate must register between one and six credit hours for dissertation research every semester, excluding summer and winter sessions, until the degree is awarded. Full-time students should register for six credit hours each semester. Every student seeking the Ph.D. must satisfactorily complete a minimum of 12 dissertation credits hours (INST 899) prior to graduation. A student must be registered in INST 899 in the semester when defending his/her dissertation.

Doctoral candidates are not eligible for Waivers of Continuous Registration. Each doctoral candidate must maintain continuous registration in 899 (Doctoral Dissertation Research) until the degree is awarded. Waivers of Continuous Registration may be granted only under the university's policy for Leave of Absence for Graduate Students for Childbearing, Adoption, Illness, or Dependent Care (see <https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/graduate/policies/registration-policies/>).

All graduate students must register for courses and pay associated tuition and fees each semester, not including summer and winter sessions, until the degree is awarded. A student who fails to register and who has not requested and received a Waivers of Continuous Registration or leave of absence will be notified by the Graduate School after the first day of classes that the student must register for the current semester. The Graduate School also informs the director of the graduate program that the student is in jeopardy of termination. If the student does not register, he or she will be dismissed from the Graduate School at the end of the semester for failure to comply with the continuous registration requirement.

A student who is dismissed for non-registration may appeal dismissal during a 30-day period following the end of the semester of non-registration. If the student does not appeal, or if the appeal is denied, and the student wishes to continue in the Graduate School, the student must apply for readmission. In this case, readmission does not alter the initial requirements for time to complete the degree or advance to candidacy.

X Dissertation Proposal

Doctoral students must have their proposal accepted no more than 2 years after advancing to candidacy, and should have their dissertation accepted no more than 2 years after their proposal is accepted. The Doctoral Committee will consider extensions to these timelines for special research or personal circumstances. Students who do not comply with these timelines may be dismissed from the program.

Dissertation Examining Committee

Upon successful completion of the Integrative Paper, the student must identify who the chair of his/her dissertation committee will be. Typically, this person is the student's pre-candidacy advisor; however, a different faculty member may be designated. The student, in consultation with his/her committee chair, selects a dissertation committee, which must be approved by the Doctoral Committee before the proposal defense.

Because the dissertation examining committee is the same committee to evaluate the dissertation proposal and dissertation, the committee membership requirements for the dissertation proposal are the same as those for the dissertation. The university guidelines for selection of committee members are as follows:

- **Dissertation Examining Committee Membership.** The Committee must include a minimum of five members of the Graduate Faculty, at least three of whom must be Full Members. The Chair of the committee normally is the student's advisor, who should be a full member of the Graduate Faculty or have been granted an exception to the policy by the Dean of the Graduate School. Each Committee has a representative of the Dean of the Graduate School. Further, the dissertation committee composition should be submitted to the Doctoral Committee and approved early in the process of preparing the proposal.
- **Nomination of the Dissertation Examining Committee.** Membership on a Dissertation Examining Committee requires nomination by the student's advisor and approval by the doctoral committee. At the *proposal defense stage*, students should email the composition of their committee to the Director of the Doctoral Program for approval. At the *dissertation defense stage*, committee membership requires approval by the Dean of the Graduate School. The nomination of a Dissertation Examining Committee should be provided to the Graduate School at least six weeks before the date of the expected final dissertation defense. The dissertation examination cannot be held until the Graduate School approves the composition of the Dissertation Examining Committee. Furthermore, if the Graduate Faculty status of any member of an approved Dissertation Examining Committee changes, the approval of the Dissertation Examining Committee may be void, and a new Dissertation Examining Committee nomination form may be required to be approved by the Graduate School.
- **Chair.** Each Dissertation Examining Committee has a chair, who must be a Full Member of the Graduate Faculty or, by special permission, has been otherwise appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. Dissertation Examining Committees may be co-chaired upon written recommendation of the program's Graduate Director and with the approval of the Dean of the Graduate School; at least one of the co-chairs must be a Full Member of the University of Maryland Graduate Faculty.
- **Representative of the Dean of the Graduate School.** Each Dissertation Examining Committee will have appointed to it a representative of the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean's

Representative should have some background or interest related to the student's research. The Dean's Representative must be a tenured member of the Graduate Faculty at the University of Maryland and must be from a graduate program other than the home program of the chair and co-chair (as applicable) of the examination committee. In cases where a student is in an interdisciplinary graduate program, the Dean's Representative must be from a unit other than the home unit(s) of the chair of the committee and the student's advisor.

- **Special Members.** Individuals from outside the University of Maryland who have been approved for Special Membership in the Graduate Faculty may serve on Dissertation Examining Committees. These Special Members must be in addition to the required three Full Members of the University of Maryland Graduate Faculty. For procedures to nominate an individual for Special Membership, please contact the Graduate School.
- **Service of Former University of Maryland Faculty Members.** Graduate Faculty who terminate employment at the University of Maryland (and who do not have emeritus status) retain their status as members of the Graduate Faculty for a twelve-month period following their termination. Thus, they may serve as members and chairs (but not as Dean's Representatives) of Dissertation Examining Committees during this twelve-month period if they are otherwise eligible. After that time, they may no longer serve as chairs of Dissertation Examining Committees, although, if granted the status of Special Members of the Graduate Faculty, they may serve as co-chairs.
- Professors Emeriti and Associate Professors Emeriti may serve on Dissertation Examining Committees provided they are members of the Graduate Faculty.

In addition, the doctoral committee recommends that a majority of your committee be composed of faculty with appointments in the iSchool.

Doctoral Committee's Approval of Dissertation Examining Committee

For dissertation proposal defense, the doctoral student does not need approval by the Graduate School. However, the student must email the Doctoral Program Director to nominate his/her committee **at least six weeks before the planned proposal defense date**. This lead time allows the Doctoral Committee to review and approve the committee (including electing special members to the Graduate Faculty). Nominations submitted late may not be approved in time and the proposal defense has to be postponed.

Preparing the Dissertation Proposal

The student must submit a dissertation proposal to the dissertation committee. This proposal includes a literature review, research plan, research methods to be used, research goals and objectives, timelines for the work, potential limitations, and any other elements deemed appropriate by the committee.

The chair and the committee work with the student to determine the format and content of the proposal and the type of proposal defense. Before the student can move past the proposal stage, a written proposal must be unanimously approved by the committee. Any changes to the goals, objectives, methods, plan, or other major element of the dissertation work must be approved by the chair in consultation with the other members of the committee.

Dissertation Proposal Defense

After completion of the proposal, a defense of the proposal must occur in a format similar to that of a dissertation defense (see Section XI Dissertation). The defense should be announced to the college at least **two weeks before the scheduled date**.

At the defense, the student gives a presentation to the committee – lasting generally 15 minutes and a maximum 45 minutes – that summarizes their proposal and what they will do in the dissertation itself. Generally, it is recommended that the student prepares for a 20-minute talk. After this presentation, there will be questions from the general audience and then from the committee.

After questions have been asked and suggestions made, the student and general audience will be asked to leave the room while the committee deliberates. Upon completion of the deliberation, the committee will immediately inform the student and the Student Services Office of the outcome of the proposal defense. In addition, the Dissertation Proposal form for Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments (see Appendix A) needs to be completed and submitted to the PhD program coordinator.

XI Dissertation

The purpose of the dissertation is to demonstrate the ability to successfully conduct original and meaningful research that contributes to the scholarly discourse. It must be finished and defended within no less than six months and no more than four years from admission to candidacy.

A dissertation is a significant undertaking that involves applying, integrating, analyzing, and advancing research in the area in which the student has chosen to specialize. The topic of study must be carefully selected by a student in close consultation with the student's advisor. **Students should begin considering potential dissertation topics as soon as they begin their doctoral studies.**

Eligibility

A student is eligible to defend a dissertation if the student (a) has advanced to candidacy and successfully defended the dissertation proposal, (b) has met all program requirements for a dissertation examination, (c) is in good standing as a graduate student at the university, (d) is registered for at least one credit, (e) has a valid Graduate School-approved Dissertation Examining Committee, and (f) if this is the second examination, the examination has been approved by the Graduate School.

Research Assurances

Everyone at the University of Maryland who is conducting research that involves human subjects must obtain approval in advance from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is charged with approving the initiation of research involving human subjects and conducts periodic reviews of that research to ensure that all projects comply with Federal regulations. These regulations are strict, and the Graduate School urges all graduate students to consult with the IRB before beginning any research involving living subjects. For application forms and guidelines on issues such as research involving minors or prisoners, surveys, and the use of audio taping, videotaping, digital recordings, and photographs, please see the Institutional Review Board's website www.umresearch.umd.edu/IRB.

Graduate School's Approval of Dissertation Examining Committee

Although the student's dissertation examination committee has been approved by the Doctoral Committee before the dissertation proposal defense, the committee must be approved by the graduate school well before the dissertation defense. Approximately 3 months before the planned dissertation defense, the doctoral candidate must submit a signed Nomination of Thesis or Dissertation Committee Form (available at <http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/images/uploads/NominationThesis.pdf>) to the Student Services Office. The form is then transferred to the Graduate School, which approves the nomination.

Dissertation Defense

Each doctoral candidate is required to orally defend his or her doctoral dissertation as a requirement in partial fulfillment of the doctoral degree. Once the dissertation chair and committee members agree that the dissertation is complete and ready to defend, the student, chair, and committee will determine an appropriate time for the defense.

The members of the Dissertation Examining Committee must receive the dissertation **at least ten working days before the scheduled examination**. Should the Dissertation Examining Committee deem it reasonable and appropriate, it may require submission of the dissertation more than ten working days in advance of the examination. Though paper copies are traditionally given to committee members to

review, the student and his/her committee may agree to use an electronic format or a combination of paper and electronic formats. If multiple formats are used, the content of all copies must be identical without exception.

Oral examinations must be attended by all members of the student's officially established Dissertation Examining Committee as approved by the Dean of the Graduate School. All examinations must be open to all members of the University of Maryland Graduate Faculty. Programs may wish to routinely open dissertation examinations to a broader audience. In such cases, program policies must be established, recorded, and made available to all doctoral students. Should a last-minute change in the constitution of the Dissertation Examining Committee be required, the change must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School in consultation with the director of the student's graduate program and the chair of the student's Dissertation Examining Committee.

Oral examinations must be held in university facilities that are readily accessible to all members of the Dissertation Examining Committee and others attending the examination. The chair selects the time and place for the examination. Announcements of the date, time, and location of the examination, as well as the candidate's name and the dissertation title, is disseminated **five working days in advance** to all members of the Graduate Faculty and graduate students within the graduate program in which the candidate's degree is to be awarded. Mass-distribution methods, such as e-mail, a faculty/student newsletter, or individual announcements are acceptable. Merely posting a paper notice on a corridor bulletin board does not constitute a sufficient announcement.

The Dean's Representative must be identified at the beginning of the examination. The responsibilities of the Dean's Representative include the following: ensuring that the procedures of the oral examination comply with those of the Graduate School (as described herein) and reporting to the Dean of the Graduate School any unusual problems experienced in the conduct of the examination.

The dissertation examination consists of two parts:

- **Part 1 is a public presentation by the candidate** on the main aspects of the research reported in the dissertation. The student is permitted to briefly present a summary of the dissertation, emphasizing the important results and giving an explanation of the reasoning that led to the conclusions reached. During Part 1, questions from the audience to the candidate are permitted. For questions from persons who are not members of the Dissertation Examining Committee, the Chair of the Dissertation Examining Committee has discretion to decide whether such questions are germane to the topic of the dissertation and how much time should be allotted for the answers.
- **Part 2 is a formal examination of the candidate** by the Dissertation Examination Committee. This part is open only to the Dissertation Examination Committee, other members of the Graduate Faculty, and graduate students from the candidate's graduate program. During Part 2, only members of the Dissertation Examination Committee are permitted to ask questions. The chair invites questions in turn from each member of the Dissertation Examining Committee. The questioning may continue as long as the Dissertation Examining Committee feels that it is necessary and reasonable for the proper examination of the student.

The Dean of the Graduate School may void any examination not carried out in accordance with the procedures and policies of the Graduate School. In addition, upon recommendation of the Dean's Representative, the Dean may rule an oral examination to be null and void.

Outcome of the Defense

After questioning has been completed, the student and any others who are not members of the Dissertation Examining Committee are asked to leave the room while the Dissertation Examining Committee discusses whether or not the dissertation and its defense are satisfactory. Attendance at the final discussion and vote is limited to the members of the Dissertation Examining Committee.

The Committee has the following options:

- To accept the dissertation without any recommended changes and sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To accept the dissertation with recommendations for changes and, except for the chair, sign the Report of the Examining Committee. The chair checks that the changes to the dissertation have been made, and, upon his or her approval, sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To recommend revisions to the dissertation and not sign the Report of Examining Committee until the student has made the changes and submitted the revised dissertation for the Dissertation Examining Committee's approval. The Dissertation Examining Committee members sign the Report of Examining Committee if they approve the revised dissertation.
- To recommend revisions and convene a second in-person meeting of the Dissertation Examining Committee to review the dissertation and complete the student's examination.
- To rule the dissertation (including its examination) unsatisfactory. In that circumstance, the student fails.

Following the examination, the chair, in the presence of the Dean's Representative, must inform the student of the outcome of the examination. The chair and the Dean's Representative both sign a Report of the Examining Committee indicating which of the above alternatives has been adopted. A copy of this statement is to be included in the student's file at the graduate program office, and a copy is given to the student. In addition, the Dissertation form for Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments (see Appendix A) needs to be completed and submitted to the PhD program coordinator.

The student passes if one member refuses to sign the Report, but the other members of the Dissertation Examining Committee agree to sign, before or after the approval of recommended changes. Two or more negative votes constitute a failure of the candidate to meet the dissertation requirement. In cases of failure, the Dissertation Examining Committee must specify in detail and in writing the nature of the deficiencies in the dissertation and/or the oral performance that led to failure. This statement is to be submitted to the Doctoral Program Director, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the student. A second examination may be permitted if the student will be in good standing at the time of the proposed second examination. A second examination requires the approval of the Doctoral Program Director and the Dean of the Graduate School. If the student fails this second examination, or if a second examination is not permitted, the student's admission to the graduate program is terminated.

Submission and Publication of the Dissertation

Students should consult with the University of Maryland Thesis and Dissertation Style Guide (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/students/academic-progress/thesis-and-dissertation-filing>) to ensure that they are following the correct formatting guidelines for the dissertation.

Dissertations are to be submitted to the Graduate School in electronic format after final approval of the dissertation by the Dissertation Examining Committee. Please refer to the University of Maryland Electronic Thesis and Dissertation (ETD) website at <http://www.etdadmin.com/cgi-bin/school?siteId=76>

for the details of this process.

Dissertations submitted to the university through the ETD process are also deposited in the UM Library's online electronic archive, DRUM (Digital Repository at the University of Maryland, <http://drum.lib.umd.edu/>). This is a free public archive of academic work by university faculty and graduate students. The submission of the dissertation to the university in fulfillment of degree requirements grants the university the one-time, non-exclusive right to publish the document on DRUM.

As the owner of copyright in the dissertation, students have the exclusive right to reproduce, distribute, make derivative works based on, publicly perform and display their work, and to authorize others to exercise some or all of those rights. When students submit their dissertations to the Graduate School, they will be given several options regarding providing access to their dissertations via ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database and DRUM.

International students may seek editing and grammatical assistance from campus organizations that provide such help. The Graduate School offers an English Editing for International Graduate Students (EEIGS, <http://www.english.umd.edu/academics/writingcenter/graduate/international>) program for whom English is not their first language, yet who must present their works in English. The EEIGS program is free, and is staffed by volunteer editors from the Volunteer Service Corps, the Golden ID program, and the community. Students may also contact the Office for Diversity Initiatives (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/admissions/choose-maryland/diverse-campus-community>) for information on this program. Further, the Maryland English Institute (MEI, <http://mei.umd.edu/>) also offers assistance through the MEI Writing Center for International Graduate Students.

If a student seeks assistance from either of these programs on his/her dissertation, the program must provide the student with a letter detailing the grammatical and editing assistance provided. This letter must be submitted with the dissertation.

XII Financial Assistance

Assistantships and Fellowships

Most Graduate Assistants are appointed either for a regular academic year (9.5 months) or for 12 months. Some appointments may be for a shorter period. The academic-year appointment begins in mid-August and ends in May. Students may be reappointed one or more times at the discretion of the College. To allow a larger number of qualified students to benefit from assistantships, the number of years that a graduate student may serve as an assistant in any capacity may be limited.

Reappointment is dependent upon satisfactory performance and normal progress toward a graduate degree. As with all university faculty and staff positions, appointment and reappointment are contingent upon the availability of funds. Inquiries concerning funding should be directed to the Student Services Office.

The Doctoral Committee awards a number of assistantships and fellowships to doctoral students each year. The assistantships and fellowships are reviewed on an annual basis and may be renewed if the student is making satisfactory progress in the doctoral program and there are funds to continue support.

Assistantship responsibilities can include teaching, research, and/or administrative duties. The assigned duties of a graduate assistant are consistent with the aims and objectives of the teaching and research missions of the university. An appointment of 20 hours per week is considered a full-time assistantship. An appointment of 10 hours per week is considered a half-time assistantship. The responsibilities assigned to a graduate assistant generally correspond to what may be reasonably expected given the graduate assistant's education and experience. Further assistantship information is available at: http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/assistantship_policies.htm.

Fellowships are merit-based awards designed to enable the recipients to focus full-time on their graduate studies. Further information about the financial policies regarding fellowships is available at: http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/fellowship_policies.htm.

The University of Maryland Graduate School offers many fellowships, prizes and awards (<http://gradschool.umd.edu/funding/fellowships-awards/student-fellowships-awards>). The application/nomination deadlines for different opportunities are different, but most are in the spring semester.

Further funding opportunities are available from grants being administered in the college and many other types of positions around campus. Externally funded grants at the college often have student assistantships. The selection of such assistantships is made by the faculty member administering a grant. Individual faculty and the research facilities affiliated with the college, such as the Center for the Advanced Study of Communities and Information (CASCI), Digital Curation Innovation Center (DCIC), Human Computer Interaction Lab (HCIL), and the Information Policy and Access Center (iPAC), may also have assistantship opportunities available.

Outside of the college, many other units on campus offer assistantships related to Information Studies, such as campus libraries, computer centers, and graduate offices. The Student Services Office makes announcements of these assistantship opportunities available as soon as they are received through the college website and email lists.

Travel Funding

The college provides doctoral students with financial assistance for travel to conferences. Students may apply to the Doctoral Program Director for travel support following procedures described in Appendix B to this handbook. The application must be made by the student's advisor **at least two weeks before the trip**, and funds are allocated based on economy excursion airfare, double-occupancy hotel accommodation, funding availability, the number of students who apply in the academic year, and the locations of the conferences. Travel funds are allotted only to students who can demonstrate that **they will apply for university funding for their travel**, as described below.

The Graduate School administers the International Conference Student Support Awards and the Jacob K. Goldhaber travel grants for graduate students. Because funding is limited, students are urged to apply for appropriate support as soon as their papers have been accepted, following the guidelines at: <http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/funding/fellowships-awards/student-fellowships-awards/graduate-school-travel-grants>.

External Fellowships

External Graduate Fellowships are fellowships sponsored and funded by organizations outside the university. Corporations, charitable foundations, and numerous other groups fund graduate fellowships. Some of these fellowships are won independently by students in national competitions; others are awarded directly to the colleges or programs, which then select student recipients. Students submitting applications for admission to graduate programs are considered for such awards as appropriate; no additional application forms are required. Our graduate students are supported on fellowships from the Department of Defense, Ford Foundation, National Science Foundation, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, to name a few. In addition, several graduate programs sponsor fellowship programs jointly with federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, NASA, and the National Institute of Standards in Technology.

Matching Tuition Scholarships for External Fellowships are awarded, subject to the availability of funding, to students who have received external fellowships that provide a stipend, but do not provide separate funds to cover the cost of tuition. The Graduate School policy on External Fellowship Tuition Remission is listed at http://apps.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/fellowship_policies.htm#16.

Other Funding Resources

The Office of Student Financial Aid administers a number of programs to assist graduate students, including loans and federal work study. See www.financialaid.umd.edu for more information.

XIII Support, Organizations, and Opportunities

As part of the overall academic and professional development of doctoral students, there are other research support and community involvement opportunities available at the college.

Student Organizations

The iSchool Doctoral Student Organization serves as the elected representative body of Maryland's iSchool doctoral student community. It represents and supports the interests of the students at the college and Doctoral Committee, integrates with Student Services, and assists in shaping school and program policy, mediation activity, and faculty relations. This organization promotes a sense of community and inclusion, encouraging diversity within the doctoral program. Finally, by supporting scholarly activities and personal growth, the doctoral student organization aims to promote leadership roles, social, educational, and professional development.

The college has a few other student organizations in which doctoral students can become involved. The college has student chapters of the American Library Association (ALA), the Society of American Archivists (SAA), the Special Library Association (SLA), and the Association for Information Science and Technology (ASIS&T). Along with these chapters of national organizations, the college also has a School Library Media Specialist Student Association.

Student Offices

Doctoral students are provided office or carrel space in the Hornbake or Patuxent buildings. This space is assigned related to the areas of student interest, the faculty with whom the students are working, the projects that students are working on, and student seniority in the doctoral program.

Along with offices, the college has many other spaces in which students can study, gather, and relax. The fourth floor College Commons provides a lounge and kitchen for student use. The second floor has carrels, a computer lab, meeting rooms, and open spaces which students can use.

Research Labs and Centers

The college features an interdisciplinary, collaborative, and very active research culture. Students wishing to become involved in research activities should speak to faculty members and other students with similar interests to find out about opportunities for involvement in ongoing projects or to discuss new projects ideas of their own.

Several different research facilities are closely affiliated with the college and its faculty. These facilities indicate areas of particular research strength at the college and offer significant opportunities for students to become involved in research projects, meet well-known researchers, hear academic talks, and work with other students who share their interests.

The Center for the Advanced Study of Communities and Information (CASCI, <http://casci.umd.edu/>) is a multidisciplinary research network, based at the University of Maryland. CASCI exists to facilitate research and education that advances our understanding of the technology, information, and organization approaches needed to realize the potential of 21st century communities to support learning, facilitate innovation, transform science and scholarship, promote economic development, and enhance individual and civic well-being.

The Digital Curation Innovation Center (DCIC, <http://dcic.umd.edu/>) is a leader in the digital curation research and education fields which fosters interdisciplinary partnerships using Big Records and archival analytics through public/industry/government partnerships. The center offers: (1) CurateLab: a 12-seat interaction lab for group learning, collaborative design, and hands-on digital curation projects, (2) DataCave: a peta-scale archival storage and analytics facility, powered by NetApp storage and the Integrated Rule-Oriented Data System (iRODS)-based commercial Alloy software, for long-term archival storage and preservation, (3) VirtualFarm: virtual farm at the iSchool for local research data processing and storage, and (4) VCLCloud: iSchool dashboard-enabled virtual computing lab for creating Windows/Linux instances using Amazon Web Services (AWS).

The Human-Computer Interaction Lab (HCIL, www.cs.umd.edu/hcil/) has a long, rich history of transforming the experience people have with new technologies. From understanding user needs, to developing and evaluating those technologies, the lab's faculty, staff, and students have been leading the way in HCI research and teaching. HCIL develops advanced user interfaces and design methodology. The lab's primary activities include collaborative research, publication and the sponsorship of open houses, workshops, and symposia.

The Trace Research & Development Center (<https://trace.umd.edu/>) uses an interdisciplinary approach to increase accessibility and usability of technology for people of all ages and ability levels.

The Information Policy and Access Center (iPAC, ipac.umd.edu) focuses on research and educational programs in the fields of information policy, equity of access, under-served populations and diversity, and cultural institution studies as applied to academic, public, school, and other libraries; museums; and archives.

The University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies (UMIACS, www.umiacs.umd.edu) fosters and enhances interdisciplinary research and education in computing across the College Park campus through research programs, cutting-edge computing infrastructure, and long-term partnerships with national and international research centers. The Institute's programs are led by distinguished researchers, many of whom hold joint appointments in strong academic units such as Computer Science, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Linguistics, Geography, Philosophy, Business, Education, and the College of Information Studies.

The Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (MITH, www.mith2.umd.edu) is collaboration among the University of Maryland's College of Arts and Humanities, Libraries, and Office of Information Technology. MITH is the university's primary intellectual hub for scholars and practitioners of digital humanities, electronic literature, and cyberculture, with research clustering around digital tools, text mining and visualization, and the creation and preservation of electronic literature, digital games, and virtual worlds.

The Computational Linguistics and Information Processing Laboratory (CLIP) (www.umiacs.umd.edu/research/CLIP) focuses on several areas of broad scale multilingual processing, such as machine translation, summarization, scalable translingual document detection, and cross-language information retrieval, and on architectures for wide area computation with heterogeneous information servers, such as those for scientific discovery from biomolecular data sources.

The first four of these research centers (i.e., CASCI, DCIC, HCIL, and iPAC) are sponsored or co-sponsored by the college. In addition, there are many other research facilities on campus that might relate to

students' academic interests. Please see a comprehensive list here: www.umd.edu/directories/centers.cfm.

Writing and Publishing

To help graduate students improve the quality of their writing, the Graduate School Writing Center maintains a website for Writing Resources: <http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/graduate-school-writing-center>. Students should become actively involved in publication activities during their first year in the program. Publishing in refereed journals and refereed conferences is an essential part of not only an academic career, but the education process of a doctoral program. Opportunities for publications can derive from course work and independent research. Many people gain their first publishing experience by taking part in ongoing research projects as a member of a study team. Opportunities for involvement in projects may be available through Centers and Labs, as well as through individual faculty members.

Ombuds Office

The Graduate School's Ombuds Office assists graduate students with concerns related to their graduate experience (<http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/about-us/ombuds-office>). The Ombudsperson is an impartial, independent and confidential resource for graduate students at the university who helps to surface and resolve school issues. The Ombudsperson can also help to affect positive change by providing upward feedback on patterns of problems and complaints to appropriate senior officers.

Graduate Student Legal Aid Office

The Graduate Student Legal Aid Office (GLAO) is a part-time program of the Graduate Student Government and operates under the auspices of the Office of Student Affairs (gradlegalaid.org). It is funded solely by graduate student fees and has been in operation since 1987. The Graduate Student Legal Aid Office provides free legal information and related assistance to individual graduate students on a wide range of both off-campus and university matters. It also maintains active educational and outreach programs for the graduate student community, and is available to provide speakers for student events and other campus activities. The office is staffed by an experienced attorney and paralegal. While it is a small two-person office funded on a part-time basis, it strives to be as accessible as possible to the graduate student community. The attorney cannot represent students in court.

XIV Campus Safety Resources

Our collective safety is a shared responsibility. As members of our campus community, faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to contact officials when safety concerns arise. Suspicious behavior should not be ignored. Early intervention in such cases is vital, and trained colleagues are prepared to assist.

Here are some warning signs of concern:

- Possession of a weapon
- Violence – striking, pushing, or assaulting another person
- Threat of violence or physical harm – in person, over the telephone, or electronically
- Stalking– pursuing another person
- Destructive behavior –damaging property
- Verbal aggression – expressions of uncontrollable anger, hostility, or frustration
- Disorderly or substantially disruptive behavior
- Unusual, bizarre, or disturbing behavior

Share your concerns with and report suspicious behavior to an appropriate resource listed below.

The university has a full suite of resources available to the entire campus community. The resources include:

1. Weapons, Violence, Substantial Disruption, Threats - The Department of Public Safety (<http://www.umpd.umd.edu/>) will respond to any act or threat of violence. To contact them, call 301.405.3333 or 911. Additionally, the Office of Student Conduct is authorized to impose an immediate suspension from classes (pending a hearing) if a student engages in threatening or disruptive behavior. Procedures may be initiated by the Vice President for Student Affairs or the Director of Student Conduct to require an evaluation conducted by campus mental health professionals or to dismiss students who pose a "direct threat" to self or others.
2. Mental Health or Psychiatric Concern - If you or someone you know needs immediate mental health/psychiatric attention or hospitalization may be necessary, contact Mental Health Services (<http://www.health.umd.edu/mentalhealth>) at 301.314.8106. The Department of Public Safety (301.405.3333 or 911) should be contacted if medical transportation is required.
3. Emotional or Psychological Distress - For anyone displaying emotional or psychological distress, comprehensive evaluation and treatment are provided by the Counseling Center, Shoemaker Hall. You may contact the Counseling Center at 301.314.7651 or Counseling Center (<http://www.counseling.umd.edu/>) for consultation with a counselor.
4. Disorderly or Disruptive Behavior - Report student behavior that is disorderly, disruptive or poses a concern for violence to the Office of Student Conduct (<http://osc.umd.edu/OSC/Default.aspx>) at 301.314.8204 or studentconduct@umd.edu. Disruptive or disorderly students may be charged under the University's Code of Student Conduct (<http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/docs/V-100B.pdf>) and/or be referred for specific counseling or other mental health interventions, if appropriate. Additional advice is provided in a Classroom Disruption Advisory issued by the Office of Student Conduct and may be found at Disruptive Student Advisory (<http://osc.umd.edu/OSC/GeneralFacultyDisruption.aspx>).

5. Behavior Evaluation and Threat Assessment, or Consultation - The BETA Team provides student behavior-related evaluation, assessment, and consultation to the campus. The Team is comprised of representatives from the departments of Public Safety, Mental Health, Counseling, and Student Conduct. If you would like to discuss a specific student behavioral concern, please contact John Zacker, BETA Team chair at jzacker@umd.edu or 301.314.BETA (301.314.2382). You may also submit a report at BETA Team (beta.umd.edu).

You may wish to print or save the following list of potential issues, resources and contact information:

<p>WEAPONS, VIOLENCE, SUBSTANTIAL DISRUPTION, THREATS Immediate Police response and intervention Department of Public Safety (www.umdps.umd.edu) - 301.405.3333 or 911</p> <p>MENTAL HEALTH OR PSYCHIATRIC CONCERNS Immediate mental health/psychiatric care Mental Health Service (www.health.umd.edu/mentalhealth) - 301.314.8106</p> <p>EMOTIONAL OR PSYCHOLOGICAL CONCERNS Assessment, counseling, and consultation Counseling Center (www.counseling.umd.edu) - 301.314.7651</p> <p>DISORDERLY OR DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR Behavior evaluation under Code of Student Conduct Office of Student Conduct (www.studentconduct.umd.edu) - 301.314.8204</p> <p>BEHAVIOR EVALUATION, THREAT ASSESSMENT, OR CONSULTATION Behavior evaluation and threat assessment BETA Team (beta.umd.edu) - 301.314.BETA (301.314.2382)</p>
--

Everyone can help by taking advantage of the services outlined above and by looking out for one another. Together, we can ensure a safe environment for all. If you have concerns that you wish to share with the Chief of University Police personally, please email umpdchief@umpd.umd.edu.

Questions and Comments about the Handbook

Any questions and comments about the handbook, including requests for clarification, should be directed to the Director of the Doctoral Program.

Appendix A Maryland's iSchool Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessments

Program Goals

How people access, use, and communicate information has become critical to professional success, life-long learning, and even government policies. Information retrieval now is heavily dependent on computer systems, the Internet, and mobile devices. The impacts of diverse cultures, emotional affect, and ever-growing digitization of information are important to understand.

This Ph.D. program is an interdisciplinary program taught by a multidisciplinary faculty at a leading public research university. This doctoral degree is an academic degree rather than a professional one, providing a background in pedagogy, theory, and research that will prepare graduates for careers in teaching and conducting research in Information Studies. In order to complete the program, students will have to demonstrate high attainment in scholarship and critical thinking, as well as the ability to carry out independent scholarly research.

Assessment Activities

Learning Outcome One

Students will demonstrate adequate yearly progress towards the PhD degree through their performance in coursework and research activities.

Benchmark Measure: Annual Review

Measures and Criteria:

A committee comprised of at least three and no more than five full-time faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the college faculty, as well as a representative from the Student Services Office, will conduct the required annual reviews. The student's advisor and the other faculty members will review the student's work and all prior annual review reports for the student; meet with the student to discuss the student's portfolio or current status; and write a report of the discussion which sets expectations and identifies any recommendations made.

Students will be evaluated in several areas including:

- Course Performance
- Contributions to ongoing research projects
- Initiative and work ethic in these research activities
- Ability to present and communicate their research

The program goal is for 80% of students to receive an average score of "meets expectations" or higher in each category of the rubric.

Learning Outcome Two

Students will complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates the ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research and scholarship.

Benchmark Measure: The Integrative Paper

Measures and Criteria:

A committee comprised of the student's advisor and at least two other college faculty members will review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then meet to discuss the evaluations with the student. Then the committee will reach a decision regarding the grade assigned to the paper. Each faculty reviewer will assign one of these grades to the Integrative Paper being reviewed. The advisor will write a report of the discussion and the recommendations made, which will include all of the comments from the committee and the grade assigned to the committee, and will send the report to the student.

Students will be evaluated in several areas including:

- Identification of a research problem and including the student's motivations of undertaking the research
- Identification of key literature in three areas of the field of study, synthesizing the lenses information, people, systems, and environment as they apply to a specific area of specialization, and utilization of appropriate research methods
- A clear and succinct statement of a research question
- Preparation of an Integrative Paper that makes an original contribution to the integration of selected areas
- Production of a paper that is suitable for publication

The program goal is for 85% of students to receive an average score of "meets expectations" or higher on every requirement.

Learning Outcome Three

Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively plan and propose novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Benchmark Measure: Dissertation Proposal

Measures and Criteria:

Before beginning to collect data for their dissertation research, students will prepare and present a proposal to their committee. The proposal must include a literature review, a research plan, a description of the proposed research methods, a description of the research goals and objectives, a proposed timeline, an outline of the potential limitations of the study, and any other elements deemed appropriate by their committee.

Students' proposals will be evaluated as to how well they meet each of the following requirements:

- Identification of a significant and original problem
- Creation of a theoretical framework based on relevant literature
- Inclusion of a clear, succinct statement of the research questions to be addressed
- Selection of methodology appropriate to the research questions
- Description of a clear plan for presenting data and findings
- Creation of a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct
- Inclusion of a detailed, feasible timeline in which the work will be completed

Each committee member will fill out this 7-category rubric. The program goal is for 90% of students to receive an average score of “meets expectations” or higher on every requirement.

Learning Outcome Four

Student will demonstrate ability to conduct and disseminate novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Benchmark Measure: Dissertation Defense

Measures and Criteria:

Each committee member shall complete the 8-category assessment rubric and provide written comments to the student based on the overall written product and oral presentation. The written comments of each committee member and verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the student’s performance will be provided to the student by the chair of the Dissertation Committee.

Students will be evaluated based on how well they meet each of the following requirements:

- Identification of a significant and original problem
- Creation of a theoretical framework based on relevant literature
- Clear and succinct statement of research question(s)
- Appropriate choice of methodology
- Clear and thorough presentation of data and discussion of findings
- Creation of a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct
- Delivery of a clear, well-organized presentation of the study
- Production of material that is suitable for publication

The program goal is for 95% of students to receive average scores of “meets expectations” or higher in each category of the rubric.

Discussion and Findings

The College of Information Studies and the Doctoral Committee will review these learning benchmarks on an annual basis to assess their suitability for gauging the success of the PhD students. The data generated by these assessment processes, particularly students’ scores on specific rubric items, will be used to shed light on where students may be facing obstacles in their PhD degree progression. This information will be used to motivate continued discussion

about these benchmarks and the measures and criteria used to assess student success on each of them, with the goal of iteratively improving and evolving the PhD program to better meet the needs of the students, to optimize the quality of the education the students receive, and to ensure the program's ongoing success.

Annual Review

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Committee Member Requirements

An initial annual review will be conducted at the end of the second semester of taking doctoral courses. Subsequent annual reviews will be conducted during the spring semester of each year in which a program milestone is not completed (i.e. Integrative Paper, dissertation proposal, or dissertation). In years when the student completes one or more program milestones, that milestone review will constitute the student's annual review for that academic year.

A committee comprised of at least three and no more than five full-time faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the college faculty, as well as a representative from the Student Services Office, will conduct the required annual reviews. The student's advisor and the other faculty members will review the student's work and all prior annual review reports for the student; meet with the student to discuss the student's portfolio or current status; and write a report of the discussion which sets expectations and identifies any recommendations made.

The committee will create a report from the review and send it to the Student Services Office for placement in the student's file. In the case of annual reviews that occur while a student is completing coursework, at the end of the semester in which the review occurs, the Student Services Office will conduct an administrative review of the student's grades (including the grades for that semester) and other materials to ensure that the student is meeting all University requirements in terms of academic performance (e.g., sufficient GPA), course selection for completion of program requirements, and any other issues of administrative or academic standing. In the case of annual reviews that occur after the student has completed coursework, the student's standing in the program will be assessed by the successful completion of program milestones or by demonstrating to the committee continuing progress toward completing milestones and receiving the degree. Upon completion of the review, the student and the committee members will receive a letter summarizing the results of the annual review and any administrative reviews, including a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee vote(s) to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student.

Annual Review Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Presents good performance in coursework or demonstrates progress toward degree.	
Outstanding	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A <i>in all</i> of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made exceptional progress toward program milestones.
Exceeds Expectations	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A <i>in all but one</i> of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made <i>significantly above average</i> progress toward program milestones.
Meets Expectations	During Coursework: The student maintains a grade of A <i>in more than half</i> of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made <i>acceptable</i> progress toward program milestones.
Below Expectations	During Coursework: The student receives a grade of B or below <i>in more than half</i> of their courses in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made <i>minimal</i> progress toward program milestones.
Unsatisfactory	During Coursework: The student receives <i>any grade</i> of C or below in the past year. After Coursework: The student has made <i>no</i> meaningful progress toward program milestones.

Indicator: Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda or demonstrates engagement with a research agenda.	
Outstanding	The student is able to clearly articulate a remarkably impressive research agenda and has made tremendous progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Exceeds Expectations	The student is able to clearly articulate a strong research agenda and has made very significant progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Meets Expectations	The student is able to clearly articulate a coherent and compelling research agenda and has made progress over the past year in advancing that agenda.
Below Expectations	The student states a number of research interests, but does not clearly communicate a coherent research agenda.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not show any research interests or future plans to develop a research agenda during the doctoral program.

Indicator: Participates actively in research activities or is actively engaged in research activities.	
Outstanding	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests. Some of these research activities have resulted in multiple publications or conference presentations as sole author or first author in a co-authored paper.
Exceeds Expectations	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests. Some of these research activities have resulted in either one publication or conference presentation as an author or co-author.
Meets Expectations	The student has participated regularly in research activities. These activities show promise to further the student's stated research interests.

Below Expectations	The student demonstrates a shallow participation in research activities. Such activities do not hold promise to further the student's stated research interests.
Unsatisfactory	The student has not participated successfully in research activities.

Indicator: Takes or exhibits initiative in research activities.

Outstanding	The student has participated regularly in research activities. They have shown great ability to work independently when given tasks, and they contribute original thought, motivation, and initiative to work beyond the requirements of a project. They have been lead authors on projects that have resulted in publication, funded grants, or conference presentations.
Exceeds Expectations	The student has regularly initiated their own research activities. They have shown great ability to work independently when given tasks, and they contribute original thought, motivation, and initiative to work beyond the requirements of a project. They have been major contributors or (co)authors on projects that have resulted in publication, funded grants, or conference presentations.
Meets Expectations	The student has successfully initiated their own research activities. Their work in these projects consistently meets the expectations of their advisor(s) or faculty who were supervising the research. The student shows initiative in designing the research activity and following through.
Below Expectations	The student's work has not consistently met the expectations of their advisor(s) or faculty who were supervising the research.
Unsatisfactory	The student has not initiated any research activities or shown any meaningful curiosity or creativity in research.

Indicator: Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research or is engaged in ongoing research.

Outstanding	Student shows exceptional ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown exceptional ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Exceeds Expectations	Student shows the above average ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and develop research interests that build from the conceptual base.
Below Expectations	Student shows some ability to understand their research literature. However, they need improvement on synthesizing ideas and developing new knowledge that build from their conceptual base.
Unsatisfactory	Student shows little ability to understand their research literature, synthesize new concepts, and build new ideas.

Indicator: Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills and ability.

Outstanding	Student shows exceptional oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. The student has demonstrated excellent poise in presenting in formal venues.
-------------	--

Exceeds Expectations	Student shows above average oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. The student has also experience presenting in formal venues.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues.
Below Expectations	Student shows basic oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. However, their ability to clearly communicate their research requires further improvement.
Unsatisfactory	Student has not shown adequate basic oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues.

Indicator: Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills and ability.	
Evidence can come from the student's writing sample, coursework, or other written artifacts (i.e. publications etc.).	
Outstanding	Student shows exceptional ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. The student has received endorsements from their committee members that their writing is particularly strong. The student also has documented formal examples of their writing such as publications that have undergone the academic peer review processes.
Exceeds Expectations	Student shows above average ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. The student has received endorsements from their committee members that their writing is particularly strong.
Meets Expectations	Student shows acceptable ability to communicate research or ideas in writing.
Below Expectations	Student has basic ability to communicate research or ideas in writing. However, they may need improvement in any areas such as writing in an academic style or grammar.
Unsatisfactory	Student has poor ability to communicate research or ideas in their writing.

First-Year Review Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Student's Name: _____

print name

Committee Member Signatures

print name signature

Advisor

print name signature

Review Date: _____

mm/dd/yyyy

print name signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Presents good performance in coursework or demonstrates progress toward degree.					
2. Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda or demonstrates engagement with a research agenda.					
3. Participates actively in research activities or is actively engaged in research activities.					
4. Takes or exhibits initiative in research activities.					
5. Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research or is engaged in ongoing research.					
6. Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills and ability.					
7. Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills and ability.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Annual Review Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Make successful progress toward completing the doctoral program, including completing course requirements and milestones.

Student's Name: _____

Signatures

Please check one: 2nd-year 3rd-year 4th-year
 5th-year 6th-year 7th-year

print name

 print name signature

Advisor
 (required)

 print name signature

Committee
 members
 (optional)

 print name signature

Review Date: _____
 mm/dd/yyyy

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Presents good performance in coursework or demonstrates progress toward degree.					
2. Clearly communicates an evolving research agenda or demonstrates engagement with a research agenda.					
3. Participates actively in research activities or is actively engaged in research activities.					
4. Takes or exhibits initiative in research activities.					
5. Demonstrates ability to analyze, critique, and synthesize research or is engaged in ongoing research.					
6. Demonstrates scholarly oral communication skills and ability.					
7. Demonstrates scholarly written communication skills and ability.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Integrative Paper

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research/scholarship.

Committee Member Requirements

The student's advisor and at least two other college faculty members will review the Integrative Paper, write evaluations, and then meet to discuss the evaluations without the student. Then, the committee will reach a decision regarding the grade assigned to the paper. Each faculty reviewer will assign one of these grades to the Integrative Paper being reviewed. The advisor will write a report of the discussion and the recommendations made, which will include all of the comments from the committee and the grade assigned by the committee, and will send this report to the student.

The review is very much like the editorial process at a professional journal. There are three independent readings of the paper, followed by an overall recommendation. The requirements for clarity of expression, quality of work and methodology, and originality are at the level of a research journal. The standard for acceptance is that the paper be comparable to articles published in respectable academic journals.

To pass this requirement, a student must receive passing grades from all reviewers of the paper. While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee vote(s) to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student. If the student receives a report of "accept with minor revisions" or "revise and resubmit," the student will have one chance to meet the concerns of the reviewers. Revisions must be completed within two weeks. The revised paper will be reviewed by the same faculty reviewers to determine if it has met the necessary changes. If it has, the student will pass the requirement. If a student receives an evaluation of reject (either by a consensus or a majority of the reviewers) at any stage, they will fail this requirement.

The committee will create a report from the review of the Integrative Paper and send it to the Student Services Office for placement in the student's file. Upon completion of the paper, the student will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation. The student and the advisor will work with the Student Services Office to complete the "Advance to Candidacy" paperwork.

Integrative Paper Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies and clearly states the research problem and details the motivations for undertaking the research.	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates exceptional depth in outlining the research problem and wide ranging motivations relating to both the research and potential outcomes.
Exceeds Expectations	The student presents the research problem and motivations for undertaking research with considerations of the broader implications of the work.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states the research problem and the motivations for undertaking the work.
Below Expectations	The research problem is vague and not well defined. Questions remain as to exactly what the problem is and/or how significant it is overall.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not effectively convey the significance of the research in a way that is understood by an interdisciplinary committee.

Indicator: Identifies key literature in three areas of the field of study synthesizing (1) the lenses information, people, systems, and environment, as they apply (2) appropriate research methods, (3) a specific area of specialization	
Outstanding	The student succinctly presents a concise, in depth synthesis of significant literature in the three areas that interconnects and extends the knowledge of multiple disciplines.
Exceeds Expectations	The student shows a distinct ability to interconnect and extend the knowledge of multiple disciplines.
Meets Expectations	The student addresses and synthesizes the key literature of the field.
Below Expectations	The student only weakly synthesizes the three areas, or adequately speaks to two of the three areas while insufficiently addressing the third.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to address any one or more of the three areas as stipulated by the Maryland Modular Method or fails to synthesize one or more of the areas.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly	
Outstanding	The student shows exceptional insight in stating research questions.
Exceeds Expectations	The student exhibits a broader depth in stating research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly and succinctly states the research question(s) and the question(s) are constructed to match the research method utilized.
Below Expectations	The student presents research question(s) that lack depth or do not match the research method utilized.
Unsatisfactory	The student does not clearly state the research question(s) or the questions are poorly conceived and/or formed.

Indicator: Designs study appropriate to field of study and the research question(s)	
Outstanding	The student study design introduces an innovative design and approach to examining the research question(s).
Exceeds Expectation	The student study design shows superior insight into utilization a design to examine the research question(s).
Meets Expectations	The student study design is appropriate to the field of study and the research question.

Below Expectations	The student study design not fully developed and does not utilize all available methods to answer the research question.
Unsatisfactory	The student study design is flawed and does not provide the best research outcome or answer to the research question.

Indicator: Applies data analytic techniques correctly	
Outstanding	Student shows the ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Exceeds Expectations	Student shows the ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and has shown ability to develop novel ideas and knowledge that further the literature.
Meets Expectations	Student shows the ability to understand their research literature, synthesize ideas, and develop research interests that build from the conceptual base.
Below Expectations	Student shows ability to understand their research literature. However, they need improvement on synthesizing ideas and developing new knowledge that build from their conceptual base.
Unsatisfactory	Student shows little ability to properly analyze data, synthesize findings, identify significance and/or build new ideas.

Indicator: Presents data and clearly and thoroughly discusses findings, drawing appropriate conclusions therefrom	
Outstanding	The student shows fluent ability to communicate research or ideas in writing.
Exceeds Expectations	The student shows fluent ability to communicate research or ideas in writing.
Meets Expectations	The student shows fluent ability to communicate research or ideas in writing.
Below Expectations	The student shows basic oral communication skills via course participation, research activities, conference presentations, or other venues. However, their ability to clearly communicate their research requires further improvement or fluency.
Unsatisfactory	The student has poor ability to communicate research or ideas in their writing.

Indicator: Draws conclusions from findings that are consistent with the data presented, well-explained, and thoroughly defended.	
Outstanding	The student draws insightful, fully developed conclusions that open new avenues for research and are exceptionally well-explained and defended.
Exceeds Expectations	The student draws broadly considered conclusions that are very well-explained and defended.
Meets Expectations	The student draws conclusions from the findings that are consistent with the data presented that are well-explained and defended.
Below Expectations	The student draws only partial or incomplete conclusions from the data presented or offers a poorly-explained or inadequately defended conclusion.
Unsatisfactory	The student draws incorrect or faulty conclusions from the data presented and does not satisfactorily explain or defend the conclusions reached.

Indicator: Prepares an Integrative Paper that makes an original contribution to the integration of the selected areas.	
Outstanding	The student paper shows exceptional insight in the integration of the selected areas.
Exceeds Expectations	The student paper shows deeper depth and wider breadth of integration of selected areas.

Meets Expectations	The student paper makes an original contribution to the integration of the selected areas.
Below Expectations	The student paper makes a limited contribution. Integration is not sufficiently developed.
Unsatisfactory	The student paper makes no contribution due to lack of integration.

Indicator: Produces material that is suitable for publication	
Outstanding	It is highly anticipated that journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Exceeds Expectations	It is very likely that journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Meets Expectations	It is likely that conference or journal publications will result from this research.
Below Expectations	It is somewhat likely, with revisions, that journal or conference publications might result from this research.
Unsatisfactory	It is unlikely that journal or conference publications can result from this research.

Integrative Paper Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Complete an Integrative Paper that demonstrates ability to independently conduct and disseminate high quality research/scholarship.

Student's Name: _____

print name

Committee Member Signatures

Acceptance Date: _____

mm/dd/yyyy

_____ Advisor

print name

signature

print name

signature

print name

signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies and clearly states the research problem and details the motivations for undertaking the research.					
2. Identifies key literature in three areas of the field of study synthesizing (1) the lenses of information, people, systems, and environment, as they apply (2) appropriate research methods, and (3) a specific area of specialization.					
3. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
4. Designs study appropriate to field of study and the research question(s).					
5. Applies data analytic techniques correctly.					
6. Presents data and findings clearly and thoroughly discusses findings.					
7. Prepares an Integrative Paper that makes an original contribution to the integration of the selected areas.					
8. Produces material that is suitable for publication.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Dissertation Proposal

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Effectively plans and proposes novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Committee Member Requirements

The student must submit a dissertation proposal to the committee, which will be written before data collection begins. This proposal will include a literature review, research plan, research methods to be used, research goals and objectives, timelines for the work, potential limitations, and any other elements deemed appropriate by the committee. The chair and the committee will work with the student to determine to format and content of the proposal and what type of proposal defense will be required. Any changes to the goals, objectives, methods, plan, or other major element of the dissertation work must be approved by the chair in consultation with the other members of the committee.

At the defense, the student will give a presentation to the committee – lasting a minimum of 15 minutes and a maximum 45 minutes – that summarizes their proposal and what they will do in the dissertation itself. Generally, it is recommended that the student prepares for a 20 minute talk. After this presentation, there will be questions from audience and then non-Ph.D. holders will be asked to leave as questions are asked from the committee. After the questions and suggestions from the committee are completed, the student will be asked to leave while the committee deliberates. Upon successful completion, the dissertation committee will sign a form to indicate that the student has passed the proposal. While it is ideal for the Committee to reach a consensus, in cases where there is a disagreement about the outcome, the student passes if no or only one member of the committee vote(s) to fail the student, and fails if two or more committee members vote to fail the student.

The completed forms and related documents will be forwarded to the Student Services Office for inclusion in the student's file. The student and will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

Dissertation Proposal Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies significant and original problem	
Outstanding	The student identifies an exceptionally significant and original problem that will make a potentially transformative contribution to the field.
Exceeds Expectations	The student identifies a highly significant and original problem that will make a major contribution to the field.
Meets Expectations	The student identifies an original and significant problem that will make a contribution to the field.
Below Expectations	The student identifies a somewhat significant and original problem that is somewhat likely to make a contribution to the field.
Unsatisfactory	The student identifies a problem of limited originality and significance that is unlikely to make a contribution to the field.

Indicator: Creates theoretical framework based on relevant literature	
Outstanding	The student demonstrates 1) mastery of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) mastery of theoretical concepts.
Exceeds Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) very sound knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) very sound understanding of theoretical concepts.
Meets Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) good knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) good understanding of theoretical concepts.
Below Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) some knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) some understanding of theoretical concepts.
Unsatisfactory	The student demonstrates 1) a lack of understanding of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) a lack of understanding of theoretical concepts.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly	
Outstanding	The student clearly states one or more research questions with the potential to transform research in the information field or a related field or subfield.
Exceeds Expectations	The student clearly states one or more compelling research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states one or more research questions.
Below Expectations	The student fails to clearly state research questions.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to clearly develop, state, or employ research questions.

Indicator: Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s)	
Outstanding	Research reflects mastery of the state-of-the-field research methods/tools. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools is exceptionally clear.
Exceeds Expectations	State-of-the-field research methods/tools are used to solve the defined problems. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools used is very well articulated.

Meets Expectations	The methodology chosen is well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is clear.
Below Expectations	The methodology chosen is somewhat well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is somewhat clear.
Unsatisfactory	The methodology chosen is not well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is not clear.

Indicator: Describes clear plan for presentation of data and findings	
Outstanding	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is exceptionally clear and very well justified
Exceeds Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is very clear and well justified.
Meets Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is clear and justified.
Below Expectations	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is only somewhat clear or only somewhat justified.
Unsatisfactory	The described plan for the presentation of data and findings is not clear or is insufficiently justified.

Indicator: Creates a written product that is clear, well organized, and grammatically correct	
Outstanding	Organization and documentation are excellent. There are no apparent grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of publishable quality.
Exceeds Expectations	Organization and documentation are very good. There are very few grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of a very good quality.
Meets Expectations	Organization is good and documentation is acceptable. There is a limited number of grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is acceptable.
Below Expectations	Organization and documentation are marginally adequate. There are some grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is somewhat acceptable.
Unsatisfactory	Organization and documentation are not adequate. There are numerous grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is of an unacceptable quality.

Indicator: Describes a detailed and feasible timeline of work to be completed	
Outstanding	Timeline is exceptionally clear and detailed. Work seems highly likely to be completed in the time allowed.
Exceeds Expectations	Timeline is very clear and detailed. Very good potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Meets Expectations	Timeline is acceptable and detailed. Good potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Below Expectations	Timeline is somewhat clear or detailed. Some potential for completion of the work in the time allowed.
Unsatisfactory	Timeline is unclear or insufficiently detailed. Work seems unlikely to be completed in time allowed.

Dissertation Proposal Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Effectively plans and proposes novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Student's Name: _____

print name

Proposal Defense Date: _____

mm/dd/yyyy

Committee Member Signatures

_____ Advisor
 print name signature

_____ Dean's Representative
 print name signature

_____ signature

_____ signature

_____ signature

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies significant and original problem.					
2. Creates theoretical framework based on relevant literature.					
3. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
4. Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s).					
5. Describes clear plan for presentation of data and findings.					
6. Creates a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct.					
7. Describes detailed and feasible timeline of work to be completed.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Dissertation

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Conduct and disseminate novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Committee Member Requirements

Each committee member shall complete the assessment rubric and provide written comments to the student based on the overall written product and oral presentation. The written comments of each committee member and verbal summarization of the overall evaluation of the student's performance will be provided to the student by the chair of the Dissertation Committee.

After questioning has been completed, the student and any others who are not members of the Dissertation Examining Committee are asked to leave the room while the Dissertation Examining Committee discusses whether or not the dissertation and its defense are satisfactory.

The Committee has the following options:

- To accept the dissertation without any recommended changes and sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To accept the dissertation with recommendations for changes and, except for the chair, sign the Report of the Examining Committee. The chair will check that the changes to the dissertation have been made, and, upon his or her approval, sign the Report of Examining Committee.
- To recommend revisions to the dissertation and not sign the Report of Examining Committee until the student has made the changes and submitted the revised dissertation for the Dissertation Examining Committee's approval. The Dissertation Examining Committee members sign the Report of Examining Committee if they approve the revised dissertation.
- To recommend revisions and convene a second in-person meeting of the Dissertation Examining Committee to review the dissertation and complete the student's examination.
- To rule the dissertation (including its examination) unsatisfactory. In that circumstance, the student fails.

Following the examination, the chair, in the presence of the Dean's Representative, must inform the student of the outcome of the examination. The chair and the Dean's Representative both sign a Report of the Examining Committee indicating which of the above alternatives has been adopted. A copy of this statement is to be included in the student's file at the graduate program office, and a copy is given to the student. The student passes if one member refuses to sign the report, but the other members of the Dissertation Examining Committee agree to sign, before or after the approval of recommended changes. Two or more negative votes constitute a failure of the candidate to meet the dissertation requirement. In cases of failure, the Dissertation Examining Committee must specify in detail and in writing the nature of the deficiencies in the dissertation and/or the oral performance

that led to failure. This statement is to be submitted to the program's Graduate Director, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the student. A second examination may be permitted if the student will be in good standing at the time of the proposed second examination. A second examination requires the approval of the program's Graduate Director and the Dean of the Graduate School. If the student fails this second examination, or if a second examination is not permitted, the student's admission to the graduate program is terminated.

The completed forms and related documents will be forwarded to the Student Services Office for inclusion in the student's file. The student will receive a copy of the completed DGOA form, which shows the names and signatures of the faculty who participated in the evaluation.

Dissertation Assessment Guidelines

Indicator: Identifies significant and original problem

Outstanding	The student identifies an exceptionally significant and original problem that will make a potentially transformative contribution to the field.
Exceeds Expectations	The student identifies a highly significant and original problem that will make a major contribution to the field.
Meets Expectations	The student identifies an original and significant problem that will make a contribution to the field.
Below Expectations	The student identifies a somewhat significant and original problem that is somewhat likely to make a contribution to the field.
Unsatisfactory	The student identifies a problem of limited originality and significance that is unlikely to make a contribution to the field.

Indicator: Creates theoretical framework based on relevant literature

Outstanding	The student demonstrates 1) mastery of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) mastery of theoretical concepts.
Exceeds Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) very sound knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) very sound understanding of theoretical concepts.
Meets Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) good knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) good understanding of theoretical concepts.
Below Expectations	The student demonstrates 1) some knowledge of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) some understanding of theoretical concepts.
Unsatisfactory	The student demonstrates 1) a lack of understanding of subject matter and associated literature, and 2) a lack of understanding of theoretical concepts.

Indicator: States research question(s) clearly and succinctly

Outstanding	The student clearly states one or more research questions with the potential to transform research in the information field or a related field or subfield.
Exceeds Expectations	The student clearly states one or more compelling research questions.
Meets Expectations	The student clearly states one or more research questions.
Below Expectations	The student fails to clearly state research questions.
Unsatisfactory	The student fails to clearly develop, state, or employ research questions.

Indicator: Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s)

Outstanding	Research reflects mastery of the state-of-the-field research methods/tools. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools is exceptionally clear.
Exceeds Expectations	State-of-the-field research methods/tools are used to solve the defined problems. The rationale for using chosen methods/tools used is very well articulated.

Meets Expectations	The methodology chosen is well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is clear.
Below Expectations	The methodology chosen is somewhat well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is somewhat clear.
Unsatisfactory	The methodology chosen is not well-aligned with or appropriate for investigating proposed questions. The rationale for using the chosen tools/methodologies is not clear.

Indicator: Presents data and clearly and thoroughly discusses findings, drawing appropriate conclusions therefrom	
Outstanding	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is exceptionally comprehensive and clear. The student draws exceptionally appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Exceeds Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is very comprehensive and clear. The student draws very appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Meets Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is comprehensive and clear. The student draws appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Below Expectations	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is somewhat comprehensive and clear. The student draws somewhat appropriate conclusions from data and findings.
Unsatisfactory	Analysis and interpretation of data and findings is not comprehensive and is unclear. The conclusions drawn by the student do not flow logically from data/findings.

Indicator: Creates a written product that is clear, well organized and grammatically correct	
Outstanding	Organization and documentation are excellent. There are no apparent grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of publishable quality.
Exceeds Expectations	Organization and documentation are very good. There are very few grammatical, spelling, or word usage errors. Overall, the writing is of a very good quality.
Meets Expectations	Organization is good and documentation is acceptable. There is a limited number of grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is acceptable.
Below Expectations	Organization and documentation are marginally adequate. There are some grammatical, spelling or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is somewhat acceptable.
Unsatisfactory	Organization and documentation are not adequate. There are numerous grammatical, spelling, or word usage mistakes. Overall, the writing is of an unacceptable quality.

Indicator: Delivers clear, well-organized presentation of the study	
Outstanding	Presentation is excellent. The student provides a clear and compelling overview of their work and its contributions.
Exceeds Expectations	Presentation is very good. The student provides a strong and informative overview of their work and potential contributions.
Meets Expectations	Presentation is acceptable. The student provides a thorough overview of their work and potential contributions.

Below Expectations	Presentation is marginally adequate. The student provides a partial overview of their work, although the details and/or implications of the work are unclear.
Unsatisfactory	Presentation is not adequate. The student fails to provide a meaningful overview of their work that clearly communicates their work or its contributions.

Indicator: Produces material that is suitable for publication	
Outstanding	It is highly anticipated that journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Exceeds Expectations	It is very likely that journal or conference publications will result from this research.
Meets Expectations	It is likely that conference or journal publications will result from this research.
Below Expectations	It is somewhat likely, with revisions, that journal or conference publications might result from this research.
Unsatisfactory	It is unlikely that journal or conference publications can result from this research.

Dissertation Assessment Form

Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment (DGOA)

Ph.D. in Information Studies

Outcome: Conduct and disseminate novel research/scholarship on a significant problem in the information field.

Student's Name: _____

print name

Defense Date: _____

mm/dd/yyyy

Committee Member Signatures

_____ Advisor
 print name signature

_____ Dean's Representative
 print name signature

_____ signature
 print name

_____ signature
 print name

_____ signature
 print name

Indicators	Outstanding	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Below Expectations	Unsatisfactory
1. Identifies significant and original problem.					
2. Creates theoretical framework based on relevant literature.					
3. States research question(s) clearly and succinctly.					
4. Chooses methodology appropriate to question(s).					
5. Presents data and findings clearly and thoroughly, drawing appropriate conclusions therefrom.					
6. Creates a written product that is clear, well-organized, and grammatically correct.					
7. Delivers clear, well-organized presentation of the study.					
8. Produces material that is suitable for publication.					

Please fill out and sign this form and submit it to the PhD Program Coordinator. Thank you!

Appendix B Doctoral Student Travel Support Application Form

College of Information Studies
University of Maryland, College Park

Instructions:

- The purpose of the Doctoral Student Travel Support is to help defray the expenses incurred by doctoral students who are traveling to scholarly, scientific, or professional events to present papers, posters, or other scholarly material.
- At least two weeks before you travel to the event, fill out this form and the college's "Travel Approval Form."
- Ask your advisor to send the following items *in one email* to the Director of Doctoral Program.
 - This form you have filled out
 - A scanned copy of the "Travel Approval Form" you have filled out and signed
 - Acceptance letter/email from the event
- The Director will notify you and your advisor as soon as the decision is made. If the decision is to support (fully or partially) your trip, please submit the following items to the Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration as soon as you have completed your trip.
 - The original of the "Travel Reimbursement Request Form" you have filled out and signed
 - If you have received full support, please include all of the expenses related to the trip.
 - If you have received partial support, please include expenses that will add up to the total amount the college has allocated to you.
 - In the bottom of the form, please indicate that you would like to charge to "College."
 - A hardcopy of the Doctoral Program Director's email informing you of the support
 - Copies of the expense receipts required for reimbursement (as indicated by * in the "Travel Reimbursement Request Form")
 - If you paid by a credit card any expense to be reimbursed, include a copy of the credit card (front and back) or the card's statement showing the transaction(s).

Date:	Student's Name:
Advisor's Name:	Student's Email:
Explain briefly how attending this event will benefit your doctoral study at the college.	
Will your advisor support your trip with his/her grant? Yes No If yes, indicate the amount of support. If there is no support from your advisor's grant, explain why.	
Have you applied a Graduate Student Travel Award offered by UMD's Graduate School? Yes No If yes, what is the status/decision? If you have not, please briefly explain why.	

