Indiana University of Pennsylvania

IUP Curriculum and Instruction Doctoral Program Handbook
Department of Professional Studies in Education

Handbook Updated August 2019

Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction in Education

Department of Professional Studies in Education
303 Davis Hall
570 South Eleventh Street, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA, 15705

Program Website: http://www.iup.edu/pse/grad/curriculum-instruction-ded/

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP) has an extensive history in the field of education. In 1875, IUP served only 225 students in a single building—the historic John Sutton Hall. It began as a "normal school"—a teacher training program. In May 1927, Indiana State Normal School became a college with the right to grant a teaching degree, and the name was changed to the State Teachers' College at Indiana, Pennsylvania. In 1959, it became Indiana State College and, in 1965, Indiana University of Pennsylvania. With its new university status, IUP was given the authority to expand its curriculum and grant degrees at the master's level, primarily in the educational field. At that time, the first doctoral program—the Doctorate of Education in Elementary Education—was initiated. This degree program was the basis for the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction in which you are now enrolled.

Today, IUP is Pennsylvania's fifth largest university and the largest in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (PASSHE). Current enrollment is approximately 14,000 and includes students from 36 states and over 55 countries. The university is nationally recognized as a "Public Ivy" in company with other public colleges and universities that offer academic environments comparable to those at Ivy League schools but at affordable prices. The College of Education and Educational Technology is fully accredited by the National Council for Teacher Education (NCATE) and the university is regionally accredited by Middle States.

IUP's Civility Statement

As a university of different peoples and perspectives, IUP aspires to promote the growth of all people in their academic, professional, social, and personal lives. Students, faculty, and staff join together to create a community where people exchange ideas, listen to one another with consideration and respect, and are committed to fostering civility through university structures, policies, and procedures. We, as members of the university, strive to achieve the following individual commitments:

To strengthen the university for Academic Success, I will act honestly, take responsibility for my behavior and continuous learning, and respect the freedom of others to express their views.

To foster an environment for personal growth, I will honor and take care of my body, mind, and character. I will be helpful to others and respect their rights. I will discourage intolerance, hatred, and injustice, and promote constructive resolution of conflict.

To contribute to the future, I will strive for the betterment of the community; myself, my university, the nation, and the world.

Mission Statement and Program Objectives

The Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction at Indiana University of Pennsylvania began in the 1960s as a doctorate in elementary education. It is a graduate program intended for teachers/scholars who have demonstrated distinguished achievement as practitioners or administrators in the field of education. The professional degree is conferred upon candidates who have demonstrated the ability to function effectively in the role of teacher educator in college and university settings and have a commitment to the professional development of preservice and in-service teachers. Successful completion of the Doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction signifies that program graduates function effectively as teachers/scholars who understand and apply educational theory, demonstrate competence in curriculum evaluation, fulfill the role of teacher educator committed to working with diverse populations, and conduct independent research that makes a significant contribution to the field of education.

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) (2009a, 2009b) summarizes the purpose of the diverse programs that lead to a doctoral degree in education as follows: "The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession." More specifically, high-quality doctoral programs in education contain the following characteristics:

> 1. Are framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice;
>
> 2. Prepare leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities;
>
> 3. Grant opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships;
>
> 4. Provide field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions;
>
> 5. Are grounded in and develop a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge that links theory with practice and systematic inquiry, and
>
> 6. Emphasize the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2010).

The program leading to a Doctor of Education in Curriculum and Instruction is an applied sequence of courses, experiences, and research for individuals who are seeking to pursue careers in higher education or become curriculum experts and professional development specialists in public, private, and independent schools.

Those who earn the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction are expected to master four areas: educational theory, teacher education, curriculum evaluation, and research methods. The program intends to prepare doctoral program graduates who will

1. Fulfill the teacher educator's role in ways that reflect the highest standards for academic rigor, intellectual inquiry, and professional integrity;

2. Study curriculum as a discipline including the design, implementation, and evaluation of programs in education;

3. Analyze critical issues in curriculum and instruction, both historical and contemporary, as they relate to a broad range of disciplinary specialties in the field;

4. Understand and apply educational theory and research in a variety of educational contexts, basic through higher education;

5. Use technology to develop outstanding college-level courses and programs for professionals;

6. Demonstrate knowledge of adult development, characteristics of adult learners, and appropriate ways of supporting professional growth;

7. Apply knowledge of learners and curriculum to offer exemplary college-level instruction and supervision to practitioners;

8. Master the research skills of the teacher/scholar as demonstrated by professional presentations, scholarly writing, and the successful completion of independent dissertation research.

9. Contribute to the Commonwealth and other educational settings by working effectively and ethically with diverse populations of educators and the children, families, and communities they serve.

Stated generally, the mission of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction is to prepare educators. Most applicants hope to become teacher educators who teach pre-service and in-service teachers, or supervisors of curriculum and instruction in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Some graduates work in higher education with a commitment to the undergraduate preparation of teachers or public school personnel who have responsibility for curriculum and the professional development of practicing teachers. Educators working in related higher education fields may also find the program appropriate for their needs and should discuss their professional goals with the program coordinator. It is not the case that "curriculum and instruction" is a catch-all for any program in any field with any type of educational function. Rather, the D.Ed. earned through the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction is the highest degree in education and, consistent with its mission, it is most appropriate for educators.

Note: The PSE Department also offers a doctoral degree in Administration and Leadership Studies (ALS). Students who seek to become school superintendents will find that this program is better suited to pursuing their career goals than the degree in Curriculum and Instruction.

ADMISSION

The Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction is housed in the College of Education and Educational Technology in the Department of Professional Studies in Education (PSE). It is a degree in education which, if successfully completed, yields a D.Ed., a doctorate in education. Virtually all students in the program have extensive backgrounds in education and classroom teaching experience at some level in the educational system, ranging from early childhood/elementary to middle school/secondary. Some students have teaching experience at the college level as well.

At times, the path of an applicant's career may have brought him or her into undergraduate teacher preparation, such as a person with a degree in mathematics who is teaching at a community college or a person with a degree in music who is working with future teachers. Under such conditions, it is the applicant's responsibility upon application to clearly demonstrate how the mission of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction is consistent with her or his professional goals. One mechanism for doing this is the goals statement that applicants are required to write as part of the process of applying to the School of Graduate Studies and Research (SGSR). An applicant's goals statement should reflect consistency between the mission of the doctoral program and the prospective student's professional goals.

Prospective doctoral students' backgrounds and goals must clearly match the mission of the program. If a student is attempting to make a career change, he or she may need additional work to acquire a background in education (e.g., enroll in masters-level courses in education) before applying to the program. To the extent that the applicant's master's degree program differs from what the Doctoral Screening Committee considers to be a sufficient background for doctoral-level courses in education, the exact number of courses required for completion of the degree may be higher than the 60-credit minimum. Such preparatory courses would not be considered as meeting any of the 60-credits beyond the master's degree doctoral program requirements, however. Decisions about additional coursework will be made on a case-by-case basis by the Doctoral Committee and the Departmental Chairperson and communicated to the student prior to enrollment in the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction.

Applications for the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction are accepted until the beginning of fall semester or until the cohort is full; however, we recommend that applicants begin the process at least one year in advance. Admission to a doctoral program is much more involved than admission to most master's degree programs for several reasons. The Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction requires all applicants to make a five-minute, research-based, video-recorded presentation and submit it to the Doctoral Program Coordinator. This requires applicants to review the literature and prepare carefully for a formal presentation.

A second reason to begin well in advance is so that doctoral students can take advantage of the full range of support mechanisms in place at IUP. For example, some students apply for graduate assistantships, and a student must be officially accepted into the program before any offer of an

assistantship is made. The deadline for graduate assistant applications is March 15th; therefore, a student would need to be admitted to the program prior to that date.

A further reason to begin the admission process early is that, for teachers, there are many school and district policies that may impinge upon doctoral studies. Applicants need to consider their district policies on such issues as tuition remission, sabbaticals, and requirements concerning full-time status. The timing of such long-range plans has implications for the start date.

Finally, it is important to apply at least one year in advance to reserve a place in the cohort. In the approximately 20-person cohort, all students begin their classes together and follow the same sequence of required courses, and admission to the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction is highly competitive. Usually, fewer than half of the applicants are accepted for the cohort. Therefore, it is very important to complete the application process in a timely fashion. After the cohort is filled, a wait list is begun and even highly qualified applicants may not be accommodated.

The Admissions Process
The admissions process involves both SGSR and departmental requirements and includes three components: (1) a review of the applicant's credentials (including a professional goals statement), (2) an evaluation of the applicant's five-minute, research-based presentation and (3) an assessment of the online writing task that is produced in response to a professional journal article. Admissions decisions are made for all applicants based on this process. Students may apply online at this website: https://welcome.iup.edu/grad/Pages/.

It is best to apply well in advance of the start of the semester in order to ensure a seat in the class.

SGSR admission process. The application materials for IUP's Graduate School can be found online at this address:

http://www.iup.edu/admissions/graduate/howto/

The SGSR requires that you create an admissions profile before you begin the actual application process. Be sure to retain login and password information.

Departmental admission process. Once a complete application packet is received by IUP's SGSR, the departmental admission process can begin with its two additional requirements: a recorded, research-based presentation and an online writing sample which is individually scheduled and evaluated by members of the Doctoral Screening Committee using the rubric in Appendix A. For more information on the Department of PSE's admission process, go to
http://www.iup.edu/pse/grad/curriculum-instruction-ded/application-process/

Five-minute, research-based, recorded presentation

> *Select a topic in curriculum and instruction with obvious implications for teaching and learning.* International students should not make a presentation on the educational system in their respective countries. It is also inappropriate to make a presentation on a

master's thesis. This is to be a presentation on current trends and issues in the field of education with a curriculum and instruction emphasis.

Review recent and relevant literature on the topic. Rather than relying on personal experiences, please use the professional literature as support for key points and refer to it during the recorded presentation. Prepare a complete reference list in APA Style, 6th edition (see guidelines at www.apa.org).

Plan a clear, informative, and well-organized five-minute presentation on the topic. Please do not exceed the time limit. Practice until the presentation can be delivered in five minutes without reading from notes. Know the material well so that you are comfortable talking about it. Be certain to mention the sources that support statements made during the recorded presentation.

Please submit this presentation on a CD or DVD, or post it online at a site such as Facebook, Flip Share, or YouTube. If mailing, send it to

Doctoral Program Coordinator Curriculum and Instruction
303 Davis Hall
570 South 11th Street
Professional Studies in Education Dept.
IUP
Indiana, PA 15705

90-minute online writing task

Initiate the task by contacting the program coordinator. Contact the coordinator via email to schedule the writing task after your graduate school application has been made available to the department. The coordinator will provide specific instructions for completion of the task.

Do not submit a sample that you prepared previously. As this exercise is task specific and will be completed via e-mail, do not plan on submitting a writing sample that was completed previously.

Work within the timeframe. Each applicant will be provided with a copy of a professional journal article and asked to respond to it in three sections:

Provide a brief summary. Describe the thesis or main point of the article and analyze the points or issues identified in the article.

Critique. Evaluate the article.

State your perspective. Apply the content of the article to your professional experiences and state your position on the topic or issue.

Please do not merely summarize the article.

Admissions Criteria

Applicants must meet the admission requirements of the SGSR and should refer to the SGSR for the current requirements. The following admission criteria have been established by the SGSR:

- An applicant must have a bachelor's and master's degree from a college or university accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools or an equivalent regional accrediting agency.
- Official transcripts of all previous undergraduate and graduate work are required, even if it did not lead to a degree. Official transcripts bear an official seal and are mailed directly from one institution to another without being in the student's hands. The applicant's undergraduate transcript must show a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.6 on a 4.0 maximum scale if the bachelor's degree was earned five or fewer years ago. If earned more than five years ago, the minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.4 is required. Applicants who do not meet the minimum undergraduate GPA criteria must submit an official Miller Analogies Test (MAT) score of at least 395 to be considered for program admission.
- TOEFL scores are required for international students who do not speak English as their first language unless the student has earned a master's degree in the United States.
- Two letters of professional reference are required from individuals qualified to assess the applicant's potential for doctoral-level work. Usually, these references are former professors and current supervisors in school settings.
- Applicants are required to write a professional goals statement that describes what they hope to achieve through doctoral study.

In addition to the SGSR criteria, applicants to the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction will also meet the following departmental program admission requirements:

- The applicant's graduate transcripts will show a minimum cumulative quality-point average of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale.
- Applicants will submit and be assessed upon a five-minute, video-recorded, research-based presentation on a curriculum and instruction topic and a list of the works cited.
- Applicants will complete and be assessed upon an online writing task that is individually scheduled and evaluated by members of the Doctoral Screening Committee.
- The applicant needs an average score of 2.6 or above on a three-point scale on the presentation, writing sample, and credentials to be recommended for admission to the program (Appendix B).

All of these materials are submitted to the individual student's admissions profile page, not directly to the PSE Department.

Decision-making Process

Upon notification of acceptance into the doctoral program by the SGSR, the student will be classified as a pre-candidate. As a pre-candidate, a student may enroll for classes on a full-time basis (nine credits in the fall and spring semesters and at least six credits in the summer) or a part-time basis (six credits during fall, spring, and summer).

It typically takes several weeks for applicants to be notified of the acceptance decision. The most common cause of a delay in processing applications is that a letter or transcript has not yet been received. Before an applicant's file is scanned and sent electronically to the PSE Department by the SGSR, it must be complete. If a delay is suspected, please contact the SGSR at 724-357-2222 or via e-mail at graduate-admissions@iup.edu to make certain that letters and transcripts have arrived and that the application package was forwarded to the PSE Department.

Applicants will be notified officially about the admissions decision in a letter from the SGSR. If a student's application is rejected, this decision is binding. If an applicant is accepted but space is no longer available in the cohort, the applicant will be placed on a waiting list and contacted if a seat in the class becomes available or when the next cohort assembles.

International Applicants

IUP provides a number of online resources for international applicants. Applicants should visit the SGSR's website for international applicants and the FAQ for International Students webpage. Information for international applicants may also be found on the website of IUP's Office of International Education.

It is important for international applicants to note that the degree awarded through the Curriculum and Instruction in Education Program is the Doctorate in Education (D.Ed.). Some international students are required to earn a Ph.D., so they should check the requirements of their employers and/or government before applying.

It is also important that international students are aware that admittance to the program is limited to starting dates in even years only. This policy is due to the federal mandate that international students must be enrolled on a university's main campus, and main campus cohorts begin only in the fall of even numbered years, i.e., 2018, 2020, 2022, etc. International students on visas cannot begin in the fall of 2017 or 2019, for example, because these cohorts are located at IUP Pittsburgh East or at the Dixon University Center in Harrisburg, both of which are considered off-campus sites. Usually, international students are required to be full time.

International applicants who are speakers of English as a second or foreign language are required to submit scores from the TOEFL or IELTS, taken no more than one year prior to the expected date of enrollment. We look for a minimum TOEFL score of 600 paper-based (PBT), 250 computer-based (CBT), or 100 Internet-based (iBT), and a minimum TWE (Test of Written English) score of 5.0. An ILETS score must be at least 6.0. TOEFL or IELTS scores are not required for students who have earned a master's degree from a college or university in the U.S. in which the instruction was delivered in English.

Information about the TOEFL examination may be obtained by contacting the Educational Testing Service at

> TOEFL Services
> Educational Testing Service
> P.O. Box 6151
> Princeton, NJ 08541-6151, USA

Or by filling out the online form at this link:

https://www.ets.org/toefl/contact/contact_form

IELTS information may be obtained by contacting the British Council at

https://www.ielts.org/info-pages/contact-us/online-enquiry-form
The linguistic proficiency of international students who received their M.A. degrees outside the U.S. is assessed by examining all application materials: the TOEFL/IELTS scores, recommendation letters, goal statement, and the presence of content courses in English on the applicant's transcripts.

International students must also complete an international student preliminary application form and present evidence to the SGSR of having financial resources sufficient to meet the cost of living in Indiana, PA, the cost of travel to and from the student's native country, and the cost of graduate education at IUP. Send evidence directly to the following address:

> Graduate Admissions Office
> IUP
> 101 Stright Hall
> 210 South Tenth Street
> Indiana, PA 15705
> USA

Please note that any international student seeking to become a graduate assistant must have a Social Security card in order to work in the United States. Directions and an application are available online.
For more information regarding Admission Classification and Provisional Admission for International Graduate Application, view the Graduate Catalog at www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/ or the Graduate Admissions website at www.iup.edu/admissions/graduate/

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The Financial Aid Office located in Clark Hall offers financial information and counseling to all students attending IUP. Types of financial assistance offered by the Financial Aid Office include student employment, loans, and scholarships. For more information on scholarships and financial aid available to graduate students, visit the following website:
http://www.iup.edu/admissions/graduate/financialaid/assistantships-and-scholarships/

In most cases, the Pennsylvania State Grant Application is used to determine eligibility for these programs. Contact the Financial Aid office for more information at 724-357-2218 or visit the IUP Financial Aid website at www.iup.edu/financialaid/. FAFSA Forms can also be found online at this link: https://fafsa.ed.gov/

Graduate Assistantships
Each year, the Department of Professional Studies in Education is allocated a limited number of graduate assistantships. The purpose of the Graduate Assistantship Program is to provide mutual professional development opportunities for the graduate student and the faculty mentor. The Graduate Assistant Program is one important way in which the SGSR supports research and scholarship at IUP.

The award of graduate assistantships is based upon academic achievement, not financial need. Graduate assistants must be available to work with a faculty mentor on research or departmental project in return for a modest stipend and tuition waiver. The following is required to qualify a student for a graduate assistantship:

> 1. Admission to the SGSR following the procedures outlined in the catalog.
>
> 2. Successful completion of the Departmental Review Process as outlined in this handbook.
>
> 3. Submission of a GA application to the SGSR by March 15th, and
>
> 4. Submission of the PSE Graduate Assistant application and a current résumé or curriculum vita to the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction Coordinator.

Appropriate activities. Appropriate duties for graduate assistants include

> 1. Conducting library research and compiling a literature review;
>
> 2. Collecting, coding, and analyzing research data;
>
> 3. Supporting innovative projects in the PSE Department, and
>
> 4. Providing support to a faculty member's teaching and supervision (with the faculty mentor present).

Inappropriate activities. The following activities are not appropriate for a graduate assistant:

1. Performing contractual duties of the faculty mentor (e.g., teaching classes without the faculty mentor present, field supervision without the faculty mentor present, covering office hours, advising students);

2. Clerical work that exceeds 10% of the total assistantship assignment;

3. Assisting the faculty mentor with personal/professional tasks (e.g., preparing a tenure or promotion file for a faculty member), or

4. Engaging in an instructor's record-keeping activities (e.g., assigning grades).

It is not possible to offer a graduate assistantship to an applicant until after the person has been officially admitted to the program. For the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction, this means that the student would have (1) a complete application packet, (2) a positive departmental review, and (3) an official admission letter from the SGSR. The graduate assistantship application deadline is March 15th; no contracts are offered until after students are accepted into the program. The PSE Department typically renders decisions about graduate assistantships by early June.

Prospective students who are interested in a graduate assistantship can visit the SGSR website at www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/ to learn more about this program.

Teaching Associate Program
Doctoral students who have been awarded candidacy are eligible to apply for the Teaching Associate program which enables them to be hired as instructors for up to six credits of teaching and/or supervision of undergraduates with assignments in the PSE Department. These appointments, awarded on the basis of academic merit, are for one academic year and are usually made in March for the following academic year.

The purpose of the TA Program is twofold: to provide high-quality instruction to undergraduate students as well as to offer opportunities for outstanding doctoral candidates to acquire college-level teaching experience. The challenges of becoming an effective college-level instructor are formidable. Even TAs with extensive teaching backgrounds in basic education frequently are surprised by how demanding it can be to teach just one or two college classes effectively and often feel much as they did back in their student teaching days.

Applicants considered for these positions must be able to come to IUP's main campus to fulfill their instructional responsibilities. They must be outstanding doctoral candidates and cannot have an incomplete grade in any of their coursework. Those at the dissertation stage must provide evidence of progress toward completion of the degree in order to be considered for a TA position. In addition, individuals with faculty status at a Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education institution are not eligible for a TA position, and students who are paid on another IUP cost code may be ineligible for a TA position.

Mentorship. To support TAs in making this important transition, each TA is assigned a faculty mentor, who earns one credit for the mentorship. The mentoring assignment is made when the faculty member's schedule for the semester is finalized. The value of the mentoring program is that TAs have an experienced instructor with whom they can discuss concerns and strategies for preventing problems and address any issues that should arise. It is essential that the faculty mentor provide the greatest support early in the semester to get the TA's experience started in a positive direction and then continue the guidance through observations and regular meetings with the TA.

Observations. It is essential for the faculty mentor to observe the TA teaching very early in the semester. This can be accomplished by videotaping each course or section of a course to which the TA is assigned and then making arrangements to discuss the mentor's critique of the tapes. Each TA should be observed by the faculty mentor twice each semester in different courses or sections of courses, if possible. The written observations become part of the TA's portfolio, just as peer observations become part of all tenure-track faculty members' portfolios.

Regular meetings. The faculty mentor and TA should arrange a minimum of five meetings during the 15-week semester to review the TA's plans and address any concerns. Meetings should be arranged at times mutually convenient for the mentor and the TA. At least some of those meetings may consist of the TA observing and participating in the faculty mentor's class with a particular goal in mind (e.g., invite the TA to attend when a paper is being returned to demonstrate how to go over the material with students and respond to their questions). It is also recommended that the TA observe other instructors teaching the same course or courses that he or she has been assigned to teach.

Preparation. TAs serve as half-time faculty in the PSE Department and carry out those faculty duties assigned by the department chair, including teaching, supervising student teachers, serving on committees, and so forth.

It is important that TAs begin to prepare for their roles well before the start of the semester by creating a course syllabus and assembling materials for performance reviews. Orientations and support will be offered throughout the TA's service.

Course syllabi. TAs should contact the PSE Administrative Assistant via e-mail to obtain a copy of the syllabus of record that is on file in the main office as a starting point for their syllabus preparation. TAs are responsible for sharing a detailed syllabus for one course as part of their portfolios during their interviews for the TA positions. After the schedule is finalized, TAs' mentors must approve the syllabus before it is shared with TAs' undergraduate students; this means that the TA should contact the mentor and provide a copy of the syllabus for review and critique either via e-mail or mail prior to the start of the semester. Each faculty mentor is responsible for carefully reviewing the course syllabus for each course the TA has been assigned to teach. The faculty mentor should critique the TA's syllabus or syllabi with an eye toward preventing problems, particularly where assignments, assessment practices, and the formula for computing grades are concerned. Learning activities need to be critiqued not only in terms of their appropriateness for students but

also in terms of state and regional accrediting standards. The syllabus is regarded as a contract between the instructor and the students and should not be altered after it is distributed without the approval of all students. The syllabus must conform to the detailed guidelines set forth in IUP's Undergraduate Catalog.

Classroom observations. In preparation for this important role, all TAs in the PSE Department are advised to observe in an undergraduate-level classroom extensively prior to beginning their experience with college-level instruction. For TAs beginning in the fall semester, this can be accomplished by visiting undergraduate courses during the summer or during the years prior to becoming a TA.

Ongoing orientation. The coordinators of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction will hold a meeting to prepare the TAs for the faculty evaluation process. In addition, the coordinators will conduct an orientation meeting for all TAs prior to the start of the fall semester and explain the procedure for conducting student evaluations. The coordinators will also provide additional informational meetings as necessary.

Evaluation procedures. TAs are a special category of part-time employee at IUP; therefore, they are responsible for adhering to all of the practices and procedures specified by the Chairperson of the Tenure and Evaluation Committee. Each TA will be provided with a deadline for the submission of a performance review each semester, including an updated curriculum vitae, mentor observations, and student evaluation data.

Student evaluations. The teaching of every TA in every section of every course to which he or she is assigned as instructor of record must be evaluated using the APSCUF-approved Student Evaluation instrument. In the case of predominately field-based courses such as EDUC 242 and EDUC 342, the faculty mentor will make arrangements to review the TA's evidence of effective supervision. This requirement extends to team-taught courses as well.

Student evaluation data are handled in strict confidence to protect the students and allow them to respond candidly to the questions. These evaluations must be conducted by full-time, permanent faculty, preferably the faculty mentor. It is not appropriate for TAs to conduct one another's student evaluations, nor is it appropriate for graduate assistants to administer student evaluations. Every TA is responsible for arranging, well in advance, for a full-time, permanent faculty member to administer the student evaluations late in the semester. TAs are responsible for having everything prepared— pencils for the students, a control sheet filled out, and the instructor's name, course number, and section on the chalkboard. TAs should carefully read the instructions on the envelope for submitting the student evaluations.

TAs are not permitted to distribute the instrument, be in the room at any time while the students are responding, handle the envelope, or read their evaluations or those of another instructor. All evaluations should be collected face down (with the written comments side up), quickly counted without reading them, sealed immediately, initialed by the full-time faculty member, and taken immediately to the PSE Administrative Assistant. It is not appropriate for the faculty member

administering the evaluations to report anything to the TA concerning the students' responses. In the event that the PSE Administrative Assistant is not present, the envelope should be slipped under her/his office door immediately.

Portfolio materials. TA applicants must submit a recorded presentation to the coordinator of the TA program in the PSE Department and, in addition, a curriculum vitae, mentor observations, and student evaluation data are to be submitted to the PSE Tenure and Evaluation Committee. It is the faculty mentor's responsibility to guide the TA through this process; however, the TA bears responsibility for organizing and submitting the required materials in a timely fashion. This portfolio is due no later than the last Friday in February.

As part of this portfolio, teaching associates should submit

> 1. an updated curriculum vitae,
>
> 2. a letter from their Dissertation Chairperson describing progress made on the dissertation,
>
> 3. a tabular report on teaching, scholarly work, and service activities recorded on the PSE matrix,
>
> 4. student evaluation data using the APSCUF-approved instrument and collected using the approved procedures,
>
> 5. mentor observation reports,
>
> 6. copies of all course syllabi,
>
> 7. sample exams
>
> 8. other supporting documentation as appropriate.

Departmental evaluation. A departmental evaluation is due no later than the second Friday in March. This evaluation should include all of the materials in the portfolio plus the departmental evaluation which consists of a letter written by the TA mentor and approved/co-signed by the PSE Chairperson. These materials must be submitted to

> Dean of the College of Education and Educational Technology
> 104 Stouffer Hall
> 1175 Maple Street
> IUP
> Indiana, PA 15705

College Dean evaluation. The College Dean's evaluation is due by the first Friday in April. The Dean of the College of Education and Educational Technology reviews the Departmental Evaluation and the portfolio and makes a recommendation to the Dean of the SGSR.

Problems and concerns. The faculty mentor assigned to work with the TA and/or the Doctoral Program Coordinator directly responsible for overseeing the TA's academic program (typically the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction) should be notified and involved if any problems arise with the TA's performance as a college-level instructor. If the TA experiences major difficulties in teaching effectively during the first semester, the PSE Department reserves the right to recommend that he or she be discontinued as a TA. TAs will be kept informed of their progress throughout the semester.

In the event that a TA is discontinued for the next semester or academic year, he or she will be notified in writing of that decision at least 30 days in advance of the first class meeting for the next semester or academic year. This decision will be communicated by the SGSR in accordance with the contract for TAs.

Remuneration. A TA may be assigned a maximum of six credits per semester in the fall and spring. The TA earns ½ of an instructor's salary at Step A (approximately $27,000 for teaching 12 credits during the academic year), as well as a six-credit tuition waiver for the summer after completing a year as a teaching associate. Half-time TAs who teach one course each semester (total of six credits) earn approximately $10,000.00. TAs sign a contract and are expected to honor that contract even if other opportunities arise. Although the contract provides for a maximum of two years as a teaching associate, the PSE Department will select the most highly qualified applicants each year; therefore, there are no guarantees of a two-year appointment.

Doctoral students interested in obtaining additional information about the TA program should contact the Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction.

ACADEMIC ADVISEMENT

Role of the Academic Advisor
The coordinator serves as the academic advisor for all students who are enrolled in the Curriculum and Instruction Program. The academic advisor supports students in completing the program by clearly communicating policies and procedures, including course and registration information, and answering questions about program policies and procedures. Policies and procedures are outlined in departmental and university handbooks and communicated through IUP email and official websites.

Student Role in the Advising Relationship
Students are responsible for their successful completion of the doctoral program. Each student must read and understand all IUP policies pertaining to their degree including those policies outlined in the Program Handbook as well as official university websites and the University Graduate Student Handbook. IUP email is the official means of communication with all students. It is each student's responsibility to maintain and frequently check their IUP email account.   Students must keep documentation of their progress throughout the program including but not limited to: successful completion of candidacy, RTAF submittal and approval, successful completion of the comprehensive exam, and IRB approval.

CAMPUS RESOURCES & STUDENT SUPPORT

The School of Graduate Studies and Research: www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/
Graduate Catalog: www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/
Office of the Bursar: www.iup.edu/bursar/
Office of the Registrar: www.iup.edu/registrar/
Disability Support Services: www.iup.edu/disabilitysupport/
IUP Campus Library www.iup.edu/library/
MyIUP: www.iup.edu/myiup/
Applied Research Lab: www.iup.edu/arl/
IT Support Center: www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/
Veterans and Service Members: www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/
IUP Writing Center: www.iup.edu/writingcenter/
IUP Career and Professional Development Center http://www.iup.edu/career/
IUP Parking Services and Visitor Center http://www.iup.edu/parking/
University Police http://www.iup.edu/police/ | 724-357-2141
Crisis Intervention 24/7 Hotline: 1 - 877 - 333- 2470

IUP EMAIL

IUP offers an email account to all active students and is the primary means by with the university will contact a student with official information. All IUP official communications should be carried out through IUP email. It is the student's responsibility to check IUP email regularly. Visit www.iup.edu/itsupportcenter/howTo.aspx?id=23401 to learn more about setting up this account.

GRADUATE STUDENT ASSEMBLY

The Graduate Student Assembly (GSA) represents the graduate student body's interests at IUP and within the Indiana community. The GSA makes recommendations related University-wide and graduate-specific policies and in areas of concern in the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the part- and full-time graduate student. Visit www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/gsa for more information.

PROGRAM AND DEGREE

Doctoral Program
The degree awarded in the Curriculum and Instruction in Education Program is the D.Ed., a Doctorate in Education. Traditionally, the Ph.D. was considered to be more theoretical, while the other education doctorates, such as the Ed.D. and D.Ed., were considered to have a more applied emphasis. Over the years, the differences that once existed in the Ed.D., D.Ed., and Ph.D. have virtually disappeared. Recent comparisons of the curricula in doctoral programs in the field of education suggest that program requirements are equally demanding. The Ph.D. is often more familiar to the general public, however, because it is used in a variety of fields and has been in existence longer.

Students in the Curriculum and Instruction Program usually enroll in the program for part-time study unless they have been awarded 20-hour graduate assistantships. Part-time students are required to enroll in six credits in the fall, six credits in the spring, and six credits in the summer semesters. Full-time students enroll in nine credits every fall, nine credits in the spring, and at least six credits in the summer semesters.

The Curriculum and Instruction Program is offered on a cohort model. In a cohort program, all students begin as a group the same semester and follow the same sequence of courses until they graduate. If, for some unforeseen reason, a student cannot take a particular class with the cohort or needs to drop out of the program entirely, he or she would need to confer with the Program Coordinator about a completion plan in order to complete the program within the seven-year time limit.

Coursework sequence. A total of 60 semester hour credits beyond the master's degree are required in the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction. The course sequence can be undertaken through part-time or full-time study. Please note that all required coursework is delivered in an all-day Saturday format during the academic year and a Friday/Saturday format in the summer sessions.

The credits are allocated as follows:

- 27 credits of required coursework in curriculum and instruction
- 18 credits of required coursework in research methods and scholarly writing.
- Six credits of advanced, graduate-level electives in education or a related field. These courses usually take place in the evenings from 5:20-7:50, online, or during the day in the summer. Any course selected to meet the elective requirement must be approved in advance by the Coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction.
- Nine credits of dissertation

Transfer credits. A maximum of six credits (two courses) may be considered for transfer. Any graduate credits considered for transfer must have been earned after the master's degree was awarded. Secondly, these credits must have been earned within the past five years from a regionally accredited graduate institution, and the student must have earned a grade of A or B or its equivalent (no pass/fail grades can be considered for transfer). Finally, the Doctoral Program Coordinator and the SGSR must approve the particular courses based on the relevance of the course content for the Curriculum and Instruction Doctoral Program.

"Students wishing to transfer credits from another institution while enrolled at IUP must receive advance written authorization for credit acceptance from the SGSR and the academic department" (Graduate Catalog). Finally, it is not until a student has passed the candidacy exam that transfer credit can be evaluated.

When considering courses for transfer credit, students should use them as electives. Online courses and workshops designed for practicing teachers are not suitable as doctoral program electives.

The transfer credits are not figured into the student's grade point average. The Graduate Catalog states, "Only the credit, not the grade or accompanying quality points, will appear on the student's IUP transcript."

The Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction does not award credit for work experience.

After the student has consulted with the Coordinator of the Doctoral Program concerning transfer of graduate credit, the student is responsible for

- Requesting that an official transcript be mailed from the other institution directly to IUP

(copies mailed to the student are not acceptable). The Graduate Catalog states: "To be

considered official, the transcript must arrive in a sealed envelope bearing the official seal of the issuing institution";

- Providing a catalog description of each course and, if available, a syllabus;

- Completing the transfer credit approval form and submitting it to the doctoral coordinator.

As the Graduate Catalog states, "The request is reviewed in the SGSR and the academic department. After a decision is rendered by the SGSR, the Registrar's Office, student's department, and the student are notified of the transfer decision."

Transfer credit is not posted on the transcript until after the student has successfully completed the Candidacy Paper. The credits transfer but the grades do not; thus, transfer credit grades are not calculated with the doctoral candidate's grade point average at IUP. For more information on transfer credit, please consult the SGSR Catalog.

Finally, it is important to note IUP's policy that the last six credits in the student's program must be taken at IUP. Therefore, students cannot complete their last two three-credit courses at another institution and transfer them to IUP. The Graduate Catalog states, "All degree candidates must complete their program's final six credits of graduate work in courses offered by IUP. Under unique circumstances, appropriate substitutions may be authorized by petitioning the dean of the SGSR after obtaining department approval."

Recommended electives. Students should check the class schedule at MyIUP to see which courses are being offered—note that an elective course must be at a 500 level or higher. Although master's and doctoral-level classes throughout the university may be acceptable, the Department of Professional Studies in Education (PSE) recommends departmental courses, including LTCY 600—Foundations of Literacy Instruction; LTCY 644—Issues and Trends in the Language Arts; LTCY 648—Creativity and the Elementary School Child; and LTCY 698—Analysis of Research in Literacy as well as several other options. The coordinator can provide additional elective recommendations.

It is important to check the location where these courses are offered; some are taught online, some in Indiana, and others at off-campus locations. Relatively few courses are offered at Pittsburgh East and Dixon University Center, so students should check the class schedule early and contact their advisor for information on any courses of interest. Another option is to take electives during the summer on IUP's main campus. These courses are often offered in a condensed format, such as workshops or institutes that meet all day, Monday through Friday, for one week.

Doctoral students' progress throughout the program will be monitored and assessed using the system outlined in Appendix C.

Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction Certificate
The Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction includes an additional option of earning the Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction Certificate from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This is an "add on" certificate. In other words, in order for a student to earn the Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction, he or she must already have a valid Instructional II Certificate in Pennsylvania and three years of successful instructional experience.

Certificate requirements. Earning this Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction Certificate requires the student to design, implement, and assess an interdisciplinary curriculum project in the public schools as well as produce a professional portfolio that documents the project. It also requires that candidates pass the required Praxis Test. The portfolio must comply with detailed guidelines set by the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE). Of course, students may elect not to pursue this certificate. International and out-of-state students, for example, cannot choose this option because they do not hold a teaching certificate from Pennsylvania.

This option is available only to individuals with at least five years of professional experience in a recognized instructional area and a valid Pennsylvania Instructional II teaching certificate. Applicants should register for CURR 798 Supervised Doctoral Internship as the six credits of

electives. It is recommended that students wait until at least the second year of the program before initiating this project. The Pennsylvania Department of Education's Guidelines for the District-Wide Supervisory Certificate appear in Appendix D.

Design an interdisciplinary curriculum project. Candidates are required to design an interdisciplinary curriculum project to successfully implement in a school setting. The school's current curricular program and needs should be addressed and a rationale for the curricular change should be submitted as part of the candidate's project proposal. The proposal must also include a scope and sequence of all components of the project and be in accordance with state and national standards. See Appendix E for a proposal outline.

Implement a major curriculum project. Candidates should determine which instructional methodologies and strategies are most appropriate for the implementation of the curriculum project. A rationale for the instructional strategies selected for the project must be included in the portfolio as well as documentation of all instructional methods used.

Evaluate a curriculum project (formative and summative). Evaluation of the instructional service should be monitored by the candidate on an on-going basis throughout the project and documented in the student's portfolio. Evidence of evaluation of classroom observations or other collaborative efforts must be included.

Evaluate students' achievements. Candidates should develop alternative forms of student assessment. These assessments should include assessments that are more authentic and comprehensive in nature than traditional assessments (e.g., more than tests and grades). Documentation of the types of student assessments used in the project as well as actual student samples must be included in the portfolio.

Plan and evaluate professional development. Candidates should identify staff development needs and resources necessary for the successful implementation of the project and work closely with teachers and other school personnel in a professional manner to facilitate the successful implementation of the project. Workshops, in-service, or other collaborative professional development activities should be designed for school personnel where necessary. Resources for the project should be identified and made available to teachers. All staff development activities must be documented in the portfolio.

Create a budget and document expenditures. Candidates should develop a budget itemizing all project expenses. The budget should be submitted and approved before the start of the project. The student must justify expenditures and show how the project expenses fit with the overall school budget.

Use the scoring rubric as a guide in preparing the report. The report must include an executive summary on PowerPoint. The scoring rubric is available in Appendix F.

Applying for the certificate. To fulfill the performance component of the Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction Certification program, students must complete the required 360 hours of field work in addition to preparing a portfolio to document all performance activities. The portfolio should be concise, contain the applicant's original work, and provide evidence of program effectiveness. After all requirements are successfully met, the doctoral candidate can complete the application, pay the fees, and pursue the advanced certificate. The Associate Dean of the College of Education and Technology is responsible for the final recommendation concerning advanced certification, which is then submitted to the PDE. Specific requirements are as follows:

1. Register to take the Praxis Specialty Test for the Advanced Certificate, Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction: Praxis Test 0411 (paper version) or test 5411 (computer version). Testing dates are available from the Career Development Center of IUP's main campus (724-357-4994). Contact the Career Development Center concerning the current cost of the test. To test at other sites, visit the Educational Testing Service website. A student's score must meet or exceed the current cut-off score set by the PDE. Have a score report sent to IUP by listing IUP (R2652) in the Number 1 position as a score recipient.

2. Obtain a copy of the verification of Pennsylvania employment form and complete it. Five years of successful teaching in a Pennsylvania public school is required.

3. Obtain the application form for an advanced Pennsylvania certificate from the PDE website or request a copy from IUP's Office of Teacher Education. Complete the form and write a check for the fee. As part of the application process, an applicant will need to attach copies of any certificates currently held and verify employment (instructions are on the form). Deliver all information to the Department of Teacher Education, 104 Stouffer Hall, IUP, Indiana, PA 15705. Email Judy Geesey at jgeesey@iup.edu or contact her at (724) 3572485 with questions.

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Courses on main campus are delivered in a traditional, face-to-face delivery format and courses at Dixon University Center and Pittsburgh East are delivered in a hybrid format that includes some online and some face-to-face instruction.

Completing the coursework in the Curriculum and Instruction Program requires that students commit to attending Saturday classes as each class meets for three to five Saturdays in a semester. Since students generally must be enrolled for a minimum of six credits in a semester, students should expect to attend class on campus for 6 - 10 Saturdays in a 15-week semester. It is also important to note that there is a substantial amount of work that has to be completed outside of the Saturday class meetings. In preparing for one all-day class, the workload is the equivalent to preparing for three class meetings in the traditional evening graduate class format.

Absences from classes are discouraged since, if a student misses one all-day class, she or he has missed 20% of the semester's class time. Individual faculty members set their policies concerning class absence in their syllabi. Consult with the instructor for the course if, due to some extreme and unforeseeable problem, you must miss a Saturday class.

In addition to class time on Saturdays, doctoral students may be expected to come to main campus for the comprehensive exam and dissertation defense.

Part-time Study

Year One			
Fall	CURR 918	Qualitative Research Design in Education	
	CURR 925	Critical Analysis of Issues in Education	
Spring	CURR 920	Quantitative Research Methods in Education	
	CURR 905	Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum	
Summer	CURR 910	Advanced Topics in Human Development & Learning	
	CURR 930	Effective Teaching and Supervision	
Year Two			
Fall	CURR 982	Quantitative Data Analysis in Education	
	CURR 915	Writing for Professional Publication	
Spring	CURR 935	Democratizing Education: Diversity, Citizenship, & Social Justice	
	CURR 983	Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research in Education	
Summer	CURR 940	Emerging Technologies in Education	
	CURR 951	Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction	
Year Three			
Fall	CURR 945	Literacy: Theory, Research, and Practice	
	CURR 955	Research Proposals and Peer Review Process	
Spring	CURR 960	Comprehensive Evaluation of Educational Programs	
	Elective course		
Summer	Elective course		
Years 4+	CURR 995	Dissertation credits	

Full-time Study

Year One			
Fall	CURR 918	Qualitative Research Design in Education	
	CURR 925	Critical Analysis of Issues in Education	
	Elective		
Spring	CURR 920	Quantitative Research Methods in Education	
	CURR 905	Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum	
	Elective		
Summer	CURR 910	Advanced Topics in Human Development & Learning	
	CURR 930	Effective Teaching and Supervision	
Year Two			
Fall	CURR 982	Quantitative Data Analysis in Education	
	CURR 915	Writing for Professional Publication	
	CURR 995	Dissertation credits	
Spring	CURR 935	Democratizing Education: Diversity, Citizenship, & Social Justice	
	CURR 983	Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research in Education	
	CURR 995	Dissertation credits	
Summer	CURR 940	Emerging Technologies in Education	
	CURR 951	Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction	
Year Three			
Fall	CURR 945	Literacy: Theory, Research, and Practice	
	CURR 955	Research Proposals and Peer Review Process	
	CURR 995	Dissertation credits	
Spring	CURR 960	Comprehensive Evaluation of Educational Programs	
	1 Extended Cr.		

Course Descriptions

Course Number	Course Title	Description
CURR 905	Implementation and Evaluation of Curriculum	Provides students with frameworks for the systematic implementation and evaluation of research-based curricula.
CURR 910	Advanced Topics in Human Development and Learning	Students analyze, evaluate, and synthesize theories of human development and learning. Emphasis is on learning and development throughout the life span.
CURR 915	Writing for Professional Publication	Designed to develop scholarly and publishable writing skills of doctoral students in education. Students produce and submit a proposal for a presentation at a professional conference and develop a full manuscript to be submitted to a scholarly journal and a book prospectus. Skills in responding to editorial feedback, peer review, and public presentation of scholarly work will be developed.
CURR 918	Qualitative Research Design in Education	A core course for doctoral students that introduces four dimensions of qualitative research: understanding traditions and purposes, formulating research questions, and collecting and analyzing data. Students develop the basic skills of the qualitative researcher and are introduced to the major types of qualitative studies.
CURR 920	Quantitative Research Methods in Education	Provides students with the requisite quantitative research skills to evaluate published research in education.
CURR 925	Critical Analysis of Issues in Education	Examines current issues, innovations, and persistent controversies that influence reform in basic and postsecondary education.
CURR 930	Effective Teaching and Supervision	Focuses on the interrelationship between instructional effectiveness and student achievement with particular emphasis on postsecondary teaching and supervision.
CURR 935	Democratizing Education: Diversity, Citizenship and Social Justice	Integrates theory and practice related to the social and philosophical ideology of equity and excellence in education. Focuses on ways in which race, gender, culture, disability, and socioeconomic status influence educational perspectives, programs, and policies.
CURR 940	Emerging Technologies in Education	Focuses on educational applications of technology, from basic education through higher education, as they relate to the college faculty member's role.
CURR 945	Literacy: Theory, Research, and Practice	Examines critical issues and cognitive processes in language learning. Topics include changing definitions for literacy, cultural aspects of literacy, methods of fostering literacy development, and alternative assessment practices. Research and theory on strategies used to support a developmental view of literacy are critically evaluated.
CURR 951	Innovations in Curriculum and Instruction	Designed to provide students with opportunities to critically evaluate educational innovation as it influences programs and outcomes for students. Emphasis is on critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and communication.
CURR 955	Research Proposals and Peer Review Processes	Students refine their written scholarly work based on instructor feedback and peer review. Focus is on dissemination of research through professional conference presentations and publications.
CURR 960	Comprehensive Evaluation of Educational Programs	Provides overviews of models and analytical methods employed to make judgments about the worth and merit of curriculum and educational programs. Students plan, conduct, and report an evaluation study of a curricular program in basic or higher education. The course improves doctoral candidates' ability to make evidence-based curricular decisions at the program level.
CURR 982	Quantitative Data Analysis in Education	Designed to prepare doctoral students to identify, critique, adapt, and design data collection tools that are reliable and valid.
CURR 983	Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research in Education	Guides doctoral candidates in developing the conceptual frameworks that underlie qualitative and mixed methods dissertation research. Students work with data sets to acquire the skills of transcribing, analyzing, and interpreting data.
CURR 995	Dissertation	9 credits

EVALUATION OF STUDENTS

The program's approach to evaluation evolves as students proceed through the program. Students are evaluated through coursework, in which grades are assigned; a candidacy exam, which is pass/fail; a comprehensive exam, which occurs after coursework is completed and is based on the first three chapters of the dissertation; and a final dissertation defense. Students must maintain a 3.5 overall GPA on a 4-point scale in all IUP classes in order to continue in the program. If a student's GPA falls below 3.5, she or he will be placed on academic probation and will be given one semester to bring the GPA up to 3.5; otherwise, the student will be dismissed from the program.

Candidacy Examination and Paper

When first enrolled in the program, students are categorized as pre-candidates. After the successful completion of the first two semesters with an overall GPA of 3.5 or higher and the successful completion of both the written Candidacy Paper (to be submitted on a cohort-specific date in May of Year One) and an oral Candidacy Examination (to be administered face-to-face or using distance education technology on a date communicated by the Doctoral Coordinator), students officially become candidates for the degree. The candidacy process assesses students' abilities to matriculate to the next step of the program in which they will become doctoral candidates.

The candidacy process has four purposes:

   1. To assess the student's ability to identify, review, critique, synthesize, and report on the relevant professional literature;

   2. To evaluate the student's skills in scholarly writing and professional presentation, indicating the potential to successfully write and defend a dissertation and contribute to the scholarly community;

   3. To assess each pre-candidate's strengths and weaknesses and offer recommendations for professional growth, and

   4. To inform a pre-candidate (prior to the completion of 18 credits) if, in the estimation of the C & I Doctoral Committee, the student's work is not indicative of successful program completion.

The candidacy process extends the abilities that were assessed prior to admission one step further. It begins with a domain of interest in curriculum and instruction from the pre-candidate. Although pre-candidates can select the topic, the following are specifically excluded: (1) the topic of papers written for the first four classes, (2) a broad overview of the educational system in another country, or (3) the same topic as a student's master's thesis. Topics must have clear connections to

curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Students are encouraged to think about an area of interest that may hold promise for their dissertation study.

Keys to success. Past cohorts have helped to develop a list of keys to success for candidacy.

Remember the purpose. The primary purpose of the candidacy paper and oral examination is to give you a sense of how you are progressing very early on and to supply you with advice on areas requiring improvement.

Set appropriate expectations. First of all, realize that no one expects a flawless performance at this very early stage in your program. While the faculty members expect you to be thoroughly prepared and to submit an excellent review of the literature, we also want to support you in successfully completing the program and guide your professional development as a teacher/scholar.

Begin right away. First and foremost, do not procrastinate and wait until the last minute to prepare your paper. Give yourself the best chance for success by starting early, revising frequently, and submitting a carefully polished manuscript.

Collaborate with your cohort. Form study groups to rehearse your presentations and gain practice responding to questions. Members of the group can assist one another by critiquing the presentations, raising questions, and so forth.

Familiarize yourself with APA style. You will find APA workbooks that are programmed learning texts at the campus or other academic or online bookstores to assist you in mastering APA style. Realize that published, typeset materials are formatted to make them visually appealing and frequently deviate from the way manuscripts have to be prepared prior to publication. Do not use a journal article as your template. Instead, use the guidelines available according to APA Style.

Use the resources provided. Do not assume that previous work in a master's program fully prepared you to conduct an integrative review of the literature. Take the time to go through tutorials on how to review the literature and make use of the sample candidacy papers (Appendix G). Some sample online sites are linked here:

[Overview of Resources on Conducting Literature Reviews from the University of Arizona](#)

[Conducting Literature Reviews in the Social Sciences An online tutorial for beginners from Adelphi University](#)

[The Literature Review: A Few Tips on Conducting It from the University of Toronto](#)

[Literature Reviews: An Overview for Graduate Students A narrated PowerPoint from North Carolina State University Libraries](#)

As you are reviewing the literature, make an annotated bibliography. This consists of the entire reference, in American Psychological Association style, followed by some brief notes that will

jog your memory about the content of each piece. Doing this will reduce confusion later on and supply you with a study tool for your presentation.

Learn when you should cite sources. Realize that the style of academic writing takes the form of making statements or assertions and then citing appropriate support. For example, if you write "Numerous studies have concluded that…", then you will definitely need to cite more than one source of support. As you write, rely on the research literature rather than your personal experience or your institution's policies and practices. When selecting resources, choose original research (with data, conclusions, and recommendations) rather than professional opinion pieces. Read the summary first for background.

Learn how to manage your citations. There is also a computer software program called EndNote Plus (get the most recent edition) that enables you to manage your citations and prompts you to put them in the correct format. A version of EndNote is available for students free of charge through the IT Support Center and the IUP offers workshops frequently on how to maximize your use of EndNote. See the IT Support Center Webpage for more information.

Avoid plagiarism. Most cases of plagiarism are the result of graduate students being unaware of what constitutes plagiarism and how to properly paraphrase and cite sources to avoid it. Please review resources on plagiarism in the APA handbook and on the IUP website, as well as other sites.

Please be extremely cautious about citing any sources that you consult; this includes not only direct quotations and but also paraphrased passages. It is considered plagiarism if you fail to give others credit for their ideas. Every direct quotation requires the author's (s') last name(s), the date, and the page number (for example, Smith, 2011, p. 14). Every time you refer to ideas that did not originate with you—even if it is not in a direct quotation—you must cite the sources (for example, Davis, 2011; Jones, 2010; Stevens, 2011).

The department uses plagiarism detection software on all candidacy papers. This software results in a score that reflects the exact matches between what you have written and other documents that are already published or have been submitted as student papers. Your score should be below 10% of an exact match with published or previously submitted material; therefore, you will want to avoid lengthy quotations in your work. Note that you will be able to check your paper one time only before it is submitted. Your reference list will not be included in the check to make the score meaningful. Allow plenty of time between the submission of your paper to the plagiarism detection software and the candidacy submission deadline to make needed changes.

Ask questions. First, study the Candidacy Exam section of this document thoroughly. It contains sample papers (Appendix G), the scoring rubric (Appendix H), and details about the paper (Appendix I). If you still have questions after thoroughly reviewing all of these materials, please do not hesitate to contact the Program Coordinator and/or discuss it with your CURR 905 and CURR 918 instructors.

Get approval on your topic and area of focus. Your topic should be sufficiently broad to locate many studies; it should be sufficiently narrow to be treated adequately in a short paper. Avoid encyclopedic topics (e.g., technology in education). Also, avoid extremely narrow topics (e.g., using distance technology to deliver a methods course in language arts to preservice teachers). Somewhere between these two extremes is appropriate. Please e-mail the doctoral coordinator at curriculum-andinstruction@iup.edu with your topic well in advance and before you begin writing.

Define key terminology. Consult the published work of leaders in the field of education so that you can adequately define all key terminology related to the topic of the candidacy paper. Dictionary definitions will not suffice.

Synthesize rather than list. Your writing is being assessed, so excessive use of bulleted lists is not acceptable. To demonstrate your ability to synthesize the literature, we suggest that you select authoritative, scholarly sources; look for patterns of related ideas; identify concepts that are similar as well as disparate, and organize some of the literature into a concept map or graphic organizer. The graphic organizer should not merely repeat what is elsewhere in the paper; rather, it should provide additional sources, organized by themes or strands in the literature. Try to visualize and use those frameworks as a structure for your presentation.

Plan and rehearse your oral presentation. Your presentation will be attended by Members of the Doctoral Screening Committee, who will have read your paper. Faculty members will respond just as they would at a professional conference by making comments, requesting further clarification of points made, or asking questions. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the pre-candidate to have a thorough grounding in the topic selected. The presentation will be timed and you will be directed to stop after five minutes. Be prepared to introduce the topic and focus, highlight the key points of the Candidacy Paper, and go beyond the information in the paper to demonstrate mastery of the topic. Also prepare to respond thoroughly and accurately to questions by citing relevant scholarly sources. You should not use PowerPoint or read from any printed materials. Presentations should be practiced and polished, but you should avoid memorizing and reciting sections of the paper. The best presentations are delivered in a relaxed tone with the student making eye contact with faculty and using appropriate vocal inflections and facial expressions.

Prepare a one-page handout following APA style that helps you remember key points for the oral presentation. You can bring a one-page handout to use to help you remember names and dates during your presentation. Students should be prepared to show their handout to a member of the Doctoral Committee if requested. Include the most important studies in the area and know the major points of each. Do not include sources with which you are unfamiliar. You will be permitted to refer to your one-page handout, but not to the Candidacy Paper, articles, books, or extensive notes during the oral presentation.

Assert, then support. Support the assertions that you make in your written and oral responses with authoritative sources from the literature. Your personal experiences, while important and valuable, are not the main source of support during the Candidacy Paper or Examination. Use the literature to

support your ideas in your paper and in your presentation. Refer to others' works by name during your oral presentation to the faculty.

Understand the evaluation criteria. The Candidacy Paper is evaluated using a scoring rubric. On the day of the presentation, students will be notified orally of the committee's decision. After the student has completed the discussion with committee members, he or she will be asked to step outside so that the committee can compile their recommendations and render a decision. Then the student is brought back in, informed of the committee's decision, and given verbal feedback on ways to improve.

Passing the candidacy paper/exam. In the case of a decision of "pass" and when all other requirements for degree candidacy have been satisfied, the department will recommend to the SGSR that degree candidacy be awarded to the student.

Retaking the candidacy paper/exam. Due to the rigorous admission process, the great majority of students (~90%) successfully complete the candidacy exam. If a student fails the candidacy exam, he or she will have the opportunity to retake the test one time. In the case of a decision of the necessity of a retake, the committee will communicate the reasons for its decision. Students will be supplied with specific recommendations on how to address the deficiencies noted in the written paper and/or the presentation. Students have the option of rewriting the paper and/or making the presentation one additional time. The retake dates will be scheduled in consultation with the Doctoral Program Coordinator and the student. Students who need to rewrite their Candidacy Paper and/or make another presentation are permitted to continue with their summer coursework but cannot begin fall courses until they earn degree candidacy.

A second failure on the candidacy exam terminates the student's enrollment in the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction Program. There is no recourse if the candidacy exam has been failed twice, so students should familiarize themselves with all of the information in this handbook as well as additional materials provided by the department to maximize their chances for success. Two sample papers and the scoring rubric are included in Appendices F and G.

Submitting the candidacy paper. The candidacy paper is submitted by email. Please submit only one copy of the candidacy paper. An electronic copy of the candidacy paper should be sent by midnight on the established date to the coordinator AND clerical support staff as communicated by the Doctoral Program Coordinator

Completing the oral candidacy exam. Individually scheduled to take place approximately two weeks following submission of the candidacy paper.

Comprehensive Examination
The Comprehensive Examination begins the process of writing the dissertation. It is open to interested faculty and other doctoral students. At that meeting, the doctoral candidate engages in discussion with the members of his or her Dissertation Committee concerning chapters one, two,

and three of the dissertation, and a complete research protocol that will be submitted to the Dissertation Committee and IRB.

This meeting gives candidates an opportunity to discuss the study with the entire committee present, make modifications, and gain approval to move the protocol through the departmental and university-wide review process.

Candidates have officially passed the Comprehensive Examination after two conditions have been met: a successful outcome of the meeting with the Dissertation Committee to approve Chapters 1-3, and the protocol, and approval of the protocol by the IRB. After the protocol has been approved by the IRB, the Dissertation Chairperson contacts the Program Coordinator to report that the Comprehensive Examination has been passed.

Dissertation

The dissertation is the culminating piece of a doctoral candidate's degree pursuit and serves as a line of demarcation between those who are good at being graduate students (e.g., can perform well in coursework and experiences directed and monitored by others) and those who are able to be self-directed in completing a major scholarly work. Traditionally, the successful completion of a dissertation is an indicator that you are capable of conducting independent research. It is also considered evidence that you have been socialized into the role of a teacher/scholar. Just as a grade of "A" in student teaching suggests that the student teacher is capable of assuming responsibility in basic education, the bearer of a doctoral degree in education is expected to be capable of fulfilling the expectations for a faculty member in higher education.

Be aware that those pursuing the doctorate in education are particularly vulnerable to succumbing to other demands and pressures because most of them are part-time doctoral students with full-time jobs.

In order to complete this portion of the coursework, a student invites faculty from the PSE Department to serve on a dissertation committee. This selection is made based on the faculty member's eligibility to chair or serve on doctoral committees, specialized expertise, interest in the dissertation topic, and willingness to serve. The Committee Chairperson must be from the PSE Department. However, other appropriate faculty at IUP may become Dissertation Committee members. It is not advisable to invite individuals outside of IUP to serve as one of the three members of the Dissertation Committee; this requires special permission from the faculty union and management.

Role of the dissertation committee. Following admission to candidacy, the student can begin the process of choosing a chairperson for the Dissertation Committee. The chairperson must be selected from among the faculty members in the PSE Department who have been approved by the SGSR to teach doctoral-level courses. An up-to-date list of those faculty are available here:

http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-faculty-and-staff/eligibility-to-teach-graduate-courses-and-to-serve-on-thesis-or-dissertation-committees/graduate-faculty-member-eligibility/

The dissertation committee discusses dissertation ideas with the candidate, responds to the research proposal and protocol, reviews the chapters produced by the student, and renders a decision about whether the substance of the dissertation document and the oral presentation made to the dissertation committee are acceptable. Dissertation committees tend to look at a dissertation study as if they were hearing it presented at a professional conference because that is what they hope for a dissertation—that it might be disseminated in a professional conference. On that basis, they try to anticipate how an audience of experts and scholars might respond to a study and to prepare a candidate for that in advance.

Selecting a dissertation committee. Selecting the members a dissertation committee is an aspect of pursuing a doctoral degree that merits careful consideration. The student who has successfully completed the Candidacy Paper, has a reasonably clear idea for the dissertation, and who has made an effort to become familiar with the research agendas of faculty in the PSE Department who are eligible to teach doctoral courses is in a position to begin this process. It is suggested that doctoral candidates use the following procedures to select their committee members:

Review the list of faculty approved to teach doctoral courses. It is a PSE Department requirement that anyone chairing or serving on Dissertation Committees must be eligible to teach doctoral courses. Doctoral students will have worked with several faculty members in conjunction with the coursework throughout the program. Candidates can learn more about the specialized expertise of the faculty by searching their works online or reviewing their curriculum vitae.

Identify a dissertation topic and an approach to studying the topic. Knowing the topic for a dissertation will enable a candidate to determine who among the faculty has acquired specialized expertise in that area or who might be interested in the topic. It is not expected that your single study will revolutionize education but it should shed light on some aspect of a phenomenon in education. It is also helpful to know the general methodology that you plan to use (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods). Some faculty members have extensive experience with surveys, for instance, while others may have extensive experience with program evaluation.

Understand the role of the dissertation committee. In the PSE Department, faculty members will not "assign" a dissertation idea to you; it is up to the individual doctoral candidate to identify a domain of interest, narrow the topic sufficiently to pose a researchable question, and conduct a study that will contribute to the research literature. Treat the dissertation committee as a panel of experts to whom well-formulated ideas and carefully crafted documents might be presented. It is not the

committee's responsibility to correct rough drafts, rewrite, or direct the candidate specifically in everything that must be done.

Use appropriate criteria for selection. Select individuals who have extensive background in a studied topic or a research method, or at least a keen interest in the particular study that has been proposed. In making these choices, think about instructors who have challenged students intellectually, provided helpful feedback on assignments, or encouraged more serious scholarship. If a student has not had the opportunity to work with a particular faculty member but has heard that this person is an expert on a particular topic, that student should investigate that person's work, share a one-page description of the dissertation study with him or her, and then make an appointment to explore the possibility of that person becoming a member of a dissertation committee. It is not appropriate to trade on friendships and choose faculty merely because they are likable and pleasant. Nor should a dissertation committee be chosen out of a sense of obligation—for example, choosing a person to chair a committee only because that person supervised graduate assistant work. It is also not appropriate to select committee members based on the false hope of an easy or fast dissertation. Realize that the best protection against later criticism is to obtain criticism early from the dissertation committee.

Select the chairperson first. The chairperson is the PSE Department faculty member with whom a student will work most closely. This is the only person who will be monetarily compensated for working on the dissertation; for other members of the committee, it is an uncompensated professional service. Therefore, the expectation is that the committee's chairperson will review all materials before they are shared with other members of the committee. After a chairperson has been identified for the committee, a student should consult with her or him to identify the two remaining members of the dissertation committee. At least one committee member must be from the PSE Department. If a study has a particular aspect that might benefit from the expertise of a faculty member from another department, discuss this with the chairperson.

Avoid inviting professionals from other institutions. Generally speaking, it is not recommended that professionals from other institutions or organizations be invited to serve on a committee at IUP. First of all, identifying committee members who are not IUP faculty requires special permission from the faculty union. In addition, those outside IUP may not know what to expect in terms of responding to lengthy written documents, numerous rewrites, and the logistical difficulties of attending meetings at IUP.

View committee selection as a firm commitment. After three faculty members have agreed to serve on a committee, they will work with the student throughout the remainder of the program. Although a student will work most closely with the

dissertation committee chairperson, all members must agree and be willing to sign off on the completed dissertation. Keep in mind that if a committee recommends extensive revisions to dissertation work, the committee members cannot be "fired" and replaced with another group. Legitimate reasons for changing the composition of a dissertation committee emanate from the committee members themselves, not from the student. Such reasons include retirement, relocation, or major changes in the dissertation topic and/or approach that render the study outside the committee member's expertise. A committee member is free to withdraw from a dissertation committee.

Share a one-page description of the dissertation with prospective committee members. In conjunction with the student's coursework, a very succinct overview of the dissertation study should be developed. This assignment can be put to use in three ways. First, it can be shared with faculty members under consideration to chair or serve on a dissertation committee. Second, it can be attached to the Research Topic Approval Form that has to be submitted to the SGSR. Finally, this one-page document can be incorporated into a protocol for the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Officially appoint a committee. The mechanism for officially appointing a committee is to complete a Research Topic Approval Form with the SGSR. This form officially appoints a committee and includes a one-page description of the study. It requires the signature of each member of the committee, the Program Coordinator, and of the Dean of the College of Education.

If you find you must make changes to you committee. Committee change forms must be submitted at least 15 days prior to the final electronic submission deadline and can be found at this website: http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-current-students/research/thesis-dissertation-information/all-forms/

Registering for dissertation credit. Nine dissertation credits are required for the Curriculum and Instruction Program. In most instances, students should wait until their last year of coursework to enroll in dissertation credit and many students will want to wait until after all coursework is completed. Once students begin taking dissertation credit, they should make measurable progress on their dissertation each semester.

To register for dissertation credits, students must request the credit by sending an e-mail message to Lynnette Colton (lcolton@iup.edu). The message must include:

- Course number (CURR 995),
- Student ID number
- Dissertation chairperson's name,

- Number of credits the student is planning to take (1 credit minimum).

If a student will enroll during summer session, the summer session must be indicated. However, it is rarely advisable for students to take dissertation credit during the summer as IUP's continuous enrollment policy does not require summer registration. Students intending to enroll in dissertation credit during the summer should contact the program coordinator first.

After registering for all nine required dissertation credits and enrolling in no other program coursework, a student will have to pay for one extended dissertation credit every fall and spring until the dissertation is complete. Remember, a student has seven years from the time she or he first enrolled in coursework to complete the program.

DEGREE COMPLETION

Based on national statistics, education majors have the longest time-to-degree average among the disciplines. One explanation for this is that most educators pursue their doctoral degrees on a part-time basis while continuing in their full-time jobs as teachers. At IUP, the great majority of candidates in the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction follow the part-time cohort program sequence, which means that they will be finished with coursework and will have registered for all 60 credits within four years. The amount of time it takes to write the dissertation varies considerably from one doctoral candidate to the next, depending on motivation, persistence, and a host of other influences. Some doctoral candidates finish in as little as four years while others take considerably longer to write their dissertations.

The SGSR sets a seven-year time limit on program completion for doctoral candidates. The seven-year timeline commences when the student enrolls in the program at IUP and begins taking classes. A seven-year limit means that it is not possible to begin coursework, sit out for seven years, and simply resume studies at a later date; the timeline would have expired, along with the credits already completed.

Under extreme circumstances, some extensions are granted, but only with the endorsement of the Program Coordinator, the student's dissertation committee, and the SGSR. Students who are granted extensions must make progress and meet deadlines established by the SGSR. These decisions are made on a case-by-case basis and typically are for no longer than one calendar year.

In addition to satisfactorily completing coursework and the dissertation, you also must assemble an electronic exit portfolio.

Doctoral Candidate Electronic Exit Portfolio
The primary purpose of the electronic portfolio is to document the ways in which respective programs have produced the intended professional outcomes with clients/students and other stakeholders in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The e-portfolio for those completing the D.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction program has three components:

Curriculum vitae. In preparation for the job search, all candidates for the D.Ed. in C & I will produce a professional résumé or curriculum vitae. Please use the Microsoft Word template for a curriculum vitae to prepare this document. All presentations and publications listed must be in correct APA style, 6th edition.

Work sample. During CURR 960, Comprehensive Evaluation of Educational Programs, candidates are required to conduct a program evaluation that is a capstone project representing the culmination of their study and professional training. The work sample is an executive summary of the key assessment from CURR 960 prepared as a PowerPoint presentation. You are required to submit this program evaluation as part of the exit portfolio.

Reflective entry. Prior to admission to the program, all applicants submitted a goals statement to the SGSR. As you near completion of the program, you are expected to revisit your initial goals or other philosophy statement drafted earlier in the program and write a reflective entry that analyzes your professional growth as a scholar (knowledge and skills) and practitioner (professional skills and dispositions).

Submission. Please submit the reflective entry, the work sample, and the résumé (or curriculum vitae) in paper and electronic format to the Doctoral Program Coordinator when you apply for graduation.

Timelines

IUP holds two graduations each year, with one ceremony in December and the other in May. To graduate, candidates must adhere to deadlines associated with the dissertation process.

May and August graduates can RSVP to participate in the May ceremony.

December and January graduates can RSVP to participate in the December ceremony.

<div align="center">

For December Graduation*

</div>

May 15—This date is the deadline for having filed with the SGSR a Research Topic Approval Form.

November 1—This date is the deadline for having submitted a draft copy of the dissertation to the thesis/dissertation office for format review.

November 1—Students must have submitted copies of the signed dissertation signature page and necessary forms/fees to the SGSR.

November 1—Students must have successfully defended the dissertation

November 15—Students must have submitted the electronic version of the dissertation to ProQuest.

December 1—Students must have applied for graduation through URSA//MyIUP (see instructions below)

<div align="center">

For May Graduation*

</div>

August 15—This date is the deadline for having filed with the SGSR a Research Topic Approval Form.

April 1—Students must have successfully defended the dissertation

April 1—This date is the deadline for having submitted a draft copy of the dissertation to the thesis/dissertation office for format review.

April 1—Students must have submitted copies of the signed dissertation signature page and necessary forms/fees to the SGSR.

April 15—Students must have submitted the electronic version of the dissertation to ProQuest.

May 1—Students must have applied for graduation through URSA/MyIUP (see instructions below)

For August Graduation

May 15—This date is the deadline for having filed with the SGSR a Research Topic Approval Form.

July 1—Students must have successfully defended the dissertation.

July 1—This date is the deadline for having submitted a draft copy of the dissertation to the thesis/dissertation office for format review.

July 1—Students must have submitted copies of the signed dissertation signature page and necessary forms/fees to the SGSR

July 15—Students must have submitted the electronic version of the dissertation to ProQuest.

August 1—Students must have applied for graduation (see instructions below)

*If a student intends to participate in a commencement ceremonies, that student must RSVP attendance on URSA/MyIUP.

Applying for graduation. To apply for graduation, a student must log on to MyIUP and follow these steps:

1. At the MyIUP homepage, log into the secure area. When prompted to enter your user ID, enter your four-letter IUP ID.
2. Enter your password.
3. Select Academics in the top menu bar, then scroll down to the Academic Record section and select Apply for Graduation: Graduate.
4. Your IUP official academic record will display your name, IUP ID number, and Program of study. It is important that you check this information carefully, for if a program of study is incorrect, your graduation checkout will be affected. (If your program is incorrect, you must contact the SGSR office).
5. You must select a graduation date. Please note that the online graduation application can only be used until the graduation application deadline. After the deadline date, the online program is not active. If you are applying after the deadline date, you must contact the SGSR to petition for permission to graduate.
6. Your diploma name will bear your full legal name in accordance with the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education Board of Governor's Policy. Your diploma name will be the

same as your transcript name in MyIUP. If your name is not correct, contact the Registrar's office at 724-357-2217.

7. Place the cursor into the address box and type in the address to where you want your diploma sent after you are cleared for graduation. Please note that whatever address you enter here has no impact on the address(es) IUP currently has on record for you. This diploma mailing address does **not** update any address you have with the university. This is strictly for mailing your diploma.

8. Please double check all the information you have entered. If you are satisfied it is correct, click on the gray "Submit" button.

9. The information you have entered will display. Any time you come back to check this "Apply for Graduation," the information you have entered will display. You can **not** update this information online. If you have any corrections after you have submitted your information, you must contact the SGSR in Stright Hall.

10. Please go to the link containing information regarding graduation for the date for which you are planning to graduate. You should refer to this graduation information and be watchful for other information to be mailed to you.

11. Log out of MyIUP.

For more information, view http://www.iup.edu/commencement/graduate/how-to-apply-for-graduation/

Dissertation Completion

Preparing Your Dissertation
Faculty will not sign a signature page unless they feel that the student's thesis/dissertation is acceptable. In addition, the Dean will not sign or accept dissertations for graduation with formatting errors within the body of the document or on the signature page. Therefore, students should follow the IUP Dissertation Manual guidelines carefully and pay close attention to formatting requirements. In addition, a student must submit an unsigned signature page to grad-research@iup.edu BEFORE the defense date so that it can be checked for accuracy and formatting errors before it is signed. Ask the Dissertation Chairperson to double-check the signature page before the defense.

Use IUP's online resources. All forms, templates (including signature page), writing tips, and instructions for submitting dissertations electronically are posted online at this site: http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-current-students/research/thesis-dissertation-information/writing-resources/.

Follow the IUP Dissertation Manual. The IUP Dissertation Manual is available at http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-current-students/research/thesis-dissertation-manual/. Follow the IUP Thesis/Dissertation Manual from the moment that you begin writing drafts of your chapters. The SGSR will not accept dissertations that fail to follow this format. Above all, a student should not assume that he or she

will clean up the formatting later, ask an administrative assistant to make it presentable, or expect committee members to catch all of the mistakes. This research is the student's; therefore, the accuracy of the content, the correct format (including APA style), and the quality of the writing are the student's responsibility. Edit carefully as any mistakes made now will be public throughout an individual's career since the dissertation will be electronically disseminated. With this in mind, many students ask someone who is very knowledgeable and skilled in editing to read the dissertation and critique it for them prior to submitting it to the Dissertation Committee.

Legal names must be used. Students must use the legal name that appears in BANNER on the signature page and throughout the front matter.

Take advantage of formatting tutorials. A format review is required and will be carried out by the SGSR. To help prepare for this review, the SGSR offers in-person formatting tutorials each semester (date/time/RSVP announcements are sent via IUP email). These tutorials are also available anytime on the SGSR's formatting website. While the SGSR will check formatting, they will not check content, grammar, etc.

Prepare the dissertation for review well before the deadline. Theses/dissertations must be sent at least 15 days prior to the final electronic submission deadline and should be sent as a single file to grad-research@iup.edu (file name should include the student's last name).

Avoid plagiarism. All IUP dissertations are uploaded to iThenticate, an online resource that checks for plagiarism. Doctoral students will receive a copy of the iThenticate report. Staff at the SGSR will carefully review the report; instances of potentially significant plagiarism will be invested for violations of IUP's Academic Integrity Policy.

Note: The SGSR will accept only one signature page for the Dean's signature.

Defending the Dissertation

For the defense, a student should give a 10–15-minute presentation followed by questions/discussion. The presentation should follow the format of the dissertation's chapters, only in condensed form—statement of the problem, etc. Students can use PowerPoint and should copy any tables or charts that are especially useful—having the defense available in electronic as well as paper copies is advisable. A student should use the same approach as if presenting at a major conference—hit the highlights and anticipate some of the questions that might be raised. The student is the expert on the study and no study is perfect. The best approach is to admit to its shortcomings and recommend future studies that would help to "round out" the picture of this issue from a research perspective.

The dissertation defense will be attended by members of the dissertation committee and, as defenses are open in this program, other university faculty and students may attend as well. As with the candidacy oral exam, faculty members will respond to the presentation by making comments, requesting further clarification of points made, or asking questions. While dissertation defenses are open, those outside of the committee must leave the room while the committee discusses whether the dissertation passes, passes with revisions, requires minor or major revisions, or fails.

The dissertation defense must occur no later than 15 days prior to the final electronic submission deadline to allow time for making the committee's required changes AND meeting the SGSR's deadlines.

For more information regarding dissertation preparation, view the following website: http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-current-students/research/thesis-dissertation-information/finishing-your-degree/preparing-and-submitting-theses-and-dissertations/

EVALUATION OUTCOME FOR DISSERTATION

A successful dissertation defense is based on the candidate's ability to present orally and in writing a dissertation that makes a contribution to the research literature. Similar to the evaluation guidelines for the comprehensive exam, the dissertation committee will consider the following questions in evaluating the dissertation and assigning a judgment of pass, pass with revisions, revise and resubmit, or fail:

1. Does the candidate present a clear statement of the problem?

2. Is the problem significant? In other words, can the candidate justify in writing why the problem needs further study. What arguments are presented? Is there a logical sequence to the argument?

3. Are the candidate's research questions clear and do these questions address the research problem?

4. Does the candidate establish a theoretical position? The theoretical position should include citations and should establish a logical argument of why the study is needed.

5. Does the candidate synthesize the professional literature in order to establish a thorough background and rationale for why the study was done?

6. Is there evidence that the candidate read and interpreted research articles and then presented arguments showing how the articles relate to the overall research problem?

7. Is the literature review comprehensive and related to the purpose of the study?

8. Has the candidate identified, described, and implemented research methods that are feasible and appropriate for the study?

9. Does the candidate accurately present the research findings?

10. Does the candidate present a discussion of the findings in relation to the existing literature?

11. Are appropriate recommendations made for others in the field and for future research?

12. Is the significance of the study made clear?

13. Does the candidate communicate effectively in writing (e.g., professional writing skills that follow the conventions of the English language, use of APA, clear and succinct writing)?

14. Does the candidate communicate effectively in the oral presentation (e.g., uses proper grammar, clearly describes the study, is succinct and concise)?

Effective for students admitted in and after fall 2017. Dissertation credits will be assigned a grade of pass or fail as the final evaluation outcome for the taken credits and carry no quality points weighted towards a student's CGPA.

Ongoing dissertation students admitted prior to fall 2017. Dissertation credits will be assigned a letter grade as the final evaluation outcome for the credits taken and carry quality points weighted towards a student's cumulative GPA (CGPA) for the number of dissertation credits required for the program. Extended dissertation credits are not calculated into a student's CGPA.

For more information, view this information on extended credits:
http://www.iup.edu/bursar/tuitionfees/doctoral%E2%80%93mfa-degrees--dissertation-extended-credit-registration/

UNIVERSITY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The university policy is the baseline policy in all programs. Programs may have policy that is more stringent than the university's baseline policy; however, those policies may not be less stringent than the university's baseline policy. For questions regarding this statement, please contact the Curriculum and Instruction Program Coordinator or the SGSR.

Academic Calendar
View the IUP Academic Calendar: www.iup.edu/news-events/calendar/academic/

Academic Grade Appeal Policy
For information regarding the grade appeal policy, view the Graduate Catalog: www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/

Academic Integrity
Any issues occurring within a classroom, class-related activity, or class-related function fall within the Academic Integrity Policy and are referred to the Provost's Office. Issues that are non-class related are referred to the Judicial Board.

The Academic Integrity Policy provides a meaningful process to address various levels of student conduct that impact the academic process and ensures the students receive due process for more serious cases of academic violations. IUP's Academic Integrity Policy has been approved by the University Senate, the president, and the Council of Trustees.

Questions or concerns regarding Academic Integrity should be referred to the Provost's Office at 724-357-3001.

Academic Status and Satisfactory Academic Progress
For more information, view the following website:
http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/financial-information/satisfactory-academic-progress-policy/

Affirmative Action
Indiana University of Pennsylvania is committed to providing leadership in taking affirmative action to attain equal educational and employment rights for all persons, without regard to race, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, physical handicap, or affectional or lifestyle orientation. This policy is placed in this document in accordance with state and federal laws including Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, Sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as well as federal and state executive orders. This policy extends to disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era. Please direct inquiries concerning equal opportunity to: Office of the Provost, 205 Sutton Hall, 1011 South Drive, IUP, Indiana, PA 15705-1046, USA.

Bereavement-Related Class Absences

For Information regarding the Bereavement-Related Class Absences policy, view
http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/university-policies/academic-policies/bereavement-related-class-absence-policy/

Continuous Graduate Registration for Dissertations*

*Note: This policy is effective for students admitted fall 2017 and after. Masters thesis, MFA thesis and doctoral dissertation students beginning the program in the fall of 2017 and thereafter must adhere to the following Continuous Graduate Registration policy for Dissertations.

Following the completion of all course work, including internships or practicums but excluding comprehensive exams or qualifiers, **all** doctoral students must be continuously enrolled for at least one credit of dissertation or thesis work each semester (Fall and Spring) annually through the graduation of the student or until the time limit is exceeded. There is to be no separation between the completion of course work, an internship, or a practicum and the initiation of dissertation credit registration.

Once the student has registered for the number of dissertation credits required by the program of study (typically nine or twelve), or the number of thesis credits required by their program of study (typically three to six), she or he must register for one dissertation or one thesis credit each semester (Fall and Spring) annually through the graduation of the student or until the time limit is exceeded (See Time Limitation Policy for doctoral or master's students). For this period, the student will be considered a full-time doctoral or masters student.

All dissertation and thesis credits will be pass/fail credits. Students must complete the minimum number of dissertation credits required by their program, but may take additional dissertation or thesis credits as is necessary to comply with the Continuous Graduate Registration for Dissertation and Thesis policy.

Until the dissertation or thesis is successfully defended, a grade of "R" will be assigned to each registered credit. Upon successful completion of the dissertation or thesis, the grade assigned by the dissertation or thesis director will apply to all registered dissertation or thesis credits. Students must pay tuition and mandatory university fees for all credits (equal to the part-time mandatory fees), and may choose to pay the Wellness Fee.

*Note: Admissions prior to fall 2017: doctoral dissertation students beginning the program prior to fall 2017 will follow the former Extended Credit Registration policy which applies to doctoral and MFA students only.

Following the completion of all course, language, and skill requirements and of the comprehensive examination requirement where applicable, doctoral and M.F.A. students must enroll for at least one credit of dissertation or thesis each semester (Fall/Spring). *(Note from the C&I Department: Students in the C&I program must be registered every fall and spring semester for either course work, or once done with course work, dissertation credit including during work on the comprehensive exam because the comprehensive exam is dissertation work.)*

Once the student has registered for the number of dissertation credits required by their program of study (typically nine or twelve), or the number of thesis credits required by their program of study (typically three to six), she or he must register for one extended credit each semester (Fall and Spring) annually through the graduation of the student or until the time limit is exceeded (See Time Limitation Policy for doctoral or master's students). For this period, the student will be considered a full-time doctoral or M.F.A. student.

Until the dissertation or thesis is successfully defended, a grade of "R" will be assigned to each registered credit. Upon successful completion of the dissertation or thesis, the grade assigned by the dissertation or thesis director will apply to all registered dissertation or thesis credits, including the extended credits. Students must pay tuition and mandatory university fees for all credits (equal to the part-time mandatory fees), and may choose to pay the Wellness Fee.

Grades earned for dissertation and thesis credits will remain part of the cumulative grade calculation; however, grades posted for extended credit registration will be excluded from the cumulative grade calculation.

Note: The Continuous Dissertation policy has been in place since 1990. Students failing to register as directed by this policy will be registered by their program coordinator and billed accordingly. If it is the doctoral or M.F.A. student's intent to quit the program, he/she should schedule an appointment with the graduate coordinator as soon as possible to avoid any further registration and subsequent assessment.

For more information regarding the SGSR policy on continuous registration for dissertation credits, please visit http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/university-policies/academic-policies/continuous-graduate-registration-for-dissertation-and-thesis/

Graduate Fresh Start Policy
A graduate student who has been separated from the university as a result of academic dismissal, including time-to-degree dismissal, may only apply for readmission to the University if the student has been separated from the university, for a minimum of two calendar years (24 consecutive months) from the date of dismissal. The request to be considered for readmission to the University must be into a graduate program, and readmission to the program from which the student was dismissed may not be sought. A student dismissed as a result of an academic integrity violation is barred from utilizing the Graduate Fresh Start Policy to request readmission.

Conditions for a Graduate Fresh Start application. A graduate student may apply for a Graduate Fresh Start only if he/she meets all of the following conditions:

- he/she was academically dismissed, including time-to-degree dismissal, from an IUP graduate program;
- he/she has been separated from the university for a minimum of two calendar years (24 consecutive months); and
- he/she will apply for readmission consideration to a graduate program at IUP, excluding the program from which the student was academically dismissed.

The graduate student must apply to the desired program through the standard admissions process. Having reviewed the prior and intervening factors for evidence of potential for improved academic success, the program coordinator, after departmental review, may recommend to the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research that the student be readmitted to the University and admitted to the program. The Dean's decision is final and is not subject to appeal.

Conditions for a Graduate Fresh Start record. All credits and grades for IUP course work taken before readmission under this Graduate Fresh Start Policy shall remain on the transcript. Upon readmission, a new cumulative GPA is established based on credits and grades earned from the date of readmission. Individuals may seek readmission to the University though the provisions of this policy only once.

Prior record. The student's graduate record will be identified as a Graduate Fresh Start. No graduate credits earned from the program in which the student was dismissed are permitted to be transferred to the Graduate Fresh Start sought degree. Any other transfer credits must meet the IUP Transfer Credit Policy.

Students seeking a degree under the Graduate Fresh Start are not permitted to repeat a previously taken course from the program in which the student was dismissed and have it count towards improving the previous CGPA that was prior to readmission. Any course repeat(s) will be counted as a course taken under the Graduate Fresh Start and applied solely to the new degree sought and new cumulative GPA.

Academic standards. A student who is readmitted under the provisions of the Graduate Fresh Start Policy shall be required to meet current degree requirements. He/she shall be academically reviewed under the policies published in the academic catalog at the time of re-matriculation. Students readmitted to the University under this policy and who were dismissed initially by exceeded time-to-degree requirements may not be granted extensions of time-to-degree requirements.

Graduation Graduate Residency Requirement Policy

Doctoral residency requirements are determined at the program level. All courework must be taken at IUP with the exception of six elective credits. Students in the C&I program may transfer up to six credits to fulfill special elective requirements. All transfer credit must be approved by the program coordinator

Note that these set the minimum number of credits that must be taken "in residence" and that universities can limit the number of hours that will be allowed to transfer into a graduate program.

Active-duty service members who are graduate students will be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Exceptions are to be approved by the Office of the Chancellor's Division of Academic and Student Affairs.

Program Level Exams Appeal Policy.
Appeals for Program Level Exams, such as candidacy, comprehensive, or qualifying examinations, are made to the Dean of the SGSR based on policy and/or procedural violations. The appeal can be based only on policy and/or procedural violations and not simply on the outcome of the examination. Procedural violations would be cases in which the program/department failed to follow program/department and/or university policies and/or procedures relating to the administration and/or evaluation of the exam.

The appeal must be made in writing to the Dean of the SGSR. Documentation of the policy(ies)/procedures in question must be provided, along with a detailed description of the alleged violations(s). All evidence supporting the alleged violation should also be provided. The student must submit the written appeal to the Dean of the SGSR within 30 days of receipt of the outcome of the examination.

Upon receipt of the written appeal to the Dean of the SGSR, the Dean will conduct an investigation of the allegation, review the documentation and render a final decision which completes the appeal process. **The final decision rendered by the Dean of the SGSR may not be appealed.**

If it is found that policy/and/or procedure has been violated, the Dean of the SGSR will instruct the program/department to allow the student to retake the exam, fully adhering to policy and procedures. In the event of a finding in support of the student allegation, the reexamination may not be counted as one of the attempts permitted under the University or Department's Reexamination Policy.

Reexamination Policy: Candidacy/Comprehensive Examination
No student is permitted a "third" examination without a recommendation to that effect from the degree program's sponsoring department per their adopted written procedures and the approval of the Dean of the SGSR (or designee). Exceptions to this policy for programs can be made only with the approval of the SGSR.

Registration
Registration for all classes is the responsibility of the student. When officially admitted, the applicant will receive a letter with all of the information needed to register online at the MyIUP section of IUP's website.

For the first semester, the program coordinator will provide an Alternate Pin Number, also called ALT or ALT PIN. This is the registration password. Once logged on to the registration system, the

student will be asked to enter the ALT PIN number. Since this is a cohort program, the student will need to register for the required courses every semester—fall, spring, and summer. Note that all Pittsburgh East Campus sections of courses are labeled as a 501 or 502 section and all Dixon University Center sections are labeled as a 601 or 602, so be certain to register for the correct section.

After the first semester, the advisor will send an e-mail with the ALT PIN number. Students should be sure to save the registration email just in case there is a problem with registration.

IMPORTANT: This process must be completed by the deadline posted online to avoid paying a late fee. Note that the start date for Saturday classes is after the semester begins. Therefore, students must register before the semester officially begins for IUP. These dates are listed on the academic calendar section of IUP's website.

Academic Calendars, Official Holidays and Breaks
The Registrar's office issues the academic calendar for the university. Although much of the information does not pertain to students enrolled in Saturday classes, students can use the calendar to anticipate times when faculty will not be expected to teach and may not be available, such as fall break, winter term, spring break, and semester breaks. Students should plan vacations around these times. The department tries to avoid scheduling classes during the first three weeks of August so that students can make summer vacation plans.

For more information regarding registration and tuition billing, please contact the Office of the Bursar: www.iup.edu/bursar/

Social Equity
The Office of Social Equity works to assist in the creation of a campus environment that promotes diversity and values individual differences. For more information on the Office of Social Equity and what it does, visit www.iup.edu/socialequity/

Student Conduct

The Office of Student Conduct supports the academic mission of the university by promoting the development of a campus community characterized by reasonable safety and security, responsible behavior, civility, and respect.

Policies from the Office of Student Conduct can be found at www.iup.edu/studentconduct/policies/

IUP Email Communication Policy
IUP provides e-mail services to all students and employees as an official form of university communication. Students maintain the responsibility to regularly read their IUP e-mail account and, if electronically responding to or sending e-mail regarding official IUP matters, use their IUP e-mail account to do so.

Information officially communicated to students through their IUP e-mail accounts includes billing invoices and information addressing academic, student conduct, student safety, and emergency matters. Students are expected to regularly use their IUP e-mail account and should check it daily.

Student Behavior Regulations.
The primary function of the student conduct system is to resolve alleged policy violations by students that occur on campus. The university reserves the right to address violations by students in off-campus locations when those violations might adversely affect the university community. The university maintains the right to amend its rules and to make such amendments effective immediately upon appropriate public notification of students. It is the responsibility of each student to become familiar with these regulations.

The Source.
The Source is a student policy guide which is intended as a one-stop resource for all that you need to know about the university. Not only does it contain information regarding IUP policies and procedures, but it also offers helpful information about university services and activities and the Indiana community. In addition, IUP's Civility Statement and our statement of student rights and responsibilities provide the framework for your role as an IUP citizen. You can find the online version of *The Source* at http://www.iup.edu/studentaffairs/student-policy-index-a-z/

Student Rights and Responsibilities.
IUP's student rights and responsibilities are extensive. Please visit this website for more information: http://www.iup.edu/studentconduct/policies/

Time Limitations
Doctoral candidates must complete degree requirements no later than seven years after beginning IUP doctoral program course work. No time extensions are considered for doctoral students unless all degree requirements other than the dissertation (including the approval of the research topic and IRB, if needed) have been completed by the expiration of the seven-year time limit.

For more information regarding SGSR policy on registration, view this site: http://www.iup.edu/registrar/students/graduate-students/

Time-to-Degree Doctoral Dismissal Appeal Policy
A student dismissed from a program because of time-to-degree expiration (see Time Limitations policy) can appeal the decision to the Dean of the SGSR, based on policy and/or procedural violations. The appeal can be based only on policy/procedural violations.

The appeal must be made in writing to the Dean of the SGSR. Documentation of the policy(ies)/procedures in question must be provided, along with a detailed description of the alleged violations(s). All evidence supporting the alleged violation should also be provided. The student must submit the written appeal to the Dean of the SGSR **within 30 days** of receipt of the dismissal letter.

Upon receipt of the written appeal to the Dean of the SGSR will conduct an investigation of the allegation, review the documentation and render a final decision **which completes the appeal process. The final decision rendered by the Dean of the SGSR may not be appealed.**

If it is found that policy/and/or procedure has been violated, the Dean of the SGSR will rescind the dismissal.

Doctoral candidate time limitation (see Time Limitations policy) may be extended through student petition. The program coordinator on behalf of the student, no later than the first day of the month of the student's time-to-degree expiration date, makes the request to the Dean (or designee) of the SGSR. The request must include justification for the extension. Official documentation will be required to justify the requests for the extension and amount of time by the Dean (or designee) of the SGSR to support the request.

No time extensions are considered for doctoral students unless all degree requirements other than the dissertation (including the approval of the research topic and IRB, if needed) have been completed by the expiration of the seven-year time limit (see Time Limitations policy).

Title IX Reporting Requirement
For more information regarding Title IX Reporting Requirement policy, view the Title IX policy at IUP: http://www.iup.edu/socialequity/policies/title-ix/

Transfer of Credits (effective fall 2017) Policy
A student may transfer up to six graduate credits from another institution, with Department approval of the required credits for the graduate student's program at IUP. These graduate courses must have been taken from a regionally accredited institution, within the past five years, and the grade earned must be a "B" or its equivalent or better. The time limitation rule and residency requirements pertain without modification to transfer credits.

Up to **six** graduate credits originally earned in one graduate program at IUP may be applied toward a different graduate program if: 1) the receiving department and 2) the SGSR both approve the credits as meeting degree requirements. These courses must have been completed within the past five years, and the grade earned must be a "B" or its equivalent or better.

The combination of transfer graduate credits earned at another institution and those earned at IUP may not exceed **six** of the total required graduate credits for the program.

To request transfer credits, the student must complete the Request for Graduate Transfer Credit Review form and follow the instructions listed on the form. A catalog course description or course syllabus must accompany the request. An official graduate transcript showing the earned graduate credits must be provided by the

school at which the credits were taken. To be considered official, the transcript must arrive in a sealed envelope bearing the official seal of the issuing institution. The request is reviewed in the SGSR and the academic department. After review, the student's program coordinator and the student are notified of the transfer decision.

If graduate credits earned at another institution are approved for transfer, only the credit, not the grade or accompanying quality points, will appear on the student's IUP transcript.

Graduate credits earned at IUP that are approved for transfer to a second program will not be posted to the transcript a second time.

For more information regarding SGSR policy on transfer credits and forms required to request credit transfer, see http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/resources-for-current-students/forms/requesting-graduate-transfer-credit/

RESEARCH

Applied Research Lab
Research courses are a required part of the Curriculum and Instruction Program's sequence of classes. To support students' and faculty members' research, the Applied Research Lab (ARL) is available to all in the IUP community on an appointment basis. The ARL is a free research consulting center dedicated to providing expert assistance to the IUP research community. The ARL also aims to increase research competencies by offering a variety of workshops, demonstrations, and tutorials throughout the academic year. More information on the ARL and making an appointment for assistance with research can be found at www.iup.edu/arl/

IUP Libraries
In addition to using the library building and its resources, students can access the IUP Library Services online. The webpage provides links to all of the IUP Library's electronic resources and services and is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Nearly all the databases can be accessed by using the computer login and password that you established to log on to an IUP site. Students can manage IUP passwords through the Personal Information Section of the MyIUP portal. If problems arise when accessing library resources, contact the Library Circulation Desk at 724-357-2340 or the Library Reference Desk at 1-800-836-8815.

STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

For more information regarding student rights and responsibilities, view http://www.iup.edu/graduatestudies/catalog/university-policies/academic-policies/student-rights-and-responsibilities/

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Criteria for Evaluation of Research-based Presentation and Online Writing Task

Applicant's Name:_____

| Rating Scale: | 3=Target | 2=Acceptable | 1=Unacceptable |

►RECORDED, RESEARCH-BASED PRESENTATION

The doctoral applicant

Is thoroughly prepared	3	2	1
Is clear and concise	3	2	1
Refers to the relevant professional literature during the presentation	3	2	1
Cites professional readings to support ideas	3	2	1
Speaks (rather than reads) the presentation	3	2	1
Provides a reference list correctly prepared in APA style	3	2	1

► ONLINE WRITING TASK

The applicant's writing sample

Is clear and logical	3	2	1
Is concise and to the point	3	2	1
Responds to the questions (e.g., define, evaluate, apply, state a position)	3	2	1
Shows promise for doctoral-level study in the overall writing style	3	2	1
Demonstrates general knowledge of the field	3	2	1

DECISION

    Definitely Accept   **Accept with**   **Reservations**
Reject

DSC member's signature and date

If rejected, please provide justification:

APPENDIX B: Application Checklist

Submit the following items to the School of Graduate Studies and Research 101 Stright Hall, IUP, Indiana, PA 15705

_____1. Complete the application form (online or in hard copy) and pay the application fee.

_____2. Submit official transcripts (sent from school to school in a sealed envelope) for all college-level study. Grade point average on a 4-point scale where 4 = A must be 2.6 or higher for undergraduate (see admission criteria on the SGSR website) and 3.5 or higher for graduate study.

_____3. International students without a master's degree from the United States must submit TOEFL [Minimum TOEFL score of 600 paper-based (PBT), 250 computer-based (CBT), or, 100 Internet-based (iBT), and a minimum TWE (Test of Written English) score of 5.0. ILETS score must be at least 6.0].

_____4. Two letters of *professional/academic* reference, written by those qualified to assess the applicant's potential for doctoral study.

_____5. A goals statement from the candidate that explains reasons for pursuing the doctorate and professional plans.

ADDITIONAL DEPARTMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

Note: These two items are evaluated after the application packet described in items 1-5 has been received.

_____6. A recorded, 5-minute, research-based presentation on a curriculum and instruction topic and a reference list in APA style of the works cited. Submit directly to the Doctoral Program Coordinator, 303 Davis Hall, 570 S. 11th Street, IUP, Indiana, PA, 15705, or post it online.

_____7. Complete the online writing task that requires the applicant to read a professional journal article, analyze it, critique it, and state a position on the issue. This occurs during a 1.5 hour time period. The applicant's response is e-mailed by the end of the time allotted for completion.

APPENDIX C: Assessment System for the Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction

Decision Point	Criteria	Evaluators
Application	Two letters of reference (professional, academic)	Doctoral Program in Curriculum and Instruction Screening Committee (DSC)
	Minimum overall GPA of 3.5 in master's degree program from an accredited institution	
	Independent review of applicant's credentials, including goals statement and educational experience	
Admission	Decision to interview or reject communicated to SGSR by doctoral coordinators	
	Quality of applicant's formal, research-based, five-minute recorded presentation	Doctoral Program Coordinator
	Online writing sample in which applicant summarizes, critiques, and takes a position on the content of a professional journal article	DSC
	Applicant's writing is reviewed independently by members of the DSC. Applicant's writing is assigned a number to preserve anonymity during evaluation	Doctoral Program Coordinator

Upon successful completion of the process outlined above, students are categorized as pre-candidates.

Candidacy	Pre-candidates select an educational issue, write an integrative literature review, and make a formal presentation	DSC
	The pre-candidate's performance on the paper and presentation is scored by members of the DSC using the scoring rubric	

The pre-candidate leaves the room while the DSC deliberates and renders a decision. The pre-candidate returns and the DSC's decision is communicated. Students who pass and have earned a minimum 3.5 GPA overall in coursework become candidates for the degree. This decision is communicated to the SGSR by the Doctoral Program Coordinator.

Upon successful completion of all coursework and the Candidacy Paper and Oral Presentation, students are categorized as candidates for the doctoral degree in Curriculum and Instruction.

Internship/Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction Certificate Option	Candidates who have a valid Pennsylvania Instructional I or II certificate and five years of public school teaching may elect to apply for the advanced certificate. The required six-credit course, CURR 798 Supervised Doctoral Internship, is tailored to the PDE portfolio requirements. Candidates must provide evidence of meeting the criteria, including evidence of employment, passing scores on the PRAXIS exam, and endorsement of the Internship Supervisor via letter submitted to the Associate Dean for Teacher Education that is based on a review of the candidate's portfolio and supporting evidence using the scoring rubric. Students who do not elect to pursue advanced certification typically use CURR 798 to gain experience in teaching/supervising at the college level or a research/service project.	Internship Supervisor (supervisors must be PSE faculty-approved to teach at the doctoral level)
Research Topic Approval Form	Candidates select their dissertation committee consisting of three faculty members approved to teach at the doctoral level; *at least two members must be PSE faculty.* A one-page description of the study is required.	Form requires the Program Coordinator's and College of Education and Educational Technology Dean's signature.

Comprehensive Paper	Consists of the research protocol and Chapters 1 and 2 of the dissertation	Dissertation Committee meets to review these documents. The Dissertation Committee functions as the Departmental Review Board.
Review of Protocol	The IRB for the Protection of Human Subjects requires that all studies undergo review. *All forms and several examples are posted online at the SGSR website*.	The IRB evaluates the protocol. If acceptable, the student is approved to begin the dissertation.
Application for Graduation	Must be completed by these deadlines: March 1st for May graduation; June 1st for August graduation; October 1st for December graduation.	SGSR
Dissertation	Chapters I-V, approved by all three members of the candidate's committee. Submit sample pages to the SGSR for approval of format well before the deadline.	Dissertation Committee
Dissertation Defense	Formal presentation of the dissertation study (approximately 15-20 minutes) to the Dissertation Committee. Questions/discussion between the candidate and the committee. Candidate's dissertation, professional growth during the program, and future plans are discussed. Committee confers to render a decision and communicates the decision at the conclusion of the defense. If dissertation is approved, the signature page is signed by each member of the committee. Follow the procedures for electronic thesis/dissertation submission from the SGSR (available online). Consider making two bound copies: one for the student and one for the dissertation chair.	**IMPORTANT: Follow the signature page Format in IUP's current Thesis/Dissertation Manual and bring 5 copies on bond paper to defense meeting. The student must deliver one signed copy of the signature page and the entire, corrected dissertation to the SGSR in order to graduate.**

Exit Portfolio   The doctoral candidate submits an
                            electronic exit portfolio to the
                            Doctoral Program Coordinator.

Graduation Checklist   After the candidate has met all
                            requirements for the degree
                            program, this is communicated to
                            the SGSR by the Coordinator(s) of
                            the Doctoral Program.

APPENDIX D: Pennsylvania Department of Education's Guidelines for the District-Wide Supervisory Certificate

A Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction is a district-wide specialist in curriculum and instruction across the total grade organization and is responsible for performing the following duties:

- supervising instruction and evaluating staff as designated by the school superintendent;
- designing and developing curricula, learning materials and innovative educational programs;
-
- conducting experimental instructional programs, and
- directing and conducting basic or applied educational research.

Issuance of the Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction certificate requires a minimum of five years of professional school experience in an instructional area.

Preparation for this professional certificate is at the graduate level and presumes in-depth study in the area of curriculum and instruction.

A person prepared as a supervisor of curriculum and instruction may be eligible for certification provided the applicant has done the following:

1. Completed an approved program of graduate study preparing the applicant for the broad area, district-wide supervisory functions specified by the endorsement area of the certificate. (Preparation completed out-of-state must meet Pennsylvania standards for certification.)

2. Obtained recommendation for certification by the authorized certification officer of the institution where such education was obtained, or holds a comparable certificate from another state (for out-of-state graduates only).

3. Provided a chief school administrator's verification of the completion of five years of satisfactory professional experience as mentioned above (22 PA Code Section 49.111).

4. Has provided evidence of satisfactory achievement on assessments prescribed by the department under Section 49.18(a).

5. Is able to meet all other requirements provided by law. For further details, see the PDE's website.

PENNSYLVANIA STANDARDS FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL AND TEACHER CERTIFICATION: SUPERVISOR OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

I. Knowing the Content

The professional education program provides evidence that supervisor of curriculum and instruction certification candidates complete a clearly articulated post-baccalaureate program

that assesses the candidate's potential for supervision through an examination of their oral and written communication skills, qualifying work experience, organizational ability and personal motivation prior to admission. The program also provides evidence that the candidates have demonstrated their knowledge of and competence in the fundamental concepts of supervising an instructional program including the following:

I.A. Theories of curriculum design that are based upon

- Philosophical, sociological and historical foundations;
- democratic values;
- student, school, and community needs;
- guidelines of the learned societies and academic standards, and
- changing socio-economic conditions.

I.B. Theories of organization that promote the school culture as a learning community including

- collaborative planning processes,
- team-building and shared best practices, and
- interdisciplinary curricula approaches.

I.C. Curriculum development processes based upon research, applied theories, and informed practice including

- alignment of multiple curricular content areas and instructional goals and objectives;
- concepts of scope, sequence, balance, and integration;
- establishment of learning outcomes, and
- multiple assessment techniques.

I.D. School organizational structures that support teaching strategies and student outcomes including

- class scheduling alternatives,
- school facilities and classroom design,
- diverse instructional methodologies, and
- infusion of technology into curriculum and instruction.

I.E. Models of supervision and teaching including

- clinical and developmental,
- cognitive and peer coaching,
- observation and conferencing,

- learner vs. teacher centered, and
- interdisciplinary teaming.

I.F. Role and function of personnel supervision including

- identifying continuous staff development needs and resources;
- organizing, facilitating, and evaluating professional development programs;
- integrating district and school priorities;
- coordinating multi-discipline curriculum integration teams;
- improving faculty as a resource;
- applying effective job analysis procedures, supervisory techniques and staff performance appraisal, and
- negotiating and managing staff conflicts.

II. Performances

The professional education program provides evidence that Supervisory Certification candidates are assessed and meet the established program competencies and exit criteria during their participation in 360 hours of field experiences and a practicum and demonstrate their ability to perform the major task areas of policy determination, program development, and instructional supervision including:

II.A. Designing curriculum scope and sequence

II.B. Evaluating instructional methodologies and strategies

II.C. Monitoring and developing alternative forms of student assessment

II.D. Assessing instructional service delivery

II.E. Identifying staff development needs and resources

II.F. Planning activities to address the needs of the educational program

II.G. Integrating curricula across multiple disciplines

II.H. Budgetary planning for curriculum and personnel development

III. Professionalism

The professional education program provides evidence that certification candidates demonstrate knowledge and competencies that foster professionalism in school and community settings including the following:

III.A. Professional organizations, publications and resources

III.B. Integrity and ethical behavior, professional conduct as stated in Pennsylvania's Code of Professional Practice and Conduct for Educators; and local, state, and federal laws and regulations

III.C. Collaborating with school colleagues, and other professionals to improve student learning

III.D. Communicating effectively with parents/guardians, other agencies and the community at large to support learning by all students

APPENDIX E: Outline for Proposal to Earn the Advanced Certificate Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction

Brief Description of the Project (explain how it meets the PDE requirements):

Professional Literature Reviewed Prior to Starting the Project (write a brief summary of other, similar projects):

Professional Development Goals for Doctoral Student (This should include maintaining a log of activities, the design and evaluation of curriculum materials, and plans for disseminating the project through professional presentations and scholarly publications):

Evidence of Effectiveness (Describe the plan for documenting the effectiveness of the curriculum project):

Signature Page

My signature below indicates that I am responsible for reading and understanding the information provided and referenced in this department/program student handbook.

_____ [please initial] I understand my program coordinator may share this document with the School of Graduate Studies and Research.

_____

Print Name

_____   _____

Signature   Date

Submit to the program coordinator by the first week of the semester.

The Professional Studies in Education Department will keep this signed document on file.

APPENDIX F: Scoring Rubric Advanced Certificate—Supervisor of Curriculum and Instruction

Student's Name: _____ **Supervisor's Name:** _____

Date: _____

Rating Scale: 3 = target   2 = acceptable   1 = not acceptable

Design of the Interdisciplinary Curriculum Project

3 2 1   Student completed 360 hours of work and 6 credits and provides a log of activities

3 2 1   Curriculum project is interdisciplinary

3 2 1   Curriculum project was implemented in a school setting

3 2 1   The school's current curriculum was described

3 2 1   A clear rationale for the curricular change was provided

3 2 1   A scope and sequence for all components of the project is supplied

3 2 1   Curriculum project is in accordance with state and national standards

Implementation of a Major Curriculum Project

3 2 1   Instructional methods and strategies are described and are appropriate for the implementation of the project

3 2 1   Rationale for the instructional methods and strategies is supplied

3 2 1   Instructional methods used are clearly documented in the portfolio

Creation of a Project Budget and Documentation of Expenditures

3 2 1 An itemized budget of all expenses for the proposed project was submitted and approved prior to the start of the project

3 2 1 A justification for the expenditures and explanation of how the project expenses fit with the overall school budget is supplied.

Evaluation of a Curriculum Project (Formative and Summative)

3 2 1   Instructional services were monitored by the candidate on an on-going basis

3 2 1   Results of formative evaluation are documented in the portfolio

3 2 1   Evidence of evaluation of the instructional services (e.g., classroom observations or collaborative efforts) is provided

Evaluation of Student Achievement

3 2 1   Alternative forms of student assessment are included in the portfolio

3 2 1   Types of student assessments used in the project are documented

3 2 1   Samples of children's work are included in the portfolio

Plan and Evaluate Professional Development

3 2 1   Resources necessary for the successful implementation of the project are documented

3 2 1   Professional collaboration with teachers and other school personnel is in evidence

3 2 1   Staff development needs are identified

3 2 1   Staff development activities are described in detail

Additional D.Ed. in C & I Requirements

3 2 1   Professional development goals are clearly stated and appropriate for doctoral-level work

3 2 1   Internship proposal includes a review of the scholarly literature on the topic

3 2 1   The doctoral internship is not part of the doctoral candidate's expected work duties, nor is it simply another job for which the intern is being compensated

3 2 1   Internship project is worthy of the credit awarded (6 credits, 360 hours)

3 2 1   The doctoral intern keeps the instructor of record for CURR 798 fully informed of activities and provides sufficient evidence that the project was effective (e.g., print materials, videotape, site supervisor evaluation letter, evaluations from participants, etc.)

3 2 1   The project includes a log of activities completed by the doctoral intern and documentation is provided in the appended materials

3 2 1   The report is succinct and focuses on original work produced by the doctoral candidate

3 2 1   Results of the internship project are disseminated to the larger academic community through a professional presentation(s) and/or publication(s)

3 2 1   The work experience is completed within the 7-year time limit for doctoral study (or during an extension requested in writing by the student and approved by PSE and the SGRS)

3 2 1   An executive summary of the project has been prepared as a PowerPoint presentation, included in the report, and submitted to the doctoral coordinator

APPENDIX G: Candidacy Paper Samples

The Effects of Generative Vocabulary Instruction

Candidacy Exam
Jason Keiner
@00000000
aaaa@iup.edu
HomeEmail@home.com
(111) 111-1111

Abstract

Generative vocabulary instruction is a powerful and promising method of enhancing student achievement in reading and writing that has received little attention from both researchers and teachers. Given the current educational climate brought about by the advent of Common Core and its accompanying emphasis on academic vocabulary and deep literacy skills, educators are searching for ways to enable all students to excel in these areas. Generative vocabulary instruction, which is the teaching of morphology in order to equip students to learn large quantities of new words as well as be able to dissect unfamiliar words, is of paramount importance in addressing these needs. Specifically, generative vocabulary instruction produces positive results in the areas of vocabulary acquisition, literacy, and spelling, and may be of special benefit to students learning English as a second language.

TurnItInScore: 1%

OUTLINE

Definition of Key Terminology/Background

Most educators who are engaged in practices relating to student acquisition of language and literacy skills know that a morpheme is the smallest possible language unit that possesses meaning (a base or an affix). Likewise, it is commonly known that morphology is the study of morphemic meanings and the ways in which the manipulation of morphemes generates new words, illuminates the meanings of complex words, and aids in the orthography (spelling) of words. However, what many educators do not know is how incredibly important vocabulary study is for academic achievement in all areas of literacy and language acquisition (Carlisle, 2010; Hairrell, Rupley & Simmons, 2011).

In addition, the advent of the Common Core State Standards (2012) and its emphasis on vocabulary knowledge and literacy have thrust vocabulary study to the forefront of educational priorities (Templeton, 2011). Given that over 60% of the total of English words and over 90% of words in core academic disciplines are derived using morphological means (Bowers & Kirby, 2010; Green, 2008; Rasinski, Padak, Newton & Newton, 2011), generative vocabulary instruction, a term interchangeable with morphological instruction, has great potential for enhancing student achievement. In particular, morphological instruction has demonstrated positive outcomes for students in the areas of vocabulary, literacy, orthography (Carlisle, 2010; Gabig & Smith, 2013), and English as a second language (Tahaineh, 2012; Jiang, Novokshanova, Masuda & Wang, 2011; Zhang & Koda, 2012).

Literature Review

The most obvious area in which generative vocabulary instruction makes a positive impact is vocabulary knowledge. This knowledge manifests itself in two areas: known vocabulary and inferring the meaning of unknown words. Several studies have demonstrated the significant positive effect of generative vocabulary instruction on student acquisition of vocabulary. For example, following a 20 session intervention on morphology among 88 4th and 5th graders, Kirby and Bowers (2010) found that the students not only learned the base words they were taught, but that they also were able to acquire the meanings of new words in the same families without explicit instruction. Likewise, Lesaux, Kieffer, Faller, and Kelley (2010) demonstrated an extra six months of growth in the word knowledge of middle school students who participated in an 18-week morphology intervention when compared to their classmates who received only the regular curriculum. In a similar study, Kieffer and Lesaux (2009) concluded that teachers could significantly increase student performance by instructing them in morphology. These types of findings are echoed by many other researchers such as Harris, Schumaker, and Deshler (2011) who asserted that teaching morphology is much more efficient than teaching individual vocabulary words, Rasinski, Padak, Newton, and Newton (2011) who argued that generative vocabulary instruction is much more productive than other types of vocabulary instruction, and Templeton (2011) who claims that generative methods allow students to learn, "quite literally tens of thousands of words" (p. 101).

Generative vocabulary instruction also enables students to accurately infer the meanings of unfamiliar words they encounter in texts. The power of such morphological instruction is evident in the work of McCutchen and Logan (2011) who studied the impact of morphological knowledge on the comprehension of unfamiliar words in 5th and 8th grade students. What

McCutchen and Logan (2011) discovered was that students in both age groups used familiar morphemes as a springboard to understand words to which they had no previous exposure, and that teaching morphology increases accurate interpretation of unknown words. Harris, Schumaker, and Deshler (2011) similarly reported the positive effects of generative vocabulary instruction following a study of ninth graders. They further found that the use of generative methods was equally effective for both regular education and special education students (Harris, Schumaker, & Deshler, 2011). Likewise, Kieffer and Lesaux's (2012) study of 583 sixth graders from linguistically disparate backgrounds demonstrated the seminal nature of morphological awareness in successfully decoding unfamiliar words for vocabulary learners at all levels of linguistic competence. Further, Pacheko and Goodwin (2013), in their studies among academically and linguistically diverse middle school students, have concluded not only that morphological knowledge is of paramount importance in comprehending new words, but that it is of even higher import for grasping the meanings of more complex academic words.

Overall, generative vocabulary instruction's positive impact on student vocabulary knowledge of both taught and unfamiliar words is positive and significant (Bowers & Kirby, 2010; Carlisle, 2010; Templeton, 2011). While the research is mixed as to whether elementary or secondary students gain the greatest benefits from morphological instruction, it is in agreement that there are, at worst, only moderate gains from such instruction, and, at best significantly positive gains (Goodwin & Ahn, 2013; Rasinski, Padak, Newton, & Newton, 2011; Stygles, 2011).

Another monumentally important area in which the teaching of morphology can make a significantly positive impact is literacy. This is not surprising since word knowledge and reading comprehension have an intensifying effect upon one another in which a greater

73

knowledge of vocabulary causes greater understanding of text and more fluent reading ability allows for greater comprehension of new words embedded in text (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2007). In fact, knowledge of morphology is so important for reading comprehension, that Kieffer and Lesaux (2007) found morphological knowledge to be a stronger indicator of students' reading ability than any other literacy variable. Similarly, in a literacy study of first graders, Wolter, Wood, and D'zatko (2009) established that morphological awareness was paramount among early literacy predictors and accounted for a 10% higher performance on literacy tasks.

Importantly, such findings on the efficacy of morphological instruction hold true and demonstrate its vital necessity for all ages, ability levels, and backgrounds of students (Godwin, Lipsky, & Ahn, 2012; Green, 2009). For example, in their examination of morphological knowledge's impact on a population of second and third graders of diverse racial, socioeconomic, and ability levels, Apel, Wilson-Fowler, Brimo, and Perrin (2012) determined that morphological knowledge exhibited a unique and specific impact on reading comprehension and exerted a strong influence upon developing literacy across the spectrum. In the same vein, similar results showing the pervasive and persistent impact of morphological knowledge on literacy with varied student populations have been articulated by Roman, Kirby, Parilla, Wade-Wooley, and Deacon (2009) in their work with elementary and middle school students, Apel and Thomas-Tate (2009) with African American students, and Katz and Carlisle (2009) with struggling readers. No matter the setting of the study or the population addressed, morphological knowledge played a key role in increasing student literacy and should be included as a component of student instruction (Reed, 2008).

Research also establishes the positive effects of generative vocabulary instruction for students who are English-Language Learners (ELLs). As with the above studies regarding

morphology's impact on vocabulary and literacy, morphological knowledge has been established as an important predictor of success in reading ability and correct vocabulary use among ELLs (Carlo, et. al., 2007; Jeon, 2011). A growing body of research points to the fact that in-depth knowledge of the basic morphemes of English and the ways in which they can be manipulated leads to more rapid vocabulary acquisition and an enhanced ability to grasp the meaning of unfamiliar words for ELLs (Khodadoust, Aliasin, & Khosravi, 2013; Tabatabaei & Yakhabi, 2011). Increased morphological ability, and the accompanying language ability that follows, have also been strongly linked to better reading comprehension for ELLs through actual vocabulary knowledge and lexical inferencing (Zhang & Koda, 2012). Even more compelling, studies have established that the positive effect of morphological instruction on reading strengthens over time, even without ongoing instruction in morphology (Kieffer & Lesaux, 2008; Lam, Chen, Geva, Luo, & Li, 2012). It is no wonder, then, that Tahaineh (2012) concludes that morphological instruction is vital in the instruction of ELLs.

Implications

Clearly, instruction in morphological processes provides an important avenue for improving student performance in vocabulary and reading regardless of student background, ability, or age. Not a single study has established any negative effects of such instruction, but a myriad of studies highlight its potential power for increasing student achievement. The implication of all of this research is simple; educators should be teaching morphology.

Yet, morphology is little used in American classrooms, likely because of a lack of teacher comfort and familiarity with this topic (Rasinski, Padak, Newton, & Newton, 2011). Thus, it seems teacher training and professional development are a reasonable place to begin the process of making generative vocabulary instruction an integral part of language instruction.

Finally, much research still needs to be done in this area. The vast majority of the published studies on morphological instruction involve small student samples. Large-scale evaluations are desperately needed. In addition, none of the available studies followed cohorts of students who were exposed to morphological instruction over the course of years. In fact, most of the studies involved morphology interventions that lasted no more than a few weeks. Obviously, much knowledge could be gained, and more credence for the efficacy of morphological instruction garnered, if cumulative positive effects for large groups of students were demonstrated.

Table 1: Additional Research on Generative Vocabulary Instruction

Area of Concern	Studies	Findings
Orthography		Teaching morphology to elementary school students causes improvement in spelling. Spelling improvement is particularly significant among words with inflectional changes.
Derivational Morphophonology		Knowledge of morphology reduces the frequency of phonological errors, which, in turn increases fluency. Increased fluency has the secondary effect of increasing comprehension.
Closing the Achievement Gap		Generative vocabulary instruction has great potential to close the racial and socioeconomic achievement gap. The teaching of morphology reduces language errors that may be associated with dialectical issues and provides access to the academic vocabulary that low achieving groups are often without.
Anastasiou & Griva, 2012; Rosa & Nunes, 2008; Templeton, 2010		
Edrington, Buder, & Jarmulovich, 2007; Jarmulovich & Hay, 2009; Larsen & Nippold, 2007		
Fisher, 2007; Apel & Thomas, 2009; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2007		

References

Anastasiou, D. & Griva, E. (2012). Morphological processing strategies: An intervention for spelling difficulties in English language. *English Language Teaching*, *5*(4), 15-23. doi: 10.5539/elt.v5n4p15

Apel, K. & Thomas-Tate, S. (2009). Morphological awareness skills of fourth-grade African American students. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *40*, 312-324.

Apel, K., Wilson-Fowler, E. B., Brimo, D., & Perrin, N. A. (2012). Metalinguistic contributions to reading and spelling in second and third grade students. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *25*, 1283-1305.

Bowers, P. N. & Kirby, J. R. (2010). Effects of morphological instruction on vocabulary acquisition. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *23*, 515-537.

Carlisle, J. F. (2010). Effects of instruction in morphological awareness on literacy achievement: An integrative review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(4), 464-487. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.45.4.5

Carlo, M., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C., Dressler, C. Lippman, T. . . . White, E. (2007). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English-language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *39*(2), 188-215.

Common Core State Standards, (2012). Retrieved from http://corestandards.org/maps

Edrington, J. E., Buder, E. H., & Jarmulovich, L. (2007). Hesitations in third graders' production of derived words. In Proceedings of the XVIth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Saarbrucken, Germany.

Fisher, D. (2007). Creating a schoolwide vocabulary initiative in an urban high school. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *12*(3), 337-351.

Gabig, C. & Zaretsky, E. (2013). Promoting morphological awareness in children with language needs: Do the Common Core Standards pave the way?. *Topics in Language Disorders*, *33*(1), 7-26. doi: 10.1097TLD.0b013e318280f592

Goodwin, A. & Ahn, S. (2013). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions in English: Effects on literacy outcomes for school-age children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *17*(4), 257-285.

Goodwin, A., Lipsky, M, & Ahn, S. (2012). Word detectives: Using units of meaning to support literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, *65*(7), 461-470.

Green, L. (2009). Morphology and literacy: Getting our heads in the game. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *40*, 283-285.

Hairrell, A., Rupley, W., & Simmons, D. (2011). The state of vocabulary research. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, *50*, 253-271. doi: 10.1080/19388071.2010.514036

Harris, M.L., Schumaker, J.B., Deshler, D.D. (2011). The effects of strategic morphological analysis instruction on the vocabulary performance of secondary students with and without disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *34*(1), 17-33.

Jarmulovich, L. & Hay, S. E. (2009). Derivational morphophonology: Exploring errors in third graders' productions. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *40*, 299-311.

Jeon, E. H. (2011). Contribution of morphological awareness to second-language reading comprehension. *The Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 217-235. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2011.01179.x

Katz, L. A. & Carlisle, J. F. (2009). Teaching students with reading difficulties to be close readers: A feasibility study. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *40*, 325-340.

Khodadoust, E., Hesamiddin, A., & Khosravi, R. (2013). The relationship between morphological awareness and receptive vocabulary knowledge of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*, *4*(1), 60-67. doi: 10.0967/ijertv4v1

Kieffer, M. J. & Lesaux, N. K. (2007). Breaking down words to build meaning: Morphology, vocabulary, and reading comprehension in the urban classroom. *The Reading Teacher*, *61*(2), 134-144.

Kieffer, M. J. & Lesaux, N. K. (2008). The role of derivational morphology in the reading comprehension of Spanish-speaking English language learners. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *21*, 783-804.

Kieffer, M. J. & Lesaux, N. K. (2010). Morphing into adolescents: Active word learning for English-language learners and their classmates in middle school. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *54*(1), 47-56.

Kieffer, M. J. & Lesaux, N. K. (2012). Knowledge of words, knowledge about words: Dimensions of vocabulary in first and second language learners in sixth grade. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *25*, 347-373.

Lam, K., Chen, X., Geva, E., Yang, C.L., & Li, H. (2012). The role of morphological awareness in reading achievement among young Chinese-speaking English language learners: A longitudinal study. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *25*, 1847-1872.

Larsen, J. A., & Nippold, M. A. (2007). Morphological analysis in school-age children: Dynamic assessment of a word learning strategy. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *38*, 201-212.

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, E., & Kelley, J. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(2), 198-230.

McCutchen, B. L. (2011). Inside incidental word learning: Children's strategic use of morphological information to infer word meanings. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *46*(4), 334-349. doi: 10.1002/RRQ.003

Pacheko, M. B. & Goodwin, A. P. (2013). Putting two and two together: Middle school students' morphological problem-solving strategies for unknown words. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *56*(7), 541-553.

Rasinski, T. V., Padak, N., Newton, J., & Newton, E. (2011). The Latin-Greek connection: Building vocabulary through morphological study. *The Reading Teacher*, *65*(2), 133-141.

Reed, D. K. (2008). A synthesis of morphology interventions and effects on reading outcomes for students in grades k-12. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *23*(1), 36-49.

Roman, A. A., Kirby, J. R., Parila, R. K., Wade-Woolley, L., & Deacon, S. H. (2009). Toward a comprehensive view of the skills involved in word reading in grades 4, 6, and 8. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *102*, 96-113.

Rosa, J. M. & Nunes, T. (2008). Morphological priming effects on children's spelling. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *21*, 763-781.

Stygles, J. (2011). Implementing morphological word study in the intermediate classroom. *The NERA Journal*, *46*(2), 60-66.

Tabatabaei, O. & Yakhabi, M. (2011). The relationship between morphological awareness and vocabulary size of EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(4), 262-273. doi: 10.5539/elt.v4n4p262

Tahaineh, Y. (2012). The awareness of English word-formation mechanisms is a necessity to make an autonomous L2 learner in EFL context. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(6), 1105-1113. doi: 10.4304/jltr.3.6.1105-1113

Templeton, S. (2010). Generative vocabulary instruction: Teaching core academic and content-specific academic vocabulary to English-only and English learner students. Paper presented at the U.S. Department of Education 2010 Reading Institute.

Templeton, S. (2011). Teaching and learning morphology: A reflection on generative vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Education*, *192*(2/3), 101-107.

Wolter, J. A., Wood, A., & D'Zatko, K. W. (2009). The influence of morphological awareness on the literacy development of first-grade children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *40*, 286-298.

Zhang, D. & Koda, K. (2012). Contribution of morphological awareness and lexical inferencing ability to L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension among advanced EFL learners: Testing direct and indirect effects. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *25*, 1195-1216.

SAMPLE PAPER TWO

Identifying Characteristics of Effective School-based Obesity Prevention Programs
Cassondra Strawser
Candidacy Exam
@00000000
aaaa@iup.edu
HomeEmail@home.com
(111) 111-1111

Abstract

The childhood obesity epidemic has initiated the implementation of a wide variety of school-based obesity prevention programs. These programs vary in terms of intervention criteria; duration; involvement of parents and the community; modification of school environments; and outcome measures. A literature review of primary prevention studies revealed nutrition knowledge as the most common outcome measure, followed by dietary behavior changes (primarily increased fruit and vegetable consumption). Few studies resulted in significant changes to anthropometric measures or increased physical activity. Emphasis on consistent nutrition and physical activity education in schools is warranted.

TurnItIn Score: 5%

OUTLINE

I.   **Definition of Key Terminology/Background**

II.   **Literature Review**

         A. Outcome measure: increase in knowledge

         B. Outcome measure: behavior change

         C. Outcome measure: anthropometrics

III.   **Implications**

IV.   **Table I: Comparison of School-based Primary Prevention Programs, 2009-2013**

V.   **References**

Definition of Key Terminology/Background

Childhood obesity has become a serious public health concern in the United States. The most recent statistics from the 2007-2008 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) estimate approximately 17% of children and adolescents between the ages of 2-19 are considered obese (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), 2013, "Obesity rates" section). *Obese* is defined as "having excess body fat," while *overweight* is defined as "having excess body weight for a particular height from fat, muscle, bone, water, or a combination of these factors" (CDC, 2013,Childhood obesity facts section, para 1). There are significant racial and ethnic disparities for childhood obesity, with adolescent Hispanic males and non-Hispanic Black females most affected (CDC, 2013, "Obesity rates" section). There is no easy solution to the childhood obesity epidemic; there are numerous risk factors, both genetic and environmental.

Schools are ideal settings for obesity prevention programs because children typically spend the majority of their day in these places, and consume anywhere from 1/3 to ½ of their daily calories there (Institute of Medicine, 2012, p. 3). Approximately 2/3 of preschool-aged children are cared for outside of the home, making these settings appropriate for positive role modeling in regards to nutrition and physical activity (Namenek Brouwer & Benjamin Neelon, 2013). Adequate intake of essential nutrients and establishment of healthy eating behaviors are critical during rapid periods of growth and development, such as early and middle childhood (Healthy People 2020, 2013). In fact, several Healthy People (HP) 2020 objectives recommend increasing health education in elementary, middle and high schools and hiring more educators with college degrees in these areas (HP 2020, 2013).

Literature Review

Inconsistencies in the inclusion of obesity prevention programs in schools – as well as types and duration of programs – make it difficult to interpret findings. The effectiveness of school-based

obesity prevention programs varies, and is dependent on multiple factors. These factors include:

duration of the program; whether or not the program emphasizes nutrition, physical activity, or a

combination of the two; parental and/or community involvement; modification of foods and

beverages offered in schools; and overall support (both within the school environment and in the

home and community) (Hoelscher, Kirk, Ritchie, & Cunningham-Sabo, 2013). The Academy of

Nutrition and Dietetics position paper on prevention of overweight and obesity (2013) summarized

successful (effective) school-based obesity prevention programs as sharing the following

characteristics: multicomponent (emphasis on nutrition and physical activity); modification of school

environment (such as offering healthy snacks, lowering fat and sugar content of meals, etc.);

engagement of parents and the community; and longer than one year in duration (Hoelscher et al.,

2013). A meta-analysis of 40 school-based obesity prevention programs from 1997-2008 supports

these findings, emphasizing that universal programs (or *primary prevention* programs, where all

children are exposed to the intervention, regardless of weight or health status); implemented

collaboratively (between the classroom teacher and field experts); that emphasize both nutritional

change and a reduction in sedentary behaviors were more likely to be effective (Cook-Cottone,

Casey, Feeley, & Baran, 2009). Programs 12 weeks or less in length were less likely to be effective

(Cook-Cottone et al., 2009).

A review of recent (2009-2013) school-based primary obesity prevention programs resulted

in the identification of 16 studies. The studies were categorized according to the following variables:

age (classified as preschool – third grade; fourth grade – eighth grade; and ninth – twelfth grade);

duration (1-12 weeks; 13-52 weeks; 1 year +); curriculum (nutrition, or combined nutrition and

physical activity); unique identifying characteristics, such as the presence of a school garden; and

outcome measures. Primary outcome measures included anthropometric (Body Mass Index (BMI);

BMI z-scores or percentiles; and waist circumference); increased nutrition and/or physical activity knowledge; and positive changes in behaviors, attitudes and self-efficacy. There was wide variation in curricula used – in fact no two programs used the same curricula. The majority of the programs were taught by classroom teachers. All programs were conducted during school hours, with one implemented after-school (Dzewaltowski et al., 2010).

Outcome measure: increase in knowledge

The most commonly reported significant outcome was an increase in nutrition-based knowledge, particularly of fruits and vegetables (Hovland et al., 2013; Katz et al., 2011; Levy et al., 2012; Parmer, Salisbury-Glennon, Shannon, & Struempler, 2009; Prelip, Kinsler, Le Thai, Erausquin, & Slusser, 2012; Puma et al., 2013; Tuuri et al., 2009; Witt & Dunn, 2012). Two of these programs lasted 12 weeks or less (see Table 1). Two randomized controlled trials conducted with 4th and 5th graders resulted in significant increases in knowledge and self-efficacy, but no changes in dietary or physical activity behaviors (Levy et al., 2012; Tuuri et al., 2009). The Levy et al. (2012) study was conducted in Mexico with 60 participating schools; characteristics of the intervention included teacher training workshops and modification of school foods. The Tuuri et al. (2009) study was conducted in Louisiana with 14 low-income, urban schools; features of the intervention included a wellness exhibit and physical activity breaks during class.

Increased nutritional knowledge and positive changes in attitudes towards healthy living were reported in two studies: the first was conducted with 3rd, 4th and 5th graders in Los Angeles; the second collected baseline data with 2nd graders in southern Colorado, then completed follow-up assessments in 5th and 8th grade (Prelip et al., 2012; Puma et al., 2013). The Prelip et al. study (2012) was a quasi-experimental design involving two intervention groups: ten hours of nutrition education per quarter compared to a standardized nutrition curriculum that included parent workshops. The

Puma et al. study (2013) indicated that although students gained nutrition and physical activity knowledge, this decreased over time (Puma et al., 2013). This study was unique in that knowledge and behavior changes were assessed 3-6 years post-intervention (Puma et al., 2013).

Outcome measure: behavior change

It is important to note that only six reviewed studies resulted in positive behavior changes (Fairclough et al., 2013; Farfan-Ramirez, Diemoz, Gong, & Lagura, 2011; Namenek Brouwer & Benjamin Neelon, 2013; Parmer et al. 2009; Whittemore et al., 2013; Witt & Dunn, 2012). Three out of six of these studies used garden-based nutrition education, which resulted in increased fruit and vegetable consumption (Farfan-Ramirez et al. (2011); Namenek Brouwer & Benjamin Neelon (2013); Parmer et al. (2009). Only one study was reviewed that utilized a high-school sample; was web-based; and resulted in significant changes to self-efficacy and dietary and physical activity behaviors (Whittemore et al., 2013). This unique program was highly interactive, and utilized a health coach, blogs, journaling, and goal setting (Whittemore et al., 2013).

Outcome measure: anthropometrics

Anthropometric data is a frequent outcome measure for obesity prevention programs, specifically BMI; BMI percentiles and z-scores; and waist circumference. BMI is a direct comparison of height to weight that correlates with body fatness and disease risk (CDC, 2011, "About BMI" section). Calculated BMI values for children and adolescents are age and sex-specific; when they are plotted on a child's growth chart, a comparison can then be made between children of the same age and sex using percentiles (CDC, 2011, "About BMI"section). BMI z-scores are directly related to percentiles; they indicate deviations from the mean of the reference population (CDC, 2013, "FAQ" section). Waist circumference (distinguishes fat distribution) and z-scores are positively associated with cardiovascular disease risk in children (Fairclough et al., 2013; Jansen et al., 2011).

However, only 3 out of 16 researched studies reported significant changes in BMI, waist circumference (WC), and/or BMI z-scores (Jansen et al., 2011; Manger et al., 2012; Fairclough et al., 2013). Two randomized, controlled trials resulted in positive significant changes in waist circumference and physical activity (Jansen et al., 2011; Fairclough et al., 2013). The *Lekker Fit!* study was conducted in the Netherlands and involved 20 schools, grades 3 – 8 (Jansen et al., 2011). Although this study was a combined intervention, there was more emphasis on physical activity with three physical education sessions per week (Jansen et al., 2011). A 2-yr. study using a convenience sample of 14 intervention schools and 15 control schools in the Catholic Diocese of Pittsburgh was conducted with 1st and 2nd graders (Manger et al., 2012). A combined intervention was used, with equal emphasis on nutrition and physical activity; results indicated a modest (but statistically significant) decrease in BMI in the intervention groups (Manger et al., 2012).

Implications

Methodological limitations; lack of community and parental involvement; and failed efforts to modify school environments (as initiated by key school personnel) impede the effectiveness of obesity prevention programs (Yetter, 2009). Due to the wide variation of curricula used and vast differences in sample sizes and demographics, it was difficult to interpret the overall findings of this particular review of literature.

In general, most of the reviewed studies indicated changes in self-efficacy, attitudes and/or behavior changes (nutrition and/or physical activity). Obesity prevention programs that incorporated garden-based education as part of the nutrition curriculum resulted in increased fruit and vegetable consumption. This finding is supported in comprehensive reviews of garden-based nutrition education (Hoelscher et al., 2013). Few studies (3 out of 16) reported significant changes in anthropometric outcomes. The focus on weight-related change (in particular, BMI) in obesity

prevention programs has limitations: BMI is not a direct measure of body fat percentage; it doesn't distinguish between location of stored body fat; and it doesn't control for other factors such as timing of pubertal development and level of physical fitness (Boylan et al., 2010; Nihiser et al., 2007).

In conclusion, schools, preschools and childcare settings are presented with unique opportunities to foster life-long healthy nutrition and physical activity behaviors in children. A consistent approach in the implementation of nutrition and physical activity education in these settings is warranted. Schools should strive to serve as role models for a healthy lifestyle, emphasizing healthy eating and the promotion of physical activity, versus focusing on weight and physical appearances.

Table 1

Comparison of School-based Primary Prevention Programs, 2009-2013

Age Category	Program Duration	Program Type	Significant Outcome Measures
Preschool –Grade 3			
Jansen et al. (2011)	32 wks	Combined	(+) waist circumference; (+) shuttle run scores; no effect on BMI
Manger et al. (2012)	2 yrs.	Combined	(+) effect on BMI; (+) teacher/parent satisfaction
Puma et al. (2013)	6 yrs.	Combined	(+) nutr. & physical activity knowledge & attitudes; no effect on self-efficacy or behavior. No effect on BMI.
Witt & Dunn (2012)	6 wks	Nutrition	(+) fruit & veg. knowledge & consumption
Farfan-Ramirez et al. (2011)	8 wk	Nutrition *garden	(+) fruit & veg. consumption
Namenek & Benjamin (2013)	16 wks	Nutrition *garden	(+) vegetable consumption
Parmer et al. (2009)	28 wks	Nutrition *garden	(+) fruit & veg. knowledge & consumption
Katz et al. (2011); Prelip et al. (2012)	36 wks	Nutrition	(+) nutrition knowledge; no effects on dietary patterns or BMI (+) fruit & veg. knowledge; (+) attitudes/beliefs; no effect on fruit/veg. consumption
Grades 4 – 8			
Lee et al. (2013)	10 wks	Nutrition *science class	(+) student and teacher satisfaction; focus on content-based vs. making behavior changes
Hovland et al. (2013)	36 wks	Nutrition *science class	(+) nutrition knowledge
Tuuri et al. (2009)	12 wks	Combined	(+) fruit & veg. knowledge & self-efficacy; no effect on consumption
Fairclough et al. (2013)	20 wks	Combined	(+) effect on BMI z-scores; waist circumference; light physical activity; breakfast consumption
Levy et al. (2012)	24 wks	Combined	(+) nutrition & physical activity knowledge & self-efficacy; (-) likelihood shifting overweight to obese category
Dzewaltowski et al. (2010)	2 yrs.	Combined *after-school	(+) increase minutes moderate & vigorous physical activity; no effect on BMI
Grades 9-12			
Whittemore et al. (2013)	32 wks	Combined *web-based	(+) dietary and physical activity behaviors; self-efficacy

References

Boylan, M., Feng., D., Chyu, M., Chin, Y., Esperat, C., Flores, D., Dinh, T., Reed, D., Borrego, J., Billings, L., & Ochoa, C. (2010). Identification of overweight in young children: is use of body mass index percentiles alone sufficient? *Texas Public Health Journal, 62*(4), 4-8. Retrieved from http://navigator-iup.passhe.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=55380281&site=ehost-live

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, About BMI for Children and Teens. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens_bmi/about_childrens_bmi.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Childhood Obesity Facts. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/obesity/facts.htm

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Frequently Asked Questions About the 2000 CDC Growth Charts. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts/growthchart_faq.htm

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Obesity Rates Among All Children in the United States. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/obesity/data/childhood.html

Cook-Cottone, C., Casey, C.M., Feeley, T.H., & Baran, J. (2009). A meta-analytic review of obesity prevention in the schools: 1997-2008. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(8), 695-719. doi: 10.1002/pits.20409

Dzewaltowski, D.A., Rosenkranz, R.R., Geller, K.S., Coleman, K.J., Welk, G.J., Hastmann, T.J., & Milliken, G.A. (2010). HOP'N after-school project: an obesity prevention randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7*(90), 1-12. Retrieved from http://navigator-iup.passhe.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mnh&AN=21144055&site=ehost-live

Fairclough, S.J., Hackett, A.F., Davies, I.G., Gobbi, R., Mackintosh, K.A., Warburton, G.L., Stratton, G., Van Sluijs, E. MF., & Boddy, L.M. (2013). Promoting healthy weight in primary school children through physical activity and nutrition education: a pragmatic evaluation of the CHANGE! randomised intervention study. *BMC Public Health, 13*(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-626

Healthy People 2020 Overview, Early and Middle Childhood. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/overview.aspx?topicid=10

Farfan-Ramirez, L., Diemoz, L., Gong, E.J., & Lagura, M.A. (2011). Curriculum intervention in preschool nutrition: nutrition matters! *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 43*(4S2), S162-S165. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2011.03.007

Healthy People 2020 Topics & Objectives, Early and Middle Childhood. (2013). Retrieved from http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/objectiveslist.aspx?topicId=10

Hoelscher, D.M., Kirk, S., Ritchie, L., & Cunningham-Sabo, L. (2013). Position of the academy of nutrition and dietetics: interventions for the prevention and treatment of pediatric overweight and obesity. *Journal of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, 113*(10), 1375-1394. doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2013.08.004

Hovland, J.A., Carraway-Stage, V.G., Cela, A., Collins, C., Diaz, S.R., Collins, A., & Duffrin, M.W. (2013). Food-based science curriculum increases 4th graders multidisciplinary science knowledge. *Journal of Food Science Education, 12,* 81-86. doi: 10.1111/1541-4329.12016

Institute of Medicine. (2012). *Accelerating progress in obesity prevention: solving the weight of the nation.* Retrieved from http://www.iom.edu/~/media/Files/Report%20Files/2012/APOP/APOP_rb.pdf

Jansen, W., Borsboom, G., Meima, A., Joosten-Van Zwanenburg, E., Mackenbach, J.P., Raat, H., & Brug, J. (2011). Effectiveness of a primary school-based intervention to reduce overweight. *International Journal of Pediatric Obesity, 6,* 70-77. doi: 10.3109/17477166.2011.575151

Katz, D.L., Katz, C.S., Treu, J.A., Reynolds, J., Njike, V., Walker, J., Smith, E., & Michael, J. (2011). Teaching healthful food choices to elementary school students and their parents: the nutrition detectives™ program. *Journal of School Health, 81*(1), 21-28. Retrieved from http://navigator-iup.passhe.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=c8h&AN=2010883233&site=ehost-live

Lee, H., Contento, I.R., & Koch, P. (2013). Using a systematic conceptual model for a process evaluation of a middle-school obesity risk-reduction nutrition curriculum intervention: choice, control & change. *Journal of Nutrition Education & Behavior, 45*(2), 126-136. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2012.07.002

Levy, T. S., Ruan, C. M., Castellanos, C. A., Coronel, A. S., Aguilar, A. J., & Gomez Humaran, I. M. (2012). Effectiveness of a diet and physical activity promotion strategy on the prevention of obesity in Mexican school children. *BMC Public Health, 12*(1), 1-13. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-152

Manger, W.M., Manger, L.S., Minno, A.M., Killmeyer, M., Holzman, R.S. Schullinger, J.N., & Rocella, E.J. (2012). Obesity prevention in young schoolchildren: results of a pilot study. *Journal of School Health, 82*(10), 462-468. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2012.00723.x

Namenek Brouwer, R. J. & Benjamin Neelon, S.E. (2013). Watch me grow: A garden-based pilot intervention to increase vegetable and fruit intake in preschoolers. *BMC Public Health, 13*, 1-6. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-363

Nihiser, A.J., Lee, S.M., Wechlser, H., McKenna, M., Odom, E., Reinold, C., Thompson, D., & Grummer-Strawn, L. (2007). Body mass index measurement in schools. *Journal of School Health, 77*(10), 651-671. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2007.00249.x

Parmer, S.M., Salisbury-Glennon, J., Shannon, D., & Struempler, B. (2009). School gardens: an experiential learning approach for a nutrition education program to increase fruit and vegetable knowledge, preference, and consumption among second grade students. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 41*(3), 212-217. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2008.06.002

Prelip, M., Kinsler, J., Le Thai, C., Erausquin, J.T., & Slusser, W. (2012). Evaluation of a school-based multicomponent nutrition education program to improve young children's fruit and vegetable consumption. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 44*(4), 310-318. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2011.10.005

Puma, J., Romaniello, C., Crane, L., Scarbro, S., Belansky, E., & Marshall, J.A. (2013). Long-term student outcomes of the integrated nutrition and physical activity program. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 45*(6), 635-642. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2013.05.006

Tuuri, G., Zanovec, M., Silverman, L., Geaghan, J., Solmon, M., Holston, D., Guarino, A., Roy, H., & Murphy, E. (2009). Smart bodies school wellness program increased children's knowledge healthy nutrition practices and self-efficacy to consume fruits and vegetables. *Appetite, 52,* 445-451. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2008.12.007

Whittemore, R., Chao, A., Jang, M., Jeon, S., Liptak, T., Popick, R., & Grey, M. (2013). Implementation of a school-based internet obesity prevention program for adolescents. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 45*(6), 586-594. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2013.03.012

Witt, K.E & Dunn, C. (2012). Increasing fruit and vegetable consumption among preschoolers: evaluation of color me healthy. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior, 44*(2), 107-113. doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2011.01.002

Yetter, G. (2009). Exercise-based school obesity prevention programs: An overview. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(8), 739-747. doi: 10.1002/pits.20412

SAMPLE HANDOUT: Linking Child Maltreatment to Academic Outcomes
  I.   Child Protective Services Law
  II. Effects
        A. Low Achievement and IQ Scores
Smithgall, Gladden, Howard, George and Courtney (2004)
              1. Egeland (1997)
              2. Margolin (2005)
              3. Leiter (2007)
        B. Special Education Disabilities
              1. Smithgall, gladden, Howard, George and Courtney (2004)
              2. Egeland (1997)
        C. Communication and Language Delays
              1. Cook, Blaustein, Spinazzola, and Van Der Kolk (2003)
              2. Smithgall, Gladden, Howard, George, and Courtney (2004)
              3. Egeland (1997)
              4. Rasmussen (2005)
              5. DePrince, Weinzierl, and Combs (2009)
              6. Perry (2002)
        D. Lack of Attachments
              1. (Perry 2002)
        E. Disorders
              1. Attention Deficit Disorder (Becker-Blease and Freyd, 2008)
              2. Oppositional Defiant Disorder (Ouyang, Fang, Mercy, Perou, and Grosse, 2008)
        F. Delinquency and Increased Drop-out Rates
              1. Mears and Aron (2003)
              2. Wiggins, Fenichel, and Mann (2007)
        G. Social Concerns
              1. Anthonysamy and Zimmer-Gembeck (2007)
              2. Edelson (1999)
              3. Margolin (2005)
              4. Mears and Aron (2003)
        H. Development Delays
              1. Edelson (1999)
        I. Mental Health Concerns
              1. Wiggins, Fenichel and Mann (2007)
  III. Stress
        A. Defining Factors
              1. Heightened sense of arousal or excitement
              2. Perception of negative or positive
              3. Controllability
        B. Behavioral and Physiological Situations (Kopin, 1995)
        C. Controllability (Fox and Dwyer, 2000)
  IV. The Brain
        A. Hippocampus and Long-term Memory (Eichenbaum, 2002)

B. Amygdala and Crisis Situations (LeDoux, 2000)
C. Affects Memory (Pederson, Mauer, and Kaminski, 2004)
V. Educators
    A. Fear and Judgment Call (Crenshaw, Crenshaw, and Litchtenberg, 1995; Kenny, 2001; Smith, 2010)
VI. Intervention Strategies
    A. In school Interventions (Veltman , 2001)
    B. Peer Mentoring Programs (Tolan, Henry, Schoeny, and Bass, 2007)
    C. Tutoring (Ritter, Denny, Albin, Bamett, and Blankenship, 2007)
    D. Reading Recovery Programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2007)
    E. Smooth Transitions (Smithgall, Gladden, Howard, George and Courtney, 2004); (Egelant, 1999)

APPENDIX H: Candidacy Paper Scoring Criteria

Category	Paper Scoring Criteria	Points	Score
Purpose **(10 points)**	The writer's central purpose or argument is stated clearly.	5	
	The stated purpose addresses a significant issue or problem.	5	
Content **(60 points)**	Content clearly supports the paper's stated purpose.	10	
	Content shows thoughtful, in-depth analysis of the topic.	10	
	Paper offers a balanced presentation of relevant information.	10	
	Evidence from professionally legitimate sources is provided.	10	
	Writer synthesizes, rather than merely summarizes, literature.	10	
	Conclusions are logically related to the content and the literature cited.	10	
Organization **(20 points)**	Paper has a clear structure with an introduction, body, and conclusion.	10	
	Ideas are arranged logically to support the purpose or argument.	10	
Mechanics **(10 points)**	Uses APA format appropriately.	5	
	Paper is free from grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors and conforms to length and format criteria*.	5	
Score	**Total Points**	**100**	

*Papers failing to meet length, formatting, or submission requirements will result in a failed first attempt at candidacy

PRESENTATION

Category	Presentation Scoring Criteria	Points	Score
Organization **(15 points)**	The type of presentation is appropriate for the topic.	5	
	Information is presented in a logical sequence.	5	
	Presentation appropriately cites requisite number of references.	5	
Content **(60 points)**	Introduction creates a framework for the presentation.	5	
	Technical terms are well-defined in language appropriate.	5	
	Presentation contains accurate information.	15	
	Material included is relevant to the overall message/purpose.	15	
	Content reflects careful and thorough preparation.	15	
	There is an obvious conclusion summarizing the presentation.	5	
Presentation	Speaker keeps eyes up, looking mostly into the camera, and is appropriately animated.	5	
	Speaker uses a clear, audible voice with good expression.	5	

Mechanics	Delivery is poised, controlled, and smooth.	5	
(25 points)	Good language skills and pronunciation are used.	5	
	Length of presentation is within the assigned time limits*.	5	
Score	**Total Points**	**100**	

*Presentations will be timed and students will not be permitted to exceed the time limit.

DECISION: _____ **REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____**

[Please indicate reasons for the decision and/or recommendations for the doctoral student on the other side of this paper.]

APPENDIX I: Candidacy Paper Requirements

Exams that do not comply with formatting and page requirements will result in a failed exam.

LENGTH: 8 pages total for the cover sheet/abstract/body. Exams that include the optional table or graphic organizer may be 9 pages. References use additional pages. Exams that do not comply with formatting and page requirements will result in a failed exam.

Please DO NOT put your name on each page of the paper as faculty members must evaluate pre-candidates' papers without knowing the student's identity (anonymous peer review). Instead, create a running header with your BANNER ID on every page of the paper. It is important to NUMBER THE PAGES at the bottom so that various sections are easy to identify during the discussion with the committee.

PAGE 1

COVER SHEET/TOPIC/FOCUS (12-point font, single spaced)

Supplies the student's name, title of the paper, Banner ID, and contact information (e-mail address, home and IUP, and telephone number). The title should not exceed 15 words; it needs to identify a topic and a focus. For example, "multicultural education" is a topic and is far too broad; "promoting multicultural competence during teacher preparation programs" has a focus. Think of the focus as a way of narrowing the topic sufficiently to discuss it in a short paper and making it more manageable. Also, when you select your topic and focus, choose something that has a body of research associated with it. For example, "Should there be prayer in schools?" is a controversy and has no accompanying research base. Additionally, while "Elementary education in Saudi Arabia" is a curriculum and instruction topic, the paper will be a description rather than an analysis of research.

PAGE 2

PLAGIARISM DETECTION SCORE, ABSTRACT, AND OUTLINE (12-point print, single spaced)

Indicate on the cover sheet your plagiarism detection score. It must be less than 10 percent. An abstract or summary of the entire paper totaling no more than four or five sentences should appear on this page. Note that an abstract is not the same as the first paragraph of your paper. An outline should be on this page as well. The main sections of it are listed below, but you will need to make it specific to your topic and focus.

IMPORTANT: The abstract, outline, and paper must match.

PAGES 3–8 (Do not exceed six double-spaced pages)

BODY OF PAPER (12-point print, double spaced).

Papers exceeding page limits will result in a failed exam

Part I: Definition of Key Terminology/Background

Identify an issue, trend, or controversy in curriculum and instruction. Use authoritative sources such as national statistics, the statements of leading professional organizations, and articles in highly regarded publications to frame the problem.

Part II: Integrated Literature Review

Critically review the research literature. For this section, do not rely solely on expert opinion; rather, identify original, published research—both quantitative and qualitative—that reports specific findings. For examples of how to do this, look at issues of the American Education Research Association journal, Reviews of Educational Research.

Part III: Implications

Summarize the research findings and discuss the implications for research and professional practice.

PAGE 9 OPIONAL TABLE OR GRAPHIC ORGANIZER (12-point font, single spaced)

Locate additional studies related to the topic. Cluster studies with similar topics, themes, or findings together. Create a ***table or graphic organizer*** that synthesizes the research into themes or strands and briefly explain each cluster. This item is optional. Candidacy exams that do not include a table or graphic organizer will begin references on page 9. Do not add an additional page to the body of the paper in lieu of including a table or graphic organizer.

PAGES 10–12 (approximately)

REFERENCES (12-point font, double spaced)

 Follow APA Style, 6th edition, for all references and in-text citations. Additional pages may be used for the references by students but should include only those sources that are cited in the body of the paper or the graphic organizer.