

University of Kansas
Intercampus Program in Communicative Disorders

Ph.D. Guidelines

Approved by IPCD Faculty December 2003
Amended by IPCD Faculty September 2004
Amended by IPCD Faculty February 2005
Amended by IPCD Faculty October 2011

INTERCAMPUS PROGRAM IN COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS

University of Kansas - Lawrence
University of Kansas Medical Center - Kansas City

Fall 2003

GUIDELINES FOR THE PH.D.

	<u>Page</u>
I. Guidelines for Doctoral Student Advising	3
II. Preliminary Research Requirements for the Doctoral Student	4
III. Research Skills/Responsible Scholarship requirement (RS/RS)	4
IV. Steps toward the Ph.D. in the IPCD	4
V. Required committees for Ph.D. Study	5
VI. Proposed doctoral plan of study	7
VII. Written comprehensive examination guidelines	7
VIII. Comprehensive oral examination	8
IX. Prospectus meeting for dissertation committee	9
X. Colloquium presentation	9
XI. Public dissertation defense	9
XII. Summary of order of events	10
APPENDIX I. Department guidelines for meeting RS/RS requirement	11
APPENDIX II. Format for Plan of Study	12
APPENDIX III: Dissertation Rubric	14

The purpose of this document is to assist the doctoral student in Audiology or Speech-Language Pathology in navigating the maze of requirements involved in achieving the Ph.D. degree at the University of Kansas. Its primary focus is on program (Intercampus Program in Communication Disorders - IPCD) requirements, which are not included in the Graduate School Catalog (available at <http://www.ur.ku.edu/Acadpub/gradcat/contents.html>). In addition to this document and the catalog, students are advised to consult the Graduate School Handbook, available at http://www.ku.edu/~graduate/pdf_files/Grad_handbook.pdf. Students doing work on the medical center campus should consult the Student Planner and Handbook for KUMC.

I. GUIDELINES FOR DOCTORAL STUDENT ADVISING

No student will be accepted into the program unless a faculty member agreed upon by the student has indicated a willingness to serve as advisor. Students can change advisors at anytime in their program. The student is responsible for requesting and reporting any change to the Student Advising Committee. Typically, when the dissertation advisor is selected, that individual becomes the student's academic/program advisor.

The advisor will be responsible for acquainting the student with the University of Kansas and the Intercampus Program with respect to policies and procedures, for helping the student plan the academic program, and when necessary, providing information about the student and her/his progress to other faculty members.

The student should work with and through her/his assigned advisor and keep the advisor informed as to the student's plans, the program of study, and the student's clinical and research activities. Although the advisor is not the sole counselor to the student, the advisor is the student's primary counselor. Regular communication between the advisor and the student can make advising a meaningful and productive process.

In addition to these guidelines it is the student's responsibility to check the graduate catalog for current graduate school requirements. The student is bound to observe Graduate School regulations in effect at the time he/she is admitted to the graduate school. If graduate school requirements or IPCD guidelines change after admission to graduate school, the student has the right to choose which set of requirements and/or guidelines her/his program will follow. If a student chooses to change the requirements and/or guidelines taking effect after her/his initial admission to the program, the student's advisor must be notified in writing.

In accordance with University regulations, the academic advisor should provide a written summary of the student's performance to date at least once a year. This summary should be discussed with the student and is placed in the student's academic file.

Grade Point Average

The grade point average requirements of the graduate school must be met at all times. In addition, a doctoral student will not be allowed to continue in the program if his/her semester GPA falls below 3.0 more than one time prior to the written comprehensive examination. In addition, students whose performance does not meet these criteria for dismissal, but whose performance suggests to the Doctoral Advisory Committee that they will not be able to successfully complete all requirements for the Ph.D., may be advised by the Committee to withdraw from the program.

II. PRELIMINARY RESEARCH REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTORAL STUDENT

The graduate catalog of the University of Kansas states, “The degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) is the highest degree offered by the University. It is awarded for mastering a field of scholarship, for learning methods of investigation appropriate to that field, and for completing a substantial piece of original research.”

The faculty of the Intercampus Program requires each doctoral student to demonstrate some research experience beyond academic course work prior to the written comprehensive examination (preferably as soon as possible after entrance into the program). Such experiences can include completion of a project or thesis that has undergone academic or peer review, or a comparable body of work deemed appropriate by the student’s Doctoral Advising Committee for meeting this requirement. No student may begin the written comprehensive examination until the preliminary research requirement has been satisfied.

III. RESEARCH SKILLS/RESPONSIBLE SCHOLARSHIP (RS/RS)

The Graduate School requires doctoral students to demonstrate competency in research skills and responsible scholarship “distinct from the dissertation itself but strongly supportive thereof.” Requirements for research skills and responsible scholarship are established by individual programs; completion of RS/RS requirements is reported to the Graduate Division using a ~~Do-All~~ PTD (Progress to Degree) form submitted by the department administrative assistant when scheduling the comprehensive Oral Examination. This requirement must be completed before the student can be certified as prepared to proceed to the Comprehensive Oral Examination. See the Research Skills/Responsible Scholarship section of the Graduate Catalog for general guidelines; detailed departmental guidelines regarding this requirement may be found in Appendix I.

IV. STEPS TOWARD THE PH.D. IN IPCD

The essential steps toward a Ph.D. in the IPCD are the following:

1. Completion of academic coursework
2. Preliminary research participation
3. Completion of the Graduate School Research Skills/Responsible Scholarship (RS/RS) requirement
4. Written comprehensive examinations
5. Comprehensive oral examinations
6. Dissertation
7. Oral defense of the dissertation

Steps 1, 2, and 3 take place concurrently and must be completed before the student can move on to Step 4. Steps 4 through 7 occur sequentially. Steps 1, 2, and 4 are specified by the IPCD; steps 3, 5, 6 and 7 are requirements of the Graduate School as well. The Graduate School will review the student’s academic record to ensure that these particular requirements have been met.

REQUIRED COMMITTEES FOR PH.D. STUDY

A student's progress toward completion of a Ph.D. degree will be guided and evaluated by a series of **5 committees**:

1. The **Doctoral Advisory Committee**, which will guide the student through steps 1, 2, and 3 and determine when the student is ready to move to step 4.
2. The **Written Comprehensive Committee**, which will oversee the written comprehensive examination. This committee may or may not be composed of the membership of the Doctoral Advisory Committee.
3. The **Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee**, which will oversee the comprehensive oral examination. Typically, the Written Examination Committee then serves as the Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee, although changes in membership are possible, pending advisor consent.
4. The **Dissertation Committee**, which will oversee the planning and execution of the dissertation study. This committee may or may not be the same as the Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee.
5. The **Oral Defense Committee**, which will oversee the oral defense of the dissertation and which is typically the same as the Dissertation Committee (but may have changes in membership).

The intent of the committee structure is to provide timely guidance to the student working through the various levels of Ph.D. preparation, with enough flexibility to accommodate possible changes in a student's interests as the student's scholarly interests mature, and to accommodate possible changes in faculty resources during that time. At the upper levels of the Ph.D. preparation, the committee structure is designed to provide fair and appropriate evaluations of student progress and achievements. Throughout the time of Ph.D. preparation, the student can change advisors and committee members as needed to match current interests and resources, although there are obvious advantages to continuity, as well. Details regarding the makeup and activities of each committee follow.

A Note about Committee Membership

Several committees require that faculty members be listed by the Graduate school as members of the Graduate Faculty. Please note that faculty and staff are *not* automatically members of the Graduate Faculty. The student should inquire to determine whether a faculty member holds a Graduate Faculty appointment. If not, it is often possible to arrange for an Ad Hoc appointment for service on a student committee, although this step requires a little additional time.

Doctoral Advisory Committee

Given its central academic advisory role, it is expected that the **Doctoral Advisory Committee** will be assembled as soon as possible to help the student develop an academic program of study. This program must be approved no later than the end of the second semester in residence (see section VI below). This committee will be composed of a minimum of three faculty members selected by the student and will include the student's advisor and at least one additional member from the IEC. All faculty members serving on this committee must also be

listed at the Graduate School as members of the graduate faculty.

The Doctoral Advisory Committee will determine when the student has successfully completed the requirements detailed in steps 1-3 and is ready to move on to the Written Comprehensive Examination requirement (step 4).

Written Comprehensive Committee

The structure of the **Written Comprehensive Committee** will be determined by the student and the student's advisor, in consultation with the Doctoral Advisory Committee. The student, in consultation with the Written Comprehensive Committee, will select the procedure to be followed for the Written Comprehensive Examinations [see Section VII below].

Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee

The **Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee** is required by the Graduate School. It is at this level that review of the Graduate School requirements becomes more explicit. In addition, note that prior approval by the Graduate School is required for scheduling the Oral Examination. See section VIII below.

The Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee will consist of at least five members, all of whom must be members of the Graduate Faculty. The academic advisor will serve as committee chairperson (note: in order to serve as chair, the advisor must have Dissertation Chair Status with the Graduate School). At least three members of the committee will be members of the IEC. One committee member must hold an academic appointment in the correlative area *outside the department*. One committee member will be the Graduate School Representative; this person must not have any appointment, either full time or courtesy, in the Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences and Disorders or the Department of Hearing and Speech. The Graduate School Representative will be selected on the recommendation of the chairperson and student, subject to review by the Graduate School. It is recommended that the majority of the committee members be selected from those who served on the Written Comprehensive Committee.

Dissertation Committee

The **Dissertation Committee** will consist of at least three members, with the academic advisor as chairperson (note: in order to serve as chair, the advisor must have Dissertation Chair Status with the Graduate School). The Dissertation Committee will have the responsibility of directing the candidate in her/his preparation of the dissertation. The chairperson and at least one other member of the Dissertation Committee shall be from the IEC. Faculty members from outside the IEC can serve as Chair if approval is obtained from the IEC. It is the joint responsibility of the Chair of the Dissertation Committee and the student to be knowledgeable about the Graduate School requirements for residency, enrollment, and other regulations that apply to completion of the dissertation.

Oral Defense Committee

The Chairperson of the Dissertation Committee, in consultation with the candidate, will select the **Oral Defense Committee**. As with the Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee, all members of this committee must have appointments to the Graduate Faculty. One member, who must not hold an appointment to the department, will be nominated to represent the

Graduate Faculty. This committee shall consist of the dissertation committee and at least two additional members from the Graduate Faculty, for a total of at least five members.

Prior to the formation of this committee, at least five months must have elapsed since the comprehensive oral examination, and the Dissertation Committee must have accepted the dissertation for defense. This requires that a written copy of the dissertation be disseminated to the members of the Dissertation Committee for review prior to the oral examination. The written dissertation is scored by each committee member using the approved departmental rubric (see Appendix III). Completed rubrics will be collected by the dissertation chair at the defense. Please also see the Graduate School requirements for enrollment, residency, and related requirements. As is the case for the Comprehensive Oral Examination, a request for Graduate Division permission must be filed at least two weeks prior to the requested examination date.

V. PROPOSED DOCTORAL PLAN OF STUDY

The doctoral student and the Doctoral Advisory Committee (see Section V) should plan, approve and file a Proposed Plan of Study with the IPCD **before the end of the second semester of the student's program**. The format for this Plan of Study appears in Appendix II.

Any and all changes in the plan of study must be initiated by all members of the Doctoral Advisory Committee, the student, and one of the IPCD Co-Directors.

Students who are completing clinical degree programs (i.e., AuD; MA SLP) in conjunction with the PhD need to formulate a plan of study for the clinical degree program as well as the PhD plan of study. Both plans should be presented to the Doctoral Advisory Committee so that it is clear how the requirements for both degree programs are being met. Both plans of study need to be filed with the IPCD before the end of the second semester of the student's program. Students are encouraged to share their plan of study for the clinical degree program with relevant clinical coordinators for advice on whether the plan for obtaining required clinical hours is feasible and realistic. Moreover, MA SLP students who are not following the traditional schedule in meeting clinical requirements (e.g., 3 hours-3 hours-1 hour practicum in Year 1) must petition the Intercampus Clinical Committee (see Appendix F of the MA SLP Handbook) for approval of modifications.

VI. WRITTEN COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION GUIDELINES

Graduate School regulations charge the faculty with responsibility for determining the readiness of a student to be admitted into candidacy for the Ph.D. In making a judgment regarding the student's admission to candidacy, the Written Comprehensive Committee will consider the student's readiness to conduct research by evaluating her or his knowledge base, ability to integrate information, and clarity of written and oral expression. The written comprehensive examination is the formal method used for determining candidacy and ascertaining whether the student is prepared to undertake independent research for the dissertation. Thus, the written comprehensive examination is scheduled after the student has (a) completed all of the required coursework on the student's program plan of study, (b) has satisfied the IPCD research requirement (see Section II), and (c) has satisfied the Graduate School RS/RS requirement (see Section III).

The nature, content, and format of the examination will be determined by the members of the Written Comprehensive Committee in consultation with the student. The committee should consider the student's chosen area(s) of research in planning the written comprehensive

Examination. Because the Ph.D. is an individualized program of study, it is understood that there is not a standard method of examining that applies to all doctoral students in the IPCD. The Written Comprehensive Committee has the ultimate responsibility for determining the nature and design of the written comprehensive examination and assuring that the standards specified by the IEC are carried out. The Committee, with the approval of the student, may request one or more non-committee faculty members to participate in the examination of the student. A variety of possible examination options exist, four of which are as follows:

- (1) The student prepares for a series of written examinations in areas designated by the Written Comprehensive Committee. Under this option, the written examinations should not exceed 8 hours per day and should be limited to no more than 20 hours in five days.
- (2) The Written Comprehensive Committee may also utilize a take-home format. In this case the examination period may be distributed over a longer period of time, but not to exceed 12 months.
- (3) The student prepares a number of written papers on topics agreed upon by members of the Written Comprehensive Committee.
- (4) Some combination of the written examinations, papers, or research projects described above.

A mechanism for grading the student's written comprehensive examination will be determined by the student's Written Comprehensive Committee. The recommended procedure is for the Committee to assign each paper or other project to three members of the Written Comprehensive Committee. The readers may assign a mark of pass, fail, or revise. To pass, at least two members must assign a grade of pass. A paper or project may be revised no more than two times. Failure to receive a passing mark after a total of three attempts on any paper or project constitutes failure of the examination.

Examination Report

The student's advisor shall report the results of the written comprehensive examinations to the student and to the respective department chairperson on each campus. This report must include appropriate recommendations for the student's admission to candidacy, continued preparatory study, or discontinuation. If the report is unfavorable, the student may repeat the examination after the lapse of at least one semester if the Written Comprehensive Committee so recommends. Should the written comprehensive examinations be failed twice, the student may not be given a third examination, except upon the recommendation of the Written Comprehensive Committee and with special approval of the IEC.

VII. COMPREHENSIVE ORAL EXAMINATION

The Comprehensive Oral Examination is open to all members of the University community. The Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee is responsible for carrying out the evaluation of the student's performance, in a closed session following the examination.

It is recommended that the candidate take the oral examination as soon as possible but no later than two weeks following successful completion of the written examinations. To accomplish this, the student should contact the members of the Comprehensive Oral

Examination Committee and arrange for the date and time with each member of the committee. When these arrangements are finalized, the information should be given to the department's administrative assistant who will fill out and send the electronic PTD (Progress to Degree) form to route to COGA and Graduate Studies-for approval. It is the student's responsibility to assure that the form has been filed with the graduate office. The student should also ask the department's administrative assistant for assistance in reserving a room for the examination.

The comprehensive oral examination focuses primarily on the student's written examination topics, although the student must be prepared to answer questions from other areas as well. The student is free to discuss aspects of the examination with Committee members prior to the examination. Each member of the Committee is free to share information about their part of the examination with the student, although they are under no obligation to do so.

Majority vote of the Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee determines satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance. In the event of failure, the Chairperson, in consultation with Committee members, will advise the student as to possible courses of action.

VIII. PROSPECTUS MEETING FOR DISSERTATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL OF PROPOSED DISSERTATION PROJECT.

The student, with the guidance of the dissertation advisor, will submit in writing a Prospectus that details a proposed original study. Members of the Dissertation Committee should have a reasonable amount of time prior to the prospectus meeting to review the prospectus. A major goal of the Prospectus meeting is to obtain advice and suggestions from Committee members that will result in a strong, empirical study. The student may take this opportunity to present pilot data to support the plan set forth in the Prospectus. At the completion of the meeting, the Committee may meet with or without the student to determine if the student should move on to the data collection phase and/or any other recommendations. It is the role of the Thesis Advisor to summarize the Committee's recommendations to the student.

IX. COLLOQUIUM PRESENTATION

Students are encouraged to present a colloquium to the IPCD faculty prior to the Dissertation Defense, preferably in the proposal stage. The student and his/her academic advisor are responsible for scheduling a colloquium.

X. PUBLIC DISSERTATION DEFENSE

At a time scheduled with the consent of the dissertation advisor and Oral Defense Committee members, the student will present his/her dissertation with an opportunity for questions from the audience. Following the presentation of the dissertation, the student commences with the defense of the dissertation with the Oral Defense Committee and any members of the public who elect to attend the defense. Any individual may ask questions of the candidate at any time. The dissertation presentation and defense typically last two hours. At the end of the meeting, the Oral Defense Committee meets without the student or guests present to provide an evaluation of the defense. **Majority** vote of the committee determines satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance. Honors performance is determined through anonymous ballot, and the awarding of honors requires a **unanimous** vote by the Oral Defense Committee.

Changes in the written dissertation may be required as a result of the oral defense. The

dissertation advisor, in collaboration with the Oral Defense Committee, will decide the nature and extent of the changes.

XII. SUMMARY OF ORDER OF EVENTS

1. Meet with academic advisor to prepare a tentative plan of study and decide on members to serve on Doctoral Advisory Committee
2. No later than the end of the second semester in residence, Doctoral Advisory Committee plans coursework, preliminary research experience (if this requirement has not been met), and completion of RS/RS requirement.
3. Written Comprehensive Committee establishes guidelines for student's written comprehensive examination.
4. Written Comprehensive Committee determines that student has passed the written comprehensive examination.
5. Comprehensive Oral Examination Committee determines that student has passed the comprehensive oral examination.
6. Student works with dissertation advisor to develop a dissertation prospectus
7. Student presents the prospectus to dissertation committee
8. Dissertation committee approves prospectus
9. Student may present prospectus at a colloquium
10. Student completes dissertation
11. Student gives public dissertation defense
12. Electronic Dissertation Submission:
 - Submit the PDF version of your dissertation to the UMI/Proquest submission site: <http://www.etdadmin.com/>
 - Dissertation formatting guidelines can be found here: http://www.graduate.ku.edu/downloads/ETD/ETD%20Doctoral%20Guidelines_10.22.10.pdf
 - Your submission will be checked for formatting and completeness by the COGA. You will be notified via email after graduation if the work is accepted or needs revisions.
13. Submit these items to COGA (College Office of Graduate Affairs) in 109 Strong Hall:
 - Title page and Acceptance page
 - Title page requires *all* committee members' signatures.
 - Acceptance page requires only committee chairperson's signature.
 - These pages must comply with the formatting guidelines. Please see the following links for templates: http://www.graduate.ku.edu/04-02_etd.shtml?FormattingInstructions
 - ETD Release Form
 - Please review and sign the form: http://www.graduate.ku.edu/downloads/ETD/ETD%20release%20form%2010_7_10.pdf
 - If you need to place an embargo on your dissertation, you must also obtain your Department Graduate Director's original signature.

APPENDIX I. DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR MEETING PHD RESEARCH SKILLS AND RESPONSIBLE SCHOLARSHIP (RS/RS) REQUIREMENT

Students are required to complete 15 credits of coursework in the Research Area: 1 course devoted to Responsible Scholarship and remaining credits in Research Skills.

Research Skills

Most students typically complete the Research Skills credits in experimental group design and statistics (e.g., PSYC 790, PSYC 791, PSYC 815, PSYC 892, PSYC 990, PSYC 991, PSYC 992, PSYC 983, PRE 710, PRE 725, PRE 811, PRE 905, or PRE 906) but courses from different research perspective such as applied behavioral analysis (e.g., HDFL 803), clinical trials (e.g., PRVM 810), qualitative research or ethnographic research (e.g., PRVM 806) may also be taken as relevant to the aspirant's research goals. More specialized research skills (e.g., specialized laboratory techniques such as acoustic analysis, neuroscience methods, etc.) may be covered through independent study or research practicum with a faculty member (SPLH 970/974 or AUD 846).

Each student's plan for completing this requirement should be detailed in his/her Plan of Study (Appendix II) and approved by his/her Doctoral Advisory Committee.

Responsible Scholarship (1 course)

Students are required to complete a departmentally approved course on Responsible Scholarship, specifically SPLH/PSYC 982 or PRVM 853. If a student wishes to complete this requirement through a course that has not been previously approved by the department, the student should submit the syllabus from the proposed course or independent study for approval by the student's Doctoral Advisory Committee. Topics covered in the course/independent study should include (as relevant to the student's research goals): protection of human subjects, welfare of laboratory animals, conflict of interest, data management, mentor/student responsibilities, collaborative research, authorship/publication/plagiarism/copyright, peer review, professional practices, maintenance of confidentiality, and appropriate research conduct and research misconduct. The course/independent study should include face-to-face meetings and a minimum of 8-hours of instruction distributed across several sessions. The pedagogical approach should include multiple opportunities for active participation in discussion, reading literature, and ethical decision-making.

Each student's plan for completing this requirement should be detailed in his/her Plan of Study (Appendix II) and approved by his/her Doctoral Advisory Committee.

APPENDIX III: Dissertation Rubric (approved October 2011)

CLAS		Department of Speech-Language-Hearing: Sciences & Disorders			
Components	Outcome Quality Levels				
	Outstanding - 4	Very Good - 3	Acceptable - 2	Unacceptable - 1	
Introduction/ Statement of the Problem	Exceptional writing/organization Comprehensive understanding of problem Compelling rationale Strongly articulated, significant question(s)	Very well written/organized Presents very good understanding of problem Persuasive, convincing case Well-articulated, interesting and important question(s)	Adequately written/organized Presents adequate understanding of problem Adequate rationale for studying the problem. Adequately articulated, important question(s)	Poorly written/organized Presents lack of understanding of the problem Insufficient knowledge to generate adequate rationale Poorly articulated and unimportant questions.	
Grounding in the Literature	Formidable summary of current, relevant literature Thoughtful, critical analysis and synthesis of literature	Comprehensive summary of the relevant literature Critical analysis and synthesis of literature	Summary of current, relevant literature Analysis and synthesis of literature	Fails to cite relevant articles Misinterprets the literature Lacks critical analysis and synthesis.	
Methodology/ Approach	Exceptional writing/organization Superior level of ability in all aspects of design to yield a valid and reliable result.	Very well written/organized Highly developed level of competence in all aspects of design to yield a valid and reliable result.	Adequately written/organized Basic level of competence in all aspects of design to yield a valid and reliable result.	Poorly written/organized, Chooses incorrect tools or methodology. Lack sufficient controls to yield valid and reliable results.	
Results/ Analysis	Exceptional writing/organization Well executed, thorough Excellent understanding of statistical methods	Very well written/organized Well executed, thorough Very good understanding of statistical methods	Adequately written/organized Well executed, thorough Shows good understanding of statistical methods	Poorly written/organized, Incomplete, poorly executed Shows poor understanding of statistical methods	
Discussion/ Conclusion	Exceptional writing writing/organization Integrates previous research Conclusions are supported by the evidence Indicates future research & limitations of the study	Very well written/organized Integrates previous research Conclusions are supported by the evidence Indicates where future research might improve upon what was done	Adequately written/organized Well synthesized Conclusions are supported by the evidence Indicates where future research might improve upon what was done	Poorly written/organized, Insufficient discussion of results and/or misinterprets the findings.	
Overall	Beautifully written/organized Innovative, Significant	Very well written/organized Solid, Important	Adequately written/organized Competent execution	Poorly written/organized, Lacks basic components	

*Adapted from Barbara Lovitts & Ellen Wert, *Developing Quality Dissertations in the Social Sciences*, 2009.