EDUCATIONAL DOCTORATE (Ed.D.) in EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

STUDENT PROGRAM HANDBOOK

Version:
13 October 2016

Department of
Educational Leadership & Foundations
Brigham Young University
306 MCKB
Provo, UT 84602

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Dear Students,

Welcome to the Ed.D. program at the McKay School of BYU. This revised Ed.D. program is based on a scholar-practitioner model and sets ambitious learning outcomes for the students. You have been selected from a large candidate pool to be in this cohort, and we are confident that together we can achieve these outcomes.

This student handbook is meant to help you understand program policies and processes. Please don't be put off by its legal tone—it is almost impossible to adopt any other tone when writing general policies and processes. Know that we are eager to work with you in courses and in your research to enhance your leadership skills in order to improve the educational institutions with which you are affiliated. Your success is our success. Together we can continue to build an Ed.D. program with a reputation of high quality and improve the educational experiences of students at all levels.

Warmest regards,

Pamela Hallam, Chair
Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About This Handbook

This handbook details the policies procedures, resources, and expectations for students in the Ed.D. program offered through the Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations Department[1] (EDLF) in the David O. McKay School of Education (MSE). This version of the handbook supersedes and replaces all previous versions, memos, and updates. A current version of the handbook is available through the departmental web site. Its information is subject to correction or change by the EDLF department at any time. The department will attempt to notify current students by e-mail or memo of any handbook changes. However, students are responsible for meeting the policies and requirements of the most recent handbook version applying to their cohort. The contact person for this handbook is Professor E. Vance Randall (vance_randall@byu.edu).

Doctoral Program Committee

The Ed.D. Program is supervised by the Doctoral Program Committee that is responsible for overseeing and implementing the policies and academic programming of the Ed.D. Program, as established by the committee of the whole (COW) of the EDLF department. One member serves as Chair of the committee. Following are the members of the doctoral committee:

Chair:

E. Vance Randall, Ph.D., Professor

Members:

Steven J. Hite, Ed.D., Professor
Sterling Hilton, Ph.D., Associate Professor
Don Baum, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Bryan Bowles, Ed.D., Assistant Professor

---

[1] Short bios of all Graduate Faculty Status faculty members in the Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations can be found in Appendix A.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

The Ed.D. Program is offered through the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations (EDLF) in the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. This doctoral degree program is grounded in the Mission of Brigham Young University "to assist individuals in their quest for perfection and eternal life. That assistance should provide a period of intensive learning in a stimulating setting where a commitment to excellence and the full realization of human potential is pursued." In addition, the Mission of the McKay School of Education is that "We strive to model the attributes of Jesus Christ, the Master Teacher, as we prepare professionals who educate with eternal perspective." Inherent in these Missions is a Christian worldview, a belief in the eternal nature of man, a commitment to the theological imperative of gaining all the knowledge we can, and the doctrinal teaching that "the glory of God is intelligence, or, in other words, light and truth" (Doctrine & Covenants 93:35).

Nested within the BYU and McKay School of Education Mission is the Vision and Mission of the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations.

EDLF Vision

Our vision is to improve life conditions and opportunities for individuals, families and communities worldwide.

EDLF Mission

As educational leaders, our mission is to improve the equity and quality of teaching and learning environments throughout the world. We accomplish this mission through the integration of research, teaching, and service to strengthen educational opportunities for all people worldwide. This integrated mission is accomplished by realizing the following three aims:

- Explore and expand the knowledge of educational leadership in theory, policy, and practice to provide conceptual and practical foundations.
- Foster the growth of educational leaders of faith and character who possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to fulfill our mission.
- Build the capacity of individuals, families, communities, states and nations to identify and solve educational problems.

Carnegie Project on the Education (CPED) Doctorate

The EDLF Department is proud to be a consortium member of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). CPED is a Consortium of over 80 colleges and schools of education, which have committed resources to work together to undertake a critical examination of the doctorate in education (Ed.D.) through dialog, experimentation, critical feedback and evaluation.

CPED vision. As explained on their [website](), the vision of the CPED is to transform the Ed.D. (referred to as a Professional Practice Doctorate within the Consortium) into the degree of choice for preparing the next generation of practitioner experts and school (K-12) college leaders in Education, especially those who will generate new knowledge and scholarship about educational practice (or related policies) and will have responsibility for stewarding the Education profession.

CPED mission. To accomplish this vision, the mission of CPED is to improve the efficacy and reliability of the professional doctorate in education for the advanced preparation of school practitioners and clinical faculty, academic leaders and professional staff for the nation's schools, colleges and the learning organizations that support them. This mission is done by redesigning all aspects of Ed.D. programs including: curriculum, assessments, admissions, etc.

To this end, CPED does not offer a prescription for professional practice preparation programs, but rather honors the local context of the school of education as well as those constituents who are served by its member programs. As a result, CPED created the following principles and architecture to inform professional practice preparation program development.

> We, the members of CPED, believe:
> 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.

CPED principles. With this understanding, CPED identified the following statements that will focus a research and development agenda to test, refine, and validate principles for the professional doctorate in education. The CPED Professional Doctorate in Education:

- *Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.*
- *Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.*
- *Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.*
- *Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.*
- *Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.*
- *Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge.*

Ed.D. Program Overview

The Ed.D. Program will follow the cohort delivery method, which results in a very specific and concentrated field of inquiry. Requirements include satisfactory completion of coursework consisting of: (a) 88 credit hours distributed as up to 36 hours of credit for completion of an appropriate master's or comparable degree, (b) 40 hours of core disciplinary subject matter coursework, and (c) 12 hours of dissertation credit.

Students will be required to pass a faculty evaluation at the end of each semester to continue the program into the second and third years. Students will be required to complete a comprehensive exam and successfully complete a dissertation. Students should be able to complete the program in three to four years.

The Ed.D. Program requirements are intended to avoid competition with or duplication of existing PhD programs in the School of Education; the program has been designed to utilize all the unique strengths of an Ed.D. model as studied and developed by nationally ranked peers in the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. Details concerning the admissions process, prerequisites, proposed curricula, and schedules follow.

Being—Knowing—Doing

Education is inherently value-laden. Likewise, leadership is a moral endeavor with its own sets of values and beliefs.   Leaders are not just to lead but also to engage in the essential transformation of themselves, other individuals, organizations and society "towards the full realization of human potential" and a society where all are "of one heart and one mind…and there [are] no poor among them" (Moses 7:18). All are alike unto God, and as God's children, we are all brothers and sisters. This transformational process of personal growth in goodness must begin first with the leader. Leadership is first and foremost a personal and individual characteristic, a combination of the matters of the heart and the analytic skills of the mind. People cannot be effective leaders of organizations until they know who they are as leaders, possessing their own personal worldview, vision and ethics to inform their thinking and to guide their actions. Authentic *being* must connect with *learning* and then *doing* if the action is to be good. You cannot be a good leader unless you are a person who has a clear sense of self, possesses a moral compass, feels the driving force of a personal mission, and has a compassionate regard for others.

The Ed.D. Program integrates leadership with stewardship. This complementary integration strives to produce steward leaders. A steward leader is motivated by the following beliefs:

- Man is God's steward who, along with others, gives him or her a stewardship or a responsibility to serve and uplift others. In serving others, we are also serving God.
- We are accountable to God and others for our stewardship.
- As the Lord's servants, we are moral agents charged with the care, nurturing, development and growth of others.
- Stewardship consists of how we use our time, talents, and resources to build others and contribute to a more just society.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Program Learning Outcomes & Curricular Foundation

The EDLF Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership prepares mid-career leaders for advanced leadership positions in educational institutions. Graduates will exhibit the dispositions, knowledge, and skills to make educational organizations transformational places for preparing all students, regardless of background or individual circumstances, for a productive and fulfilling life and to contribute to the improvement of our society. The goal of the program is to equip ethical leaders to use research and best practices to improve learning, personal and societal well-being, and other important outcomes in educational settings "where a commitment to excellence and the full realization of human potential is pursued" (BYU Mission Statement) for all students.

Graduates of this program will be able to:

- Understand and develop into steward leaders in education who are moral change agents committed to assist in the profound and broad transformation of individuals, educational organizations and society.
- Understand and influence the larger educational ecosystem with its political, philosophical, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts to expedite the transformation of education organizations.
- Possess the knowledge, skills, and strategies to facilitate organizational and systemic change in education towards an equitable, excellent and transformative learning environment for all students.
- Apply the knowledge, skills, and inquiry strategies acquired in this program to solve significant problems of educational practice.

These program-learning outcomes can be organized into four operational domains with sub-components, which lay a curricular and course foundation for the Ed.D. Program (see Table 1).

Table 1

Four Ed.D. Operational Domains

Personal and Interpersonal Domain	• Worldviews and Ethics • Steward Leaders and Leadership Theory • Interpersonal Relationships, Communication, and Group Dynamics • Teaching and Learning
Contextual Domain	• Philosophy of Education • Political Ideology and Governance in Education • Social and Cultural Foundations of Education • Legal Aspects
Organizational Domain	• Organizational Change and Development • Strategic Leadership and Planning • Strategic Use of Human and Fiscal Resources • Education Policy and Politics
Inquiry Domain	• Problem Identification and Resolution • Research Methodology and Methods (Quantitative and Qualitative) • Analytics (Statistics and Data Analysis) • Personnel and Program Evaluation

Ed.D. Program Processes

Admissions

The deadline for program admissions is March 1st during even years only. To be admissible to the Ed.D. Program, an applicant is required to have a master's degree (or acceptable equivalent). To be competitive for admission, applicants need to meet the following qualifications:

1. Three years of leadership experience in an educational setting before beginning the program.
2. A cumulative GPA of at least 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) during the last 60 hours of coursework.
3. One of the following three graduate admissions tests, at following level of performance:
   a. GRE, with each sub-test score at or above the 50th percentile;
   b. LSAT, with a test score at or above the 60th percentile; and/or
   c. GMAT, with a test score at or above the 50th percentile.
4. A clear statement in the letter of intent that describes how the Ed.D. will facilitate advancement in the applicant's current career trajectory.

Students may also be asked to participate in interviews with faculty by telephone, video conferencing or in person as part of the admissions process.

A completed BYU Graduate School application must be received (Online Application). The completed application form must include: a report of scores obtained on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), LSAT, or GMAT; official transcripts of all previous college and university studies; a letter of intent addressed to the admissions committee; letters of recommendation from three individuals who are familiar with the student's work such as his or her current supervisor and scholarly potential; and a completed Ecclesiastical Endorsement form.

Admission decisions should be made by late March. Upon notification of an offer of admission to the program, students must submit within two weeks a completed *Memorandum of Understanding* (see Appendix B) from their employing institution or direct supervisor detailing the time commitment and travel requirements of the program and agreeing to support the student's admission into the program. Students will not be allowed to enroll in classes for the first summer of study until this memo is placed in their file. This requirement is not negotiable.

Financial Aid Opportunities

The EDLF Department has very limited funding for its students and our annual scholarship funding is variable from year to year. Incoming students interested in financial aid should submit the ***EDLF Ed.D. Program Application for Financial Aid*** form as part of the initial application process for funding in the summer or fall of the current calendar year. This form can be found on the website or obtained from the Department Secretary in 306 MCKB and is due by July 15th. The Ed.D. Program Committee will review applications and determine the scholarship funding. Students should be aware that receiving funding for one year does not guarantee that a student will receive the funding the next year.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Dissertation Committee

Throughout the course of the Ed.D. Program, each student will work under the supervision of a dissertation committee. Dissertation committees are comprised of five members, all of whom must hold graduate faculty status at BYU. One member of the dissertation committee serves as chair who will chair the student's dissertation, and the other four members serve either as major (2) or minor (2) committee members. The dissertation chair, major committee members and at least one minor committee member must be a member of the EDLF faculty. The dissertation committee also function as the examining committee for the prospectus and dissertation defenses. If a student has constituted a dissertation committee in collaboration with the chair, then this committee will likely be the committee throughout the entire program of study. If the committee is not formed in collaboration with the chair, then a temporary committee will be constituted by the department, which committee will need to be replaced at the earliest possible opportunity with faculty members who have been specifically recruited to work with the student and chair on a specific topic. Students with similar research problems may choose to work together with one or more faculty member(s), or a student can choose to work with one professor and the committee in the more traditional committee structure.

The responsibilities of the chair, as well as major and minor members, are specified in the Dissertation and Defense Processes section of this handbook.

Program of Study

The **Study List** is a form used to designate for the student the program of study or which courses need to be taken to complete the Ed.D. degree. This form is essentially a contract with the university that the Ed.D. degree will be granted upon completion of the dissertation, the comprehensive exam and the courses listed on the form (including 799R, Dissertation).

The Ed.D. candidate's dissertation chair will help with filling out the form, which is then signed by the dissertation committee and sent to the EDLF graduate coordinator. The completed and signed *Study List* form should be given to the department secretary by the EDLF graduate coordinator no later than the end of the first summer term of graduate study. In accordance with university policy, the department can place a hold on a graduate student for failure to submit a *Study List* in a timely manner, which will block registration.

With dissertation committee consent, students can make changes in the *Study List*, including changes in dissertation committee membership. All *Study List* changes must be submitted using the **Study List Change** form obtained from the department secretary. Signatures must be obtained on this form from the student's dissertation chair, Graduate Coordinator and the Department Chair before the change is approved.

A committee member cannot be removed from the committee without their prior knowledge and consent, nor should they be removed from the committee to expedite the defense of the prospectus or dissertation. Prior to being asked to shift to or from, vacate, or accept a position on a dissertation committee, at any point during the dissertation process, a faculty member must be informed in person by the dissertation chair of the rationale for the requested action. If the

faculty member concurs with the reason and rationale, then they can sign the appropriate location in the *Study List Change* form. If the faculty member does not agree with the rationale, particularly in the case of vacating a position on the dissertation committee, then the chair of the dissertation committee can present a petition in writing to the EDLF Committee of the Whole (COW) to authorize the removal of the faculty member from the committee. The decision of the EDLF COW regarding the petition is binding and final.

Progress Toward Graduation

Students must make satisfactory progress[2] in each of the semesters and terms during the Ed.D. program. While the university allows a maximum of eight years to complete the doctoral degree, this program is designed to be completed in three to four years. While this timeframe is possible, the student is responsible to make this timeframe a reality. In this program, only truly exceptional reasons for extending beyond the university-allocated eight years will be considered. Formal application for extension, including a careful presentation of the extenuating circumstances, proposed timeline (including the mechanisms for completion of all program requirements), and plans to ensure program currency, must be made by the student to the dissertation committee. Upon signed and unanimous approval of the dissertation committee, the application will be forwarded to the graduate coordinator.

Minimum Registration

Students must maintain minimum registration at the university to retain current student status. If the minimum registration requirement is not met, the University automatically drops the student. **Minimum registration is 6 credit hours per academic year (September through August)**. Additionally, the student must do the following: (a) register for and complete at least 2 credit hours their first semester of graduate study, and (b) be registered for at least two hours during the semester of both the prospectus and dissertation defenses and graduation. Spring and Summer terms are counted together as being a single semester for these registration requirements. Students must be registered for at least one credit of dissertation at any time they are working on their dissertation, including, but not limited to, writing, data collection and analysis, and consulting with faculty.

In addition, a student must be registered for at least 2 semester hours when employed on campus (which includes graduate assistantships). Spring and Summer terms are counted separately for this requirement.

Course Evaluations

Each semester/term all students are strongly encouraged to complete course evaluations. These evaluations rate the course as well as the instructor. We ask all students to please take the time at the end of each semester/term to complete these course evaluations. They can be found on MyBYU under *Student Ratings*. Student responses are anonymous (unless the student indicates

---

[2] For definition and elaboration of satisfactory progress, please refer to the section on **Graduate Student Evaluation**.

otherwise), and the professors will not see any of the responses until after grades have been submitted.

Attendance and Adequate Performance

Students will be required to be present for all cohort coursework. This type of program and its course delivery model are intended to develop intensive study with group interaction and research skills by meeting Friday afternoon and evening and all day Saturday on selected weekends, with intensive class preparation when students are at their worksites between course meetings. Students must be present at course meetings because missing a weekend may mean missing a large percentage of coursework as well as reducing the productivity of the cohort as an interactive learning community.

Course Performance Expectation

Students must earn a grade of C- or better in any class for the course to count toward the graduate degree. Courses below a C- will have to be remediated and will lead automatically to an unsatisfactory progress towards graduation for that semester. Coursework overall must average a 3.0 to graduate from the program.

Graduate Student Evaluation

Each graduate student is formally evaluated after each semester, with spring and summer terms considered together as one semester. On an ongoing and less formal basis, if a graduate student needs guidance and assistance in meeting performance standards in coursework and group processes, the faculty members involved will communicate the relevant issues to the student's dissertation chair, who will counsel with the student. The chair is the student's advocate and defender, acting as counselor and taking the lead among the faculty in responsibility for maximizing the student's performance.

The EDLF faculty meets as the COW and, for each student, considers progress made during the semester. Progress is considered in terms of the following criteria: (a) courses taken and grades received, (b) a report from the dissertation chair on progress, (c) a progress report from the department secretary and/or graduate coordinator (e.g. plan of study, prospectus approval, comprehensive exam completion, etc.), and (d) participation in the activities of the cohort. Evaluation of progress is made in the final faculty meeting of each of the semester throughout the course of study. Student progress is rated as satisfactory, marginal, or unsatisfactory. Marginal progress is an expression of concern and is accompanied by a formal letter describing the concerns and stating what must be done to return to satisfactory progress. The following conditions would generally lead to a marginal progress evaluation:

1. No Study List was submitted by the end of fall semester of the first year.
2. Inadequate progress toward the prospectus being approved by the end of winter semester of the second year.
3. Poor academic performance in the program.
4. Lack of response to requested contact by dissertation committee members.

5. Interactional, communication or performance deficiencies exist which impair progress toward the academic and professional success of the student.
6. Interactional, communication or performance deficiencies exist which impair progress toward the academic and professional success of other students in the program.
7. Plagiarism of any kind, cheating or other types of dishonesty.

Students are expected to resolve specified concerns leading to a marginal rating before the next semester review. Failure to resolve the matter(s) on time will change the evaluation to unsatisfactory progress. An unsatisfactory progress evaluation may also result from:

1. Poor performance in a class or classes, such as a grade in a class of less than a C-. Remediation requirements will be specified by the instructor, e.g. retake a class, do remedial work associated with the class, or taking additional coursework.
2. Cumulative graduate GPA falling below 3.0.
3. Inadequate progress toward the completion of the comprehensive examination by the end of fall semester of the third year.
4. Inadequate progress toward the completion of the dissertation defense by the end of winter semester of the fourth year.

Students are dropped from the graduate program if they receive two consecutive non-satisfactory ratings (i.e., either Marginal or Unsatisfactory). According to the BYU Graduate Studies catalog, a student may also be dropped from the program if she or he:

1. Fails to maintain minimum registration.
2. Receives a marginal or unsatisfactory rating in a periodic review by the academic department and is unable or unwilling to comply with conditions for continuance outlined by the department.
3. Fails to make what the department or the university deems to be satisfactory progress toward a graduate degree.
4. Fails the departmental comprehensive examination or the dissertation defense.
5. Violates the university's standards of conduct or the Honor Code.

Students will receive a formal letter if their semester evaluation is either marginal and/or unsatisfactory. This letter is written by the student's Chair, with consultation with the doctoral committee, on behalf of the EDLF COW. The formal letter is sent by certified mail, requiring a signature confirmation. After receiving the letter, the student should make an appointment with their Chair as soon as possible. The letter will list requirements that the student must fulfill to make satisfactory progress, the time deadlines for meeting those requirements, the faculty whom the student should contact for information or help, and what will happen if requirements are not accomplished (e.g., an unsatisfactory rating for the next semester or termination from the program).

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Program Components

In the Ed.D. program, each student must complete six essential components to qualify for graduation:

1. Course Credits
   - Regular Courses
   - Research Core Courses
   - Dissertation Credits
2. Comprehensive Examination
3. Prospectus Worksheet and Defense
4. IRB (Institutional Review Board) Application
5. Dissertation
6. Graduation

Required Academic Courses, Sequence & Schedule

Regular coursework. The regular coursework includes nine content courses accumulating to a total 28 credit hours of course work:

EDLF 655 – Social History of American Education
EDLF 695R – Independent Research
ELDF 700 – Strategic and Organizational Leadership
EDLF 701 – Collaborative Leadership for Change
EDLF 714 – Multiculturalism in Education
EDLF 721 – Economics of Education
EDLF 722 – Constitutional Law and Education
EDLF 750 – Education Policy and Politics
EDLF 768 – Philosophy and History of American Education
EDLF 791R – Doctoral Seminar

Research core. The courses in the research core include four research courses, accumulating to a total 12 credit hours of course work:

EDLF 645 – Quantitative Inquiry 1
EDLF 646 – Qualitative Inquiry 1
EDLF 776 - Quantitative Inquiry 2
EDLF 777 – Qualitative Inquiry 2

Dissertation credits. EDLF 799R is the course required for dissertation credits and can be taken in one or more credit hours. Candidates are required to be registered for a minimum of 1 credit per semester/term while completing their dissertation. A minimum of 12 dissertation credit hours is required.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Program course schedule. Table 2 outlines the program course schedule which is delivered six weekends per semester: Friday 4:00 pm to 10:00 pm and Saturday 8:00 am to 4:00 pm. This course schedule enables the completion of 6 credit hours each Fall and Winter semester and 3 credit hours for each Spring term. Summer terms require full-time registration for 6 credits during the 7-week summer term, which may be offered in some combination of intensive weekends and/or weeks of residency. This course schedule results in at least as many hours of traditional course time as other doctoral programs in the McKay School of Education. While at BYU for courses, students will be focused completely on coursework, research, and library experiences. In intervening weeks, they will continue to work on course assignments.

Table 2

2016 Ed.D. Course Sequence

Semester	Year 1 2016-2017	Year 2 2017-2018	Year 3 2018-2019
Spring	Friday – Half day (end with banquet) • Program orientation • Introduction to faculty • Syllabi for summer courses	768: Philosophy and History of American Education	799R – Dissertation (3 hours) 695R – Independent Research (1)
Summer	701: Collaborative Leadership for Change 791R: Doctoral Seminar • Prospectus Worksheet Intro • PoP and DiP orientation • Faculty presentations • Selection of Dissertation Chair • Exploration of broad PoPs	655: Social History of American Education 721: Economics of Education	799R - Dissertation (3 hours)
Fall	645: Quantitative Inquiry 1 700: Strategic & Organizational Leadership	646: Qualitative Inquiry 1 750: Education Policy and Politics	799R - Dissertation (3 hours) Comprehensive Exam and Prospectus Process completed
Winter	776: Quantitative Inquiry 2 722: Constitutional Law and Education	777: Qualitative Inquiry 2 714: Multicultural Education	799R (3 hours) Defend Dissertation

Note: Course sequence may be modified to accommodate department needs and scheduling.

Comprehensive Exam

To be admitted to final doctoral candidacy, students must complete a comprehensive examination and all coursework with satisfactory ratings. Depending on the year of admission,

an Ed.D. candidate may choose to make a presentation at a national or international professional conference (2012 and 2013 cohorts) or prepare a paper in accordance with department guidelines (2012, 2013 and 2014 cohorts). The paper will consist of at least 10 pages showing how every course in the doctoral program has benefited him/or her in their studies. The paper is to be submitted to the dissertation committee chair who will make a determination of whether the student passed the comprehensive exam or needs further work.

For the 2016 and future cohorts, as well as any candidates from prior cohorts who so choose, the comprehensive examination consists of a written paper based on completion of Section #1 (The Research Problem & Guiding Theory) of the Prospectus Worksheet (see Appendix G) and incorporating a 15-20 page scholarly literature review (extensive but not exhaustive) with synthesis.[3] The Prospectus Worksheet will serve as an outline of the paper.

The student will participate in an oral defense of the paper with the dissertation chair, reacting to the problem-of practice the student has identified for his or her dissertation topic. A copy of the paper will be sent the major members of the committee for their information only.

The comprehensive exam should normally be completed by the end of the fall semester of the third year.

Prospectus Worksheet and Defense

A prospectus is an academic research proposal and is the first step in producing a dissertation. The purpose of the prospectus is to convince the dissertation committee (chair, two major members and two minor members) that the dissertation topic addresses a problem of practice and how the student proposes to approach the problem is sound, both theoretically and methodologically. Once the prospectus is approved by the dissertation committee, the student can proceed with the actual research. IRB approval may be needed before any data are collected (see IRB Section below). The following protocol should be followed to complete the prospectus process:

1. Step #1: Pre-Defense Drafting - Chair and candidate address and integrate the outcomes of the questions and discussion from the comprehensive examination, finish completing the Prospectus Worksheet, and produce a new draft of the Prospectus Worksheet for Pre-defense Workshop. In preparation for the Pre-defense Workshop, major committee members may ask for the opportunity to review the draft prior to pre-defense workshop, the chair and candidate will facilitate that process. This review process will not exceed a five-working day review on the part of the committee member, and normally no more than two cycles of review and revision.

---

[3] "The student does not use the literature to demonstrate that a project is unique, but rather to contextualize it within big ideas that may bring the problem into sharper focus, identify root causes of the problem, and help etch out appropriate entry points for investigation that truly have the potential to help solve the problem" (Belzer & Ryan (2013).) "Defining the Problem of Practice Dissertation: Where's the Practice, What's the Problem," *Planning and Changing, 44* (3-4), 204).

2. Step #2 – Pre-defense Workshop
   Major committee members receive the prospectus worksheet no fewer than five working days prior to the Pre-defense Workshop. During this review period, the major members do not provide feedback to make suggestions for change or improvement, but they rather review the prospectus worksheet to prepare for the Pre-defense Workshop where all their questions and issues may be raised. The chair and major members of the committee meet for 1-2 hours with the student to review and improve the contents of the prospectus worksheet. All three committee members must agree on whether the candidate is ready to defend the prospectus, or whether further work needs to be done and another review workshop held.

3. Step #3: Prospectus Defense - A prospectus defense meeting may be held as soon as the dissertation committee agrees to hold one by signing the EDLF ***Approval for Dissertation Prospectus Defense*** form (see Appendix D). Major faculty members reviewing a prospectus worksheet for approval for defense should <u>not</u> be asked or required to designate availability or to set a prospectus defense date at the same time that they are asked to review the prospectus worksheet for approval. The scheduling of the prospectus defense date should only proceed <u>after</u> all of the major members of the committee have approved the prospectus worksheet for defense by signing the appropriate form. It is recommended that the prospectus defense meeting not be scheduled earlier than 5-10 working days following the date of final approval for defense by the major members of the dissertation committee. Once the prospectus defense date has been set by the dissertation committee, the minor members are given three days to read the prospectus worksheet and do not normally review and provide feedback prior to the defense. Rather, they attend to provide *cold-read* reactions and informed, interested feedback.

   The scheduling of the prospectus defense will be done by using an online scheduling program (such as DoodlePoll) by the EDLF department secretary based on dates and times provided by the dissertation committee chair (after consulting with the student). No fewer than six (6) date and time options will be provided to the dissertation committee. Once determined, the date, time and place of the prospectus defense will be posted under the direction of the department secretary in prominent locations in and around the department offices at least 10 working days prior to the defense.

   The defense is open to the public. The defense meeting is chaired by the dissertation committee chair and must be attended by all five members of the committee. If one or two of the committee members are out of town, the defense can proceed only if they are actually available online (using some form of audio-visual online conferencing). If the online connection cannot be established, then the defense meeting must normally be postponed until at least four of the five committee members can participate. The sudden unavailability of any one committee member, in person or online, does not require the defense meeting to be rescheduled, but the unavailability of two or more <u>does require rescheduling</u>.

Only members of the committee participate directly in the defense of the prospectus. In the prospectus defense meeting, the student presents the prospectus and explores any questions about the study or the worksheet. The student's goal is to convince the committee that the study can be effectively completed based on the resources and methodologies available to the student, is important, and that the student knows what they are doing. Full-time BYU CFS or CFS-track professors in attendance may be invited by the chair to ask questions or make observations, but this not a typical feature of the defense and can only be done at the invitation of the chair after all committee members are satisfied that their questions, issues and observations have been adequately voiced in the defense.

4. Step #4: Final Prospectus Version - Chair and candidate respond to defense feedback in final prospectus worksheet. Committee members may review the final prospectus worksheet, if desired. If the committee feels that the student is ready to proceed, formal approval will be given by each committee member by signing the EDLF *Dissertation Prospectus Approval Form* (see Appendix D).

As with all aspects of the Ed.D. program, the primary responsibility for completing the prospectus phase rests with the student. In order to stay on the three-year timeline, the prospectus should be successfully defended by the end of winter semester of the second year. The pre-prospectus defense meeting with the major members of the dissertation committee is held to facilitate the successful writing and defense of the prospectus.

IRB Application and Approval

Following approval of the final Prospectus Worksheet, the student must immediately pursue application for BYU IRB approval. If the proposed research includes the use of human subjects, any data identifiably connected to living persons or previously collected data, formal approval of the BYU Institutional Review Board (IRB) must be obtained prior to commencing ***any*** data collection or analysis. All data collection and analysis must conform strictly to the procedures outlined in the approved IRB. The utmost care must be taken by the student to report and represent the findings of the data analysis in an honest and forthright manner. Any misrepresentation or falsification of data and/or findings will constitute a violation of the Honor Code of BYU. Such a violation will be remanded immediately to the BYU Honor Code Office for processing.

If the Ed.D. candidate or their dissertation chair believe that the intended research work does not require BYU IRB approval, then the candidate must write a petition letter to the EDLF Doctoral Committee describing why this is thought to be the case. The letter must be countersigned by the chair of the dissertation committee and submitted with the final prospectus worksheet. If the EDLF Doctoral Committee concurs with the candidate and chair, then a letter stating such will be sent to the candidate and chair. Once this letter has been received, then the candidate may proceed with their dissertation research. A copy of this letter from the doctoral committee must attached to the Dissertation Prospectus Approval form in the candidate's file and also be included as an appendix in the final dissertation.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

If the EDLF Doctoral Committee does <u>not</u> concur, then a letter stating such will be sent to the candidate and chair, with a copy added to the Dissertation Prospectus Approval Form for the candidate's file. If this is the determination of the committee, then the candidate is required to pursue BYU IRB approval prior to commencing any dissertation research. The EDLF Doctoral Committee will have 10 working days to respond to the initial IRB petition letter by the candidate. There is no appeal to the decision of the EDLF Doctoral Committee in this matter.

Ed.D. candidates and their chairs should note that BYU IRB approval to pursue research does <u>not</u> supersede the need to also pursue permission to conduct research in the public schools. Permission to conduct research in the public schools is pursued independently of the BYU IRB approval process (see MSE's [Request to Conduct Research](#) form). Also note that special conditions are required when conducting research in the schools affiliated with the BYU-Public School Partnership districts. These special conditions change from time to time, and the candidate and chair are responsible for meeting all such conditions prior to commencing research in any partnership school or district.

When IRB approval has been received (if needed), the approval date is noted on the **Dissertation Prospectus Approval Form** (see Appendix D), a copy of the approved stamped consent form is attached and **<u>then</u>** the Dissertation Prospectus Approval Form is signed by the Doctoral Program Committee Chair, Graduate Chair and the Department Chair. After the dissertation committee approves the prospectus, the signed copy of the approval form, a paper copy of the final prospectus worksheet, and an BYU IRB approval document (if required) should be turned in to the Graduate Coordinator, who will ensure that these prospectus documents are placed in the student's file.

<u>The student cannot proceed to actually conducting the dissertation study until after these documents are placed in the student's file</u>, and the completed **_Ed.D. Prospectus Checklist_** form (Appendix F) has been received by the student.[JH1] For purposes of the student's regular progress evaluation, the prospectus is considered to be completed when these completed documents have been added to the student's file.

All EDLF faculty members and students involved in research using human subjects, or data identifiably connected to living persons, are required to be familiar with BYU's IRB regulations and expectations, and to have a *current* CITI Certification login number demonstrating successful completion of the [IRB CITI Certification](#). This tutorial is available on-line and requires approximately 2-3 hours to complete. The requirement of completing the online IRB CITI Certification includes not only the principal investigator but also all co-investigators, research technicians, research assistants, or student assistants who have contact with the research subjects and/or control of data in ways that impact human subjects and their protection.

Faculty members cannot serve on prospectus or dissertation committees without having a current IRB CITI Certification login number on file with the department secretary. Students

without a current IRB CITI Certification login number in their departmental student file cannot go on to collect data and analyze data until their IRB CITI Certification is made current.

Dissertation chairs and committee members are required to provide reasonable and adequate instruction of the student relative to IRB and "ethical research practice" requirements and expectations. A student cannot assume that lack of intervention or warning on the part of their dissertation committee constitutes approval of compliance to IRB and ethical research requirements and expectations. Details concerning the IRB requirements and process can be obtained by reviewing the material at the following ORCA URL: http://orca.byu.edu/IRB/.

No IRB application shall be submitted to the BYU IRB committee by a student for research on their dissertation until successful completion of their prospectus defense. Successful completion includes all required revisions and modifications to the prospectus resulting from the defense.

Dissertation and Defense Processes

The Greek word **θέσις** (thesis) means *position*, referring in philosophy to an intellectual proposition. The Latin word **dissertatio** (dissertation) means *discourse*, typically delivered in a public forum. In some universities, the doctoral thesis is the document and the public defense of the thesis is the dissertation. At BYU, the document presented, defended and submitted as the culminating product of the doctoral program of study is called the dissertation, and the public presentation of the dissertation is called the defense. A thesis at BYU refers to the culminating product for the master's degree.

Candidates will complete a dissertation focused on active research confronting current issues and problems in education in ways that will improve educational practice.
The Ed.D. dissertation is characterized as a Dissertation in Practice (DiP) and must:

1. be rigorous in the creation of new **practitioner** knowledge,
2. describe and contextualize a challenge in **educational practice**,
3. demonstrate the candidate's ability to conceptualize, define, analyze, and frame a **problem in practice** that warrants academic rigor to find solutions,
4. **investigate the challenge** and/or tests solution(s) to address the challenge,
5. demonstrate the candidate's ability to translate analytical data into **normative** solutions,
6. **bridge the gap** between academe and practice
7. implement an academically rigorous and systematic design that manifestly serves the **practical functions** of a **targeted stakeholder group** by identifying implications and generating actionable recommendations, and
8. appropriately **communicate** these findings to a potentially wide practitioner community.

Hybrid dissertation process. The EDLF Ed.D. Program has adopted the McKay School of Education's *hybrid dissertation*, as approved by the university. The EDLF hybrid dissertation

requires the writing and defense of a prospectus worksheet and the writing and final oral defense of a dissertation. The following is a description of the EDLF hybrid dissertation process:

1. The prospectus worksheet is passed.
2. IRB submission is made and approval is received.
3. Study is conducted.
4. Article and required appendices are completed.
5. Full committee review of dissertation is completed according to department guidelines.
6. A final oral defense is scheduled in compliance with university guidelines.
7. The full dissertation is passed
8. Dissertation revisions are completed and dissertation is brought into full compliance with EDLF, MSE, BYU & ETD content and format requirements (see Appendix F for the MSE Checklist of Formats and Conventions of Theses and Dissertations).

Hybrid dissertation format. The dissertation is submitted according to MSE guidelines. The dissertation includes the following sections (see Appendix D for EDLF Dissertation Template):

1. The signature and cover pages required by The Office of Graduate Studies.
2. A one-page abstract that positions the study.
3. A description of the hybrid dissertation.
4. A scholarly journal article manuscript and references ready for submission.
5. Appendix A: Extended Review of Literature.
6. Appendix B: A description of the methods employed in the study at the level required for an IRB submission.
7. Appendix C: Evidence of IRB Approval, if needed (e.g. approval letter or IRB-stamped informed consent)
8. Appendix D: Dissertation references (including the article references)

Scholarly journal article – order of authorship. The hybrid dissertation format leads to the writing and submission of at least one scholarly journal article for each dissertation. The determination of the order of authorship for article for the student and the committee members will be guided by the preferences of the student and the dissertation chair in consultation with the other four committee members. The *Ed.D. Program Co-Authorship Agreement* form (see Appendix F) must be completed and placed in the student's file no earlier than the prospectus defense and no later than the dissertation defense. This form must be submitted to the Graduate Coordinator for counter-signature. The Graduate Coordinator will place the completed form in the student's file. This form must be completed and in the student's file after the dissertation defense for a satisfactory progress evaluation to be received for the semester.

Dissertation review policy. The chair and the major and minor committee members have two weeks (10 working days) to review all dissertation documents and drafts—in whatever iterative stage they are given to them at any particular point prior to the final defense. However, if the chair or any committee member has compelling reasons for this review time to be extended, the committee member will negotiate the needed time with the chair who will notify the candidate. The chair and both major and minor committee members provide feedback to the

candidate. After each review by the chair and/or committee members, the candidate is responsible to attend to the comments and submit a revision, if requested, for another review (and a new 10 working-day review period).

The candidate needs to be aware of and respect the dissertation review policy and not place undue pressure on the chair and/or committee members for faster reviews so that the candidate can meet deadlines. The chair and committee members also need to respect this review policy by returning feedback to the candidate within the review period and letting the chair know if they need extended time (as outlined above). Chairs also respect this policy by not pressing committee members to *hurry* their reviews. If a committee member is not meeting his/her review deadline requirement in returning material to the candidate, the candidate may wish to consult with the chair to help address this situation. The chair and the student are responsible to manage the dissertation review process in such a way that the legitimate academic schedules of the committee members.

Dissertation deadlines and format. Following the approved processes for completing the dissertation is the responsibility of the student. The dissertation chair will provide adequate orientation and supervision of the student but will not be responsible for difficulties arising from the student not following the approved process. Members of the dissertation committee should notify the chair when variations from the prescribed processes occur. It is the responsibility of the chair to inform the student of unacceptable variations from the process and to monitor the student's compliance once notified.

In order to be able to graduate in April, June, August or December, the doctoral candidate must meet many deadlines along the way regarding the final dissertation processes. These deadlines are provided in Appendix H and span the time from the candidate's submission of the *full* dissertation to the chair for its complete review to the submission of final required forms to Graduate Studies. Note that the dates given**,** and the intervals between the dates**,** are minimum *baselines* in that they do not include the time that the candidate will almost inevitably have to spend in attending to comments by various members of his/her dissertation committee as well as by the Department, Dean's Office and ETD reviews. In this sense, the deadlines in Appendix H present an *ideal scenario,* and the doctoral candidate should actually allow for considerably more time than indicated in this schedule to successfully pass through all the steps leading to a fully approved dissertation and subsequent graduation.

When the dissertation is submitted to committee members for defense approval, it must be in *full* dissertation format. The candidate is responsible to ensure the *full* dissertation document:

- Is in excellent form—grammatically, rhetorically, and technically.
- Uses the *EDLF Dissertation Template* (see Appendix D), including the Table of Contents, lists of tables and figures, description of the dissertation, all required appendices and both article and dissertation references.
- Has front pages of the dissertation that meet MSE requirements, as indicated in the EDLF Dissertation Template (see Appendix D).

- Is in APA 6th format (with particular attention to headings and format of tables, figures, citations and references).
- Meets all requirements on the Dean's Office Checklist (see Appendix E)
- Includes the journal article that is not more than 1,000 words (or 3 pages) beyond the target journal's submission limit.

Candidates may be required by the chair to have a professional editor review the *full* dissertation before submitting it to the chair and/or committee members for defense approval. (A list of MSE-recommended external editors is on the MSE Thesis and Dissertation Aids website.) It is not appropriate for the candidate to give the chair a *full* dissertation that does not meet the required standards and expect the chair to attend to such deficiencies. Indeed, if the document is given to the chair or committee member in an inadequate form in any of these respects, they may return the document and advise the chair and candidate of the need to obtain an additional professional editorial review to bring the document into style and form compliance.

If the target journal requires a style format other than APA 6th, the journal's required style format must be indicated on the *Description of Structure and Content* page of the dissertation, along with: (a) Clarification regarding the required location of tables and figures (if not placed in the text), and (b) a link for reviewers to the style format instructions. In addition, Appendix D must provide the journal's style format requirements. The article portion of the dissertation is then presented in the journal's required style format while the rest of the dissertation remains in APA 6th standards.

After the dissertation defense, the candidate works with the chair to prepare the *final* dissertation which addresses the feedback from the committee and department reviewer. The chair and committee approve the *final* dissertation by signing ADV Form 8d.

Dissertation committee roles. The chair of the dissertation committee is designated as the formal leader of the committee and is the principal faculty figure in the dissertation processes. In addition to advising the candidate concerning coursework and degree requirements, the chair mentors and oversees the student in all aspects of the dissertation process. The chair functions as the mediator between committee members and between committee members and the student. The student should seek advisement from the chair with any questions regarding committee feedback. The primary responsibility for the conceptualization and drafting of the dissertation rests with the student and chair. The chair negotiates as needed with committee members and has the authority to make the final decision regarding responses to committee feedback. The chair leads both prospectus and dissertation defenses and works with the student after the defense to prepare the *final* dissertation for department approval and provides guidance regarding required final dissertation and graduation processes.

Major members take a significant role in the writing and review of the dissertation, however they are typically not deeply involved in the conceptualization until the drafting of the sections of the document has made sufficient progress to allow a useful review. The major members may be

consulted regularly in areas of their expertise throughout the conceptualization and writing phase. Early drafts of the dissertation (before seeking approval for defense) may be given to major members for feedback with approved by the chair.

Minor committee members only become involved in the review of the *full* dissertation after both the chair and major members are satisfied that the document is satisfactory for defense, unless negotiated otherwise by the committee chair. Under the direction of the chair, minor members may be consulted earlier in the process where their areas of expertise may benefit the development of the dissertation.

Dissertation committee review processes. The candidate works with the chair and an editor to prepare the *full* dissertation (see MSE Dissertation Aids for list of MSE-approved editors). The *full* dissertation uses the EDLF Dissertation Template (see Appendix D) and includes all required elements and formatting for the complete dissertation. The candidate submits the *full* dissertation to the chair for review for defense approval, along with a copy of the completed Dean's Office Checklist (pgs. 1-2). The chair will review the *full* dissertation, including a review against the candidate's completed Dean's Office Checklist, before giving the candidate approval to send the dissertation to the major committee members for review. The *full* dissertation will typically need to be reviewed several times by the chair, and an editor if requested by the chair, before the chair approves it as ready to send to the major committee members.

After the chair approves that the *full* dissertation meets expectations and is ready for defense, the candidate sends the *full* dissertation to the two major committee members for review for defense approval. The major committee members should also review the *full* dissertation against APA 6th format and may request that the candidate seek additional editorial support. Major members provide feedback directly to the candidate (with a cc to the chair), and may ask for revisions from the candidate before granting approval for defense. The candidate should work with the chair in responding to their feedback. Major members should not approve the *full* dissertation for defense until all of their concerns regarding approving the dissertation for defense have been addressed by the candidate, or until those issues have been resolved in communication between the committee member and the chair, to the committee member's satisfaction.

After approval for defense from both the chair and major members, the chair gives permission for the candidate to send the *full* dissertation to the minor committee members for review for defense approval. Minor committee members are mainly responsible for reviewing the journal article portion of the *full* dissertation for any areas of *major* theoretical, methodological, or practical concern (although they may choose to review the entire document). They review the article from the point of view of a journal reviewer, focusing on: (a) overall coherence; (b) clear alignment with the stated research problem and questions; (c) clarity of claims, arguments, methods and findings; (d) effectiveness of tables and figures; (e) effectiveness of discussion in addressing research questions; and as a dissertation in practice (f) value added for the intended audience. The minor committee members may also review the document against APA-6th format, but are not required to do so. They provide feedback directly to the candidate (with a cc to the chair) and may ask for revisions from the candidate before granting approval for defense. Minor members should also not approve the *full* dissertation for defense until all of their

concerns have been addressed by the candidate, or until those issues have been resolved in communication between the committee member and the chair, to the committee member's satisfaction.

After each review of the *full* dissertation for defense approval, each committee member informs the chair about their decision--indicating one of the following three options:

- **Review it Again**. Provide feedback, ask to see the revisions, provide an additional review (with another 10-day review period) before considering approval for defense.

- **Approve and Address Issues at Defense**. Approve the dissertation for defense. Provide feedback regarding revisions candidate should address by, at or after the defense. Receive the *full* pre-defense version at least two weeks prior to the defense.

- **Approve**. Approve the dissertation for defense. Receive the final defense version at least two weeks prior to the defense.

  Scheduling the final defense. Whereas the prospectus defense takes place under the auspices of the department, the dissertation defense is a university-authorized event. The examining committee consists of the five graduate faculty members (all with Graduate Faculty Status) who comprise the student's dissertation committee, with the chair of the dissertation committee chairing the prospectus and dissertation defenses. The final dissertation defense is a public meeting, scheduled through the Graduate School, in which the candidate presents the dissertation and defends it by answering questions from the dissertation committee members. A successful dissertation defense leads to the department's recommendation to the university that the candidate be awarded the Ed.D. degree.

Prior to scheduling the defense, the candidate must:

- Apply for graduation through AIM (Graduation Application) by the university deadline,
- Provide the chair and department secretary with the completed Dean's Office Checklist (p. 1-2),
- Ensure that the Graduate Committee names listed on the dissertation title page reflect the same people, in the same order, as on the candidate's progress report.
- Ensure that the journal article is not more than 1,000 words (or 3 pages) beyond the target journal's submission limit.

The dissertation defense cannot be scheduled until all five members of the dissertation committee have read the *full* dissertation and have approved it for defense. They should not be expected to identify potential dates for the defense when they are given the *full* dissertation to review for defense approval. Potential dates for the defense will be explored by the chair only after ALL members of the committee have approved the *full* dissertation for defense.

After all committee members have approved the dissertation for defense, the chair is responsible for facilitating the completion of the *Dissertation Defense Scheduling and Approval (DDSA) Form*

(see Appendix E), Sections A-C (in lieu of ADV Form 8c and other previously used department forms). After completing DDSA Sections A, B and C, the chair (not the candidate or department secretaries) coordinates with the candidate and committee members to find a mutually acceptable date/time for the defense. (The use of Doodle Poll can be very helpful in this process.)

University policy requires the scheduling of the final defense date to be completed a minimum of two weeks prior to the actual dissertation defense date. See the deadline for scheduling the dissertation defense with Graduate Studies for each graduation in Appendix H or on the university website. The scheduled defense date should also allow ample time after the defense for the candidate to address feedback from both the committee and department reviewer, make any required revisions to the dissertation, and complete the department, Dean's office and ETD approvals by the deadlines indicated in Appendix H.

The chair indicates the mutually acceptable defense date and time on DDSA, Section D and gives the completed *DDSA* form (Sections A-D) to the department secretary (instead of ADV Form 8c or previous department defense approval forms). The department secretary officially schedules the defense date with Graduate Studies, keeps the *DDSA Form* in the candidate's file and makes all necessary department preparations for the defense.

Committee review of *full pre-*defense dissertation. After defense approval (and at least two weeks prior to the defense), the chair notifies the candidate to send the *full* pre-defense dissertation to each member of the committee. This *full pre-*defense dissertation must be sent at least two weeks prior to the defense, needs to have addressed all required pre-defense revisions and be in *full* dissertation format. Given that the defense will be based on the *full* pre-defense dissertation, the candidate should not make additional revisions to this document for the defense.

Department review of *full pre-*defense dissertation. After defense approval (and at least two weeks prior to the defense), the candidate submits the *full* pre-defense dissertation for Department Review. The department review will provide a technical review of the *full* pre-defense dissertation (including appendices and references) including grammar, style, and compliance with APA-6th format, all Dean's Office Checklist requirements, and Section A of the Checklist for Preparing ETD (PDF) for Submission (ADV Form 11). The candidate sends the following to the faculty Department Reviewer:

- *Full* pre-defense dissertation
- Dean's Office Checklist (pgs 1-2) with all boxes checked off indicating dissertation is compliant with the requirements
- Completed Checklist for Preparing ETD (PDF) for Submission (ADV Form 11) with all boxes checked off indicating dissertation is compliant with the requirements

If the dissertation requires considerable work to be compliant to the technical standards, the department reviewer may ask whether the candidate engaged an editor and recommend to the chair and candidate the need for an additional editorial review.

The Department Reviewer reviews dissertations in the order received. Feedback will be provided to the student, using track changes and comments, within two weeks (by the defense) unless the reviewer already has more than two reviews and notifies the student of a different feedback date which may be after the defense. The candidate does not provide a revision back to the department reviewer but rather considers this feedback with the chair (as needed) preparatory to the chair's and committee's approval of the *final* dissertation. The department reviewer indicates the completion of the department review by signing the *DDSA Form,* Section E.

       The final defense. Since the dissertation defense is a university event, attendance at the defense is open to the public and doctoral students are especially invited to attend. The dissertation defense is chaired by the dissertation committee chair and must be attended by all five members of the committee. If one or two of the committee members are out of town, the defense can proceed only if they are actually available online (using Skype or some other form of audio-visual online conferencing). If the online connection cannot be established, then the defense meeting must be postponed until all committee members can participate. The sudden unavailability of any committee member, in person or online, requires the defense meeting to be rescheduled.

Prior to the defense, the candidate completes the candidate section of ADV Form 8d and lists all committee members with the same names as found on the dissertation title page (which need to reflect the same people as on the progress report).

During the defense, while the public may attend the defense, only the committee members participate directly in the defense. In the defense meeting, the candidate presents the study, focusing on salient aspects of the data collection, analysis, results, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The candidate engages in an exploration of the dissertation with the members of the dissertation committee. The chair leads the prospectus and dissertation defenses, provides all necessary paperwork, takes notes for the student regarding feedback and required revisions, and allows the student to be the focus of and answer the questions in the defense.

Full-time BYU CFS or CFS-track professors in attendance may be invited by the chair to ask questions or make observations, but this not a typical feature of the defense and can only be done at the invitation of the chair after all committee members are satisfied that their questions, issues, and observations have been adequately voiced in the defense.

Following the defense, if the committee feels that the dissertation meets the expectations of the department, school, and university for doctoral-level quality, rigor and presentation (both oral and written), then formal approval will be given by each committee member by signing:
- ADV Form 10 (***Report of Committee Action for Final Oral Examination***, available only to the Department's Graduate Secretary from the Office of Graduate Studies)
- ADV Form (xx) (***Committee Member Evaluation of Final Oral Examination - Doctoral***, also available only to the Department's Graduate Secretary from the Office of Graduate Studies).

- ADV Form 8d (<mark>title</mark>) – Committee members sign this form when they do not need to see the dissertation again and give their final dissertation approval. They may ask to see revisions before providing their final dissertation approval and signing the ADV Form 8d. The chair is the last committee member to sign ADV Form 8d after the chair has given approval for the *final* dissertation.

After the defense, students are encouraged to participate in a poster session at the annual MSE Research Conference (recommended but not required).

Chair review and approval. After the defense, the candidate is responsible to work with the chair to address feedback from the committee and department reviewer. The candidate may be asked to send revisions back to committee members for further review. The candidate is responsible to ensure that the *final* dissertation meets APA-6th standards and all requirements on the Dean's Office Checklist. The candidate then emails the *final* dissertation to the chair for final approval. Once the *final* dissertation has received the chair's approval, the chair signs the DDSA, Section F and the ADV Form 8d. The chair gives both forms to the department secretary who maintains the dissertation paperwork in the office and ensures copies are placed in the candidate's file. The chair informs the student to send the *final* dissertation to the graduate coordinator preparatory for department approval.

Departmental review & approval. The graduate coordinator receives and reviews the *final* dissertation. The graduate coordinator may request additional format revisions before signing DDSA, Section G. The *DDSA Form,* and the completed ADV Form 8d, are then given together to the department chair. The department chair's signature on ADV Form 8d indicates final department approval of the dissertation. The *DDSA Form* is then filed in the candidate's folder. The chair will be notified of final department approval by the department secretary.

Dean's office review & approval. Following department approval, the department secretary submits ADV Form 8d and the completed Dean's Office Checklist to the Dean's Office, and then notifies the chair to inform the candidate to email the *final* dissertation to the Dean's Office for review (amber_richardson@byu.edu).

The Dean's Office reviews the *final* dissertation and provides feedback to the candidate by email (with cc to the chair and the graduate coordinator) indicating any required revisions using comments and track changes. The candidate is responsible to work with the chair, as needed, to make the requested revisions and send the revised *final* dissertation back to the Dean's Office. If the student, with the Chair's approval, determines not to make specific revisions requested by the Dean's Office Review, the candidate needs to provide a memo with their revised dissertation to the Dean's Office explaining the rationale for the decision and indicating the chair's agreement with the decision. Given that the Dean's Office review involves a review by both the Dean's Office reviewer and then the Associate Dean, the candidate should plan that this review may take several iterations. The Dean's Office will email the candidate (with cc to the chair and graduate coordinator) when the dissertation has received Dean's Office approval.

ETD review & approval. Once the *final* dissertation has received Dean's Office approval, the candidate prepares the dissertation document as a PDF for ETD submission, guided by the

ETD Checklist (ADV Form 11) and resources on the ETD submission website. Once the PDF is posted for ETD review, the PDF is reviewed and approved at the department level by the graduate coordinator and then at the college level by the Dean's Office. The candidate can monitor the status of ETD approval by logging into their own ETD account (etd.lib.edu).

The candidate will receive email notifications from Graduate Studies at both department and Dean's Office levels of review regarding ETD approval or any necessary revisions if the ETD is not approved. If ETD revisions are required before approval, the candidate is responsible to make the revisions and resubmit the PDF to ETD for another review to obtain approval. To facilitate ETD creation and review, candidates are advised to format the text with heading styles (which also support the automatic table of contents) so that bookmarks will automatically import into the PDF.

Final Graduate Studies requirements. Graduate Studies has several additional requirements that must be met before their final graduation deadline.

1) Survey of Earned Doctorates – The candidate completes the survey, requests a confirmation email and sends a copy of the certificate of completion to the department secretary to be attached to the ADV Form 8d. Survey of Earn Doctorates (SED) (ADV Form 14)

2) Submission of ETD-approved PDF to ProQuest -- Once the candidate has received ETD approval from the college, and the ETD status (upon signing into the ETD account (etd.lib.edu) shows 'Grad Office Review' (meaning the ETD is being reviewed by the Office of Graduate Studies), the candidate then submits the ETD-approved PDF to ProQuest. The candidate sends confirmation to the department secretary.

3) Remaining Requirements -- The candidate will contact the department secretary in inquire about and complete any remaining requirements for a degree including payment of fees and submitting grade changes (for T's).

4) ADV Form 8d – The candidate will communicate to the department secretary regarding the completion of the survey (also sending certificate), ProQuest submission, and any remaining requirements. The department secretary will check off the respective boxes on ADV Form 8d.

5) The candidate is responsible to ensure that ADV Form 8d is delivered to Graduate Studies (105 FPH) by the Graduate Studies deadline in Appendix I. The candidate may ask the department secretary to walk the forms to Graduate Studies. Unless directly asked, the department secretary will assume that the student will deliver the forms to Graduate Studies.

Graduation

Application for Graduation

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

The Graduate Office sets the exact dates and deadlines for application for graduation and they vary from year to year. Students should check the Graduate Office webpage (http://www.byu.edu/gradstudies/) for exact dates and deadlines for the semester/term they wish to graduate. In general, the deadlines are as follows:

- December graduation—September
- April graduation—January
- June graduation – March
- August graduation—May

Applications for Graduation should be done online at: Apply for Graduation - https://y.byu.edu/ry/ae/prod/acad_plan/cgi/stdGraduationApp.cgi. While these forms are completed online, they will need to be printed by the EDLF department secretary for approval by the student's dissertation committee chair and the Department Chair. Consequently, students are responsible for notifying the EDLF department secretary when these forms have been completed and are ready for processing in the EDLF department. Failure on the part of the student to notify the department secretary in a timely fashion, or to have thoroughly completed the online forms, can easily result in a delay in graduation.

Graduation & Convocation Ceremonies

To qualify for graduation, students must apply for graduation by the university deadline, successfully defend their dissertation, complete all dissertation revisions and receive all dissertation approvals, and complete all work associated with the ADV forms listed above. The program is designed to target graduation in three to four years.

A candidate may petition to walk during April and August convocations and commencements, even if they have not yet met all the dissertation deadlines, as long as their final dissertation has been successfully defended, requiring only *minor revisions*, and they have an MSE-approved Petition to Walk. Rows 13 and 14 of Table X provide the deadline for petitioning to walk with EDLF and obtaining MSE approval, respectively. Their name can also be read in the convocation exercises, even if they have not met the university deadline for graduation that semester. Students who walk, but do not qualify for the current graduation will not have their names printed in the university-level and McKay School of Education graduation announcements. Their names will appear in the following graduation announcements (see: MSE Graduation Convocations Instructions).

Students must register for 2 credit hours the semester they intend to graduate to meet the University's 2-credit registration requirement during the semester of graduation. Students should plan accordingly. If the student plans to graduate in August, registering for 1 credit in the Spring term and 1 credit in the Summer term, or 2 credits in either term, meets this requirement.
Petition to Walk

If a student is unable to complete all dissertation and program requirements by the deadline for the April or August graduation deadlines, they may petition to *walk* in the graduation ceremonies if they have successfully passed their dissertation defense. Students must submit the *Petition to*

Walk Application to the department and have it approved by the MSE deadline indicated in the schedule (see Appendix __).

Core BYU Policies

BYU Honor Code

Every BYU student must be continuously endorsed by his or her ecclesiastical leader as one who is worthy to attend BYU and is living in harmony with the Honor Code and the Dress and Grooming Standards. Specific policies embodied in the Honor Code include (1) the Academic Honesty Policy, (2) the Dress and Grooming Standards, (3) the Residential Living Standards, and (4) the Continuing Student Ecclesiastical Endorsement. Each student is obligated to be familiar with, and conduct themselves in accordance to the BYU Honor Code and all of its associated articles as clarified at http://registrar.byu.edu/catalog/2010-2011ucat/GeneralInfo/HonorCode.php.

Preventing Sexual Harassment

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education. Title IX covers discrimination in programs, admissions, activities, and student-to-student sexual harassment. BYU's policy against sexual harassment extends not only to employees of the university but to students as well. If you encounter unlawful sexual harassment or gender based discrimination, please talk to your professor; contact the Equal Employment Office at 801-422-5895 or 801-367-5689 (24-hours); or contact the Honor Code Office at 801-422-2847.

Students with Disabilities

Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you suspect or are aware that you have a disability, you are strongly encouraged to contact the University Accessibility Center (UAC) located at 1520 WSC (801-422-2767) as soon as possible. The disability will be evaluated and eligible students will receive assistance in obtaining reasonable University approved accommodations. Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified documented disabilities.

Discrimination

BYU is committed to providing an environment that is inspiring, productive, comfortable, and safe and to follow legal requirements that prohibit unlawful discrimination. Treating others with respect is an essential aspect of this commitment and is a requirement of all employees according to both the Honor Code and federal law. Respectful conduct must permeate all aspects of the BYU community, including classroom and academic activities and campus employment. Harassing others because of their age, color, disability, national origin, race,

religion, sex, or veteran status is disrespectful. Limiting employment or educational opportunities because of these characteristics is unlawful.

The Equal Opportunity Office supports the University in its commitment by helping students to address concerns about disrespectful and discriminatory behavior, including unlawful sexual harassment and inappropriate gender-based behavior. If you encounter sexual harassment or gender-based discrimination, contact your professor, supervisor, or the Equal Employment Office at 801-422-5895 or 1-888-238-1062 (24 hours), or http://www.ethicspoint.com. You may also contact the Honor Code Office at 801-422-2847.

Plagiarism

Intentional plagiarism is a form of intellectual theft that violates widely recognized principles of academic integrity as well as the Honor Code. Such plagiarism may subject the student to appropriate disciplinary action administered through the university Honor Code Office, in addition to academic sanctions that may be applied by an instructor. Plagiarism of any kind is completely contrary to the established practices of higher education, where all members of the university are expected to acknowledge the original intellectual work of others that is included in one's own work. In some cases, plagiarism may also involve violations of copyright law. The following are the most common types of plagiarism:

- **Intentional plagiarism** is the deliberate act of representing the words, ideas, or data of another as one's own without providing proper attribution to the author through quotation, reference, or footnote.
- **Inadvertent plagiarism** involves the inappropriate, but non-deliberate, use of another's words, ideas, or data without proper attribution. Inadvertent plagiarism usually results from an ignorant failure to follow established rules for documenting sources or from simply being insufficiently careful in research and writing. Although not a violation of the Honor Code, inadvertent plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct for which an instructor can impose appropriate academic sanctions. Students who are in doubt as to whether they are providing proper attribution have the responsibility to consult with their instructor and obtain guidance.
- **Direct plagiarism** is the verbatim copying of an original source without acknowledging the source.
- **Paraphrased plagiarism** is the paraphrasing, without acknowledgment, of ideas from another that the reader might mistake for your own.
- **Plagiarism mosaic** is the borrowing of words, ideas, or data from an original source and blending this original material with one's own without acknowledging the source.
- **Insufficient acknowledgement** is the partial or incomplete attribution of words, ideas, or data from an original source.

Plagiarism may occur with respect to unpublished as well as published material. Acts of copying another student's work and submitting it as one's own individual work without proper attribution is a serious form of plagiarism. Violations of the Honor Code and any of its policies will be dealt with according to the policy and procedure of the University Honor Code Office. For more information please visit the Honor Code Office webpage at http://honorcode.byu.edu/.

Resources

Computer and Network Access

Lab-based computer resources are provided by the university at the Provo Campus. A computer laboratory with web access is located in the *Computer Lab and Technology Classroom* (180/185 MCKB). Other resources available in the TEC Lab can be explored at: http://education.byu.edu/teclab.

BYU will help students set up an alias so that email accounts already used by students can be included in the BYU system for use with Learning Suite and other BYU communications systems.

Student Feedback

Doctoral Student Input

The EDLF department actively solicits doctoral student input. Students may make suggestions (orally or in writing) to the doctoral committee, graduate coordinator, or department chair. The doctoral chair should always be the first order of communication. The graduate coordinator or department chair should only be contacted if adequate response has not been received from the doctoral chair, or if the communication is of a personal and clearly confidential nature requiring the direct attention of first, the graduate coordinator, or finally the department chair.

Each student is also asked for feedback and suggestions as part of their exit interview. Student suggestions are discussed in faculty meetings, when necessary and/or appropriate, and will be implemented when they will improve the quality of the graduate program.

Grievances

Concerns or grievances may be general (i.e., changes needed in the curriculum, policies, etc.) pertaining to all students, or they may be specific to a student, or exist between a student and faculty member. Specific concerns should first be discussed with the faculty member involved, in accordance with Matthew 18:15 and Doctrine and Covenants 42:88. If resolution satisfactory to the student is not obtained, the student and faculty member should have a joint meeting with the EDLF department chair.

Grievances dealing with student termination will first be handled by the doctoral committee, and if resolution is not satisfactory to the student, appeal can be made to the EDLF department chair, followed by the Dean of the School of Education, and finally the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Appendix A: EDLF Faculty

EDLF Faculty

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

The Ed.D. faculty consists of all faculty members in the EDLF department who currently hold Graduate Faculty Status with the university. Only faculty members listed below may serve as chair or members of dissertation committees and as academic advisors to Ed.D. students.

Dr. Donald Baum, has expertise in education policy, international development, the economics of education, and quantitative research methods. His research focuses on the behaviors and contributions of the private sector in education, including the expansion of for-profit education markets, private schooling for the poor, and state regulation of private schools, with the primary geographic focus of Sub-Saharan Africa. Baum was the lead author of the World Bank's *Framework for Engaging the Private Sector in Education* (2014).
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/baum-donald]

Dr. David Boren, directs the masters of school leadership program. David has been an elementary school principal in the public school setting. His research and teaching focus on issues of principal leadership, trust, and teacher well-being.
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/david-boren]

Dr. Bryan Bowles, ….
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/bryan-bowles]

Dr. Scott Ferrin, focuses his research in educational law and policy, and is the faculty chair to the national peer-reviewed BYU Journal of Education and Law, a joint publication of the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations and the J. Reuben Clark Law School. His research and teaching also include language policies and acquisition in education.
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/scott-ferrin]

Dr. MacLeans Geo-JaJa, recognized and honored as one of the leading economists of education in Africa, brings to his students the latest economic issues and theories on education, with an international perspective. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/macleans-geo-jaja]

Dr. Pam Hallam has been a public school principal and district administrator, bringing the practical perspectives and practices of public education to the classroom, offering the pragmatic "grounding" that students desire and need in educational leadership. She has also published widely in top-tier educational journals regarding instructional leadership and trust.
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/pamela-hallam]

Dr. Sterling Hilton, a biomedical statistician before shifting his emphasis and joining the McKay School of Education, offers research expertise in both qualitative and quantitative research theory and practice. He is instrumental in leading and developing the Utah Math Initiative, which is currently being implemented in public schools.
[http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/sterling-hilton]

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Dr. Julie Hite, with graduate degrees in organizational behavior and strategic management, offers students opportunities to approach educational leadership issues from the perspective of leadership and change within organizational systems, not typically available in colleges of education. Her research on strategic organizational networks, with publications in top-tier journals and in book chapters, and her expertise in qualitative research provide students with a multifaceted approach to educational leadership. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/julie-hite]

Dr. Steven Hite has strong methodological expertise in designing and carrying out macro-level educational research projects in Europe, South Asia, and particularly in Africa. His service to and publications for UNESCO are widely recognized. He has also published frequently in top-level journals and contributed chapters to many books in his field. His students are instructed in research theory and methodology, and are given opportunities to practice various educational research modalities. Additionally, Dr. Hite grounds students in core issues in the history and philosophy of science. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/steven-hite]

Dr. Clifford Mayes is an educational scholar and also a psychologist. He has published widely on issues in educational psychology, having written seven books and over 40 scholarly articles in national and international journals of education. His two textbooks on multicultural education, which are nationally recognized, are used at institutions across the U.S. His doctorate in education is in the history of American education, so he teaches classes in those areas as well. He also has written two textbooks in curriculum theory, a topic on which he provides particularly strong contributions to the doctoral program. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/clifford-mayes]

Dr. Vance Randall has written and contributed to several nationally recognized books on educational policy, an area of expertise he has experienced personally while serving as a legislative fellow to the U.S. Senate in the office of Senator Orrin G. Hatch. He has researched and written on issues regarding private education in the U.S., with expanded research into the development of private education in China. He thus offers students opportunities to analyze both the history and current state of educational policy, the philosophical underpinnings of those policies, and the pragmatics of how those policies are operationalized in various legislative contexts. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/vance-randall]

Dr. A. Legrand Richards is an educational philosopher. His classes offer students theoretical perspectives that are deeply rooted in practice. Much of Dr. Richards' research is concerned with socioeconomic inequalities in public schools, particularly the schools in Utah Valley. [http://education.byu.edu/directory/view/scott-richards]

Appendix B: Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum of Understanding
BYU Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations
Candidate for the Doctorate in Educational Leadership

On behalf of the following organization: _____

I (please print):_____, Title: (please print):_____

hereby acknowledge and agree to allow the below doctoral candidate:

(please print): _____

to participate in the Doctorate in Educational Leadership at Brigham Young University, as offered by the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations. I recognize that this is a commitment to support and allow him or her to attend the below dates and times this academic year, and similar dates and times in the subsequent second and third academic years. I recognize that a student's failure to attend all sessions may result in dismissal from the program when student performance and attendance is evaluated at the end of the first academic year, or subsequently also, if there is lack of academic progress and attendance in subsequent years.

Coursework will be delivered six weekends per semester intensively during the Fall and Winter Semesters, beginning Friday at 4:00 pm until 10:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm, for the completion of 6 credit hours each semester and also in the spring and summer term. Courses will be delivered three weekends in spring terms and summer terms will be offered in one full week of full time coursework and two weekend meetings. The first year schedule is below:

Spring Term (7 weeks) Sample dates. Dates will vary slightly by year

1. May 5-6
2. May 19-20
3. June 2-3

Summer Term (7 weeks) Sample dates. Dates will vary slightly by year

1. Week-long meeting June 20-25, full time, beginning Monday morning and ending Saturday at 4:00 pm.
3. Weekend 2: 10 hour weekend (Usually the first weekend in August).

Daily schedule varies somewhat in the summer term to allow for afternoon activities and library research experiences but begins generally at 8:00 am and ends at 5:15 pm. There are 8 hours of in-class instruction on Monday and Tuesday and 6 hours Wed, Thurs, Friday and Saturday.

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

(This summer schedule provides 60 hours of in class instruction and several activities.)

Fall Semester (14 weeks) Sample dates. Dates will vary slightly by year

1. September 9-10
2. September 23-24
3. October 14-15
4. October 28-29
5. November 18-19
6. December 2-3

(Course meetings are Friday at 4:00 pm until 10:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm, which provides 60 hours of in class instruction time.)

Winter Semester (14 weeks) Sample dates. Dates will vary slightly by year

1. January 13-14
2. January 27-28
3. February 10-11
4. February 24-25
5. March 10-11
6. March 24-25

(Course meetings are Friday at 4:00 pm until 10:00 pm and Saturday from 8:00 am to 4:00 pm, which provides 60 hours of in class instruction time.)

My signature as organizational representative below indicates that I understand the attendance requirements of the program and we as an organization agree to support the above referenced and undersigned student in meeting all attendance requirements:

_____

Signature of Organizational Representative

My signature as a doctoral candidate means I understand the attendance requirements and I agree to attend all sessions.

_____

Signature of Doctoral Candidate

Appendix C: EDLF Prospectus Forms

Ed.D. Prospectus Worksheet
EDLF Department
Rev. 10 October 2014

Student Name:	Title of Proposed Study:

Section #1: **The Research Problem & Guiding Theory**

1) What/whose perspective are you going to assume in your study? (≤ 50 words)

•⁴
⌘
•

*The perspective is the viewpoint from which the nature of the problem is defined—that is, the facts are identified as problematic from that perspective. Take the case of the learning challenges experienced by an ELP 4th grade student in Utah. The perspective taken in considering the problem could be the student, the parents of the student, the student's teacher, the building principal, the district superintendent, etc. **OR**, the perspective could be defined as a local socio-cultural issue, a state-level funding issue, a national economic issue, etc. The perspective chosen directs, to a large degree, the nature of the literature that becomes relevant. Consequently, choosing a specific perspective delineates what literature is germane, and which is tangential. This brings focus to the design and implementation at all stages and helps avoid trying to do too much.*

2) What is the disciplinary (content) area of your proposed study? (≤ 20 words)

•
⌘
•

One way to think about a "discipline" is to think about what departments or schools exist in a large, prestigious university like BYU. In this regard, you could look at the list of departments on BYU's website (http://colleges.byu.edu/). Take a look at the departments listed under Family, Home and Social Sciences, for instance. Each of those eleven departments or schools represents, in a broad sense, a discipline. Another way is to look around at professional organizations to which professors at may belong (American Psychological Association, American Historical Society, etc.). In the case of the APA, psychology is the discipline, or in the case of the AHS, history is the discipline. Professor's CV's almost always list the professional organizations to which they belong – look up the CVs of some of the authors you are reading for an indication of the professional organizations they belong to, and thereby implicated would be the discipline from which the article they wrote derives. So, examples of typical disciplines from which EDLF doctoral dissertations might draw would be: psychology, business, sociology, economics, law, linguistics, etc. – but NOT education, as education is inherently cross- or multi-disciplinary.

3) What/who is the target audience for your study? (≤ 50 words)

•
⌘
•

The target audience is the group or organization that cares about the problem, is responsible for addressing the problem and is in a position to actually do something about it. Choosing a well-focused target audience allows us to be strategic in terms of what type(s) of data are actually relevant and persuasive. The target audience determines at what level the review of literature needs to be approached and how the results need to be tailored. The target audience needs to be finite and specific. For example, targeting K-6 public school building principals or 4th – 6th grade public school classroom teachers would be appropriate, while targeting all k-12 public school educators would be too broad.

---

⁴ The presence of an icon in the left column indicates that the item at the right is a required component. If an icon is absent, then the item can either be skipped for that type of research, or the item can be attempted, but altered, for use in the type of research being conducted. The three icons represent the following very general types of research: ❿ = Empirical, Quantitative; = Empirical, Qualitative; ❿ = Archival, Historical, etc.

4) What are the essential facts underlying your research? (≤ 75 words)

⌘
• •

The "facts" are elements, which we typically assert as problems, but which are indeed only non-problematized facts. For example, the lack of funding for education is a fact, as opposed to being a particular problem from a specific perspective resulting from that fact. The predictable and consistent low scores of language and ethnic minority students on standardized assessments is a fact and, as a fact, remains completely non-problematized until a specific perspective and audience is chosen and the problematic aspects of the facts from that perspective for that audience is articulated. So, state here only the facts on which you are proposing to focus.

5) What is the "problematic" aspect of these facts, ***specifically*** given your perspective and target audience? (≤ 50 words)

• ⌘ •

*Now clarify, specifically, the problematic aspects of the facts presented in #4 as seen from the perspective you have chosen in #1. WHY are these facts problematic from the perspective you have chosen? Your audience needs to understand the problematic aspects of the facts, **not** as **they** (the audience) see it, but as it is seen from the chosen perspective. Take, for example, the predictable and consistent low scores of language and ethnic minority students on standardized assessments. The problematic aspects of this fact are very specific if the perspective is the student(s) involved. The problematic aspect of the fact are substantially, if not entirely, different if the perspective taken is the sitting U.S. Secretary of Education. In the first case, the problematic aspects are likely to be psychological or sociological (or, in the long term, employability, fiscal stability, family resource limitations, etc.), while the second case would lead to problematic aspects focused on issues such as global economic competitiveness, or legal/legislative compliance, etc.*

6) What will be "solved" or become "solvable" as a result of your study? (≤ 50 words)

• ⌘ •

*Indicate clearly what your targeted audience (see #3) can expect to do and/or solve in connection with the problematic aspects of the fact(s) – now that they see, can articulate, and "feel the pain" from the perspective you have chosen in item #1. This is NOT a statement of new facts, it is the predictable negative **consequence** of not addressing the facts, as problematized in item #5. This problem statement provides the focus and motivation for the target audience to act in such a way as to solve the issue(s) and thereby to hopefully avert the problem otherwise accruing to the members of the "perspective" group.*

7) Now, phrase the problem in a concise 1-2 sentence problem statement. Your problem statement needs to directly reflect the content of #4-6. (≤ 50 words)

• ⌘ •

The problem statement does not introduce new content, and does not require any narrative. It succinctly expresses the typically negative "end-of the-row" consequences accruing directly to those from whose perspective is taken. For example,

8) How are the key terms (constructs, indicators, etc.) in your problem ***operationally*** (not ***constitutively***) defined? (≤ 100 words)

• ⌘ •

An operational definition requires that actions and operations (empirical work) or discipline-specific and normative language (archival, historical, etc., work) need to be specified that will measure or identify each key term in such a way that the audience (who is supposed to "do" something) clearly understands what is actually being described, in terms they can fully understand from inside their sphere of operation. A "dictionary definition" would be found in Webster's dictionary, but would

typically be so generic as to have little meaning in the context and value-laden specialist world of the target audience! The operational definition needs to be the "usual and customary" definition according to the standards and conventions of the chosen disciplinary (content) area. Also, remember that often a compound term needs to be defined, such as "bilingual education," and as such both terms need to be accounted for individually and collectively. Some studies will have terms which are operationally defined by law, or legislative act. But most studies will have at least some key terms that need clear and careful operationalization. If you feel that all of your terms are operationally defined by law, etc., then you may be under-construing what terms need operationalization.

9) What theoretical framework will provide the basis for the relevance and interpretation of your results? (≤ 50 words)

The theoretical framework provides the theoretical/conceptual basis for proceeding with the work of the study and, eventually, interpreting the results. The theoretical framework is distinguished from the actual analytical framework (e.g. statistical) – here, we are interested in the theoretical framework only. The function of the theoretical framework can change, depending on the nature of the dissertation. In a post-positivist, empirical quantitative dissertation, the theoretical framework typically provides the ontological and epistemological basis from start to finish, where the goal is to test (possibly falsifying) one or more major assumptions framed by the theory. This is also largely true in many archival and historical works, as well. In most empirically qualitative works, however, the role of the theoretical framework is much more emic, providing a starting point from which the study is virtually assured to depart – but it provides an initial framework to anchor the starting point and initial design elements, and perhaps to provide important contrasts when discussing the results or final emergent theory.

10) Who are the major figures cited for this theoretical framework or perspective(s)? (≤ 50 words)

While there may be many major figures to choose from, it is best to present the primary theoretical, research, and historical figures who serve to define the topic of inquiry. To narrow this down, you may ask yourself questions like: "Who would be considered the originator of this theoretical framework?" or "Who made the largest contribution to a major theoretical or practical shift, once the theoretical framework had gained initial acceptance?" or "Who is currently known as the most prominent proponent?" In responding to this item, don't simply enter names; rather, provide a bit of information such as the title of their most prominent work, their vital stats (such as birth, and death dates, where they worked as a professor, where they lived [USA, France, Australia, China, etc.], etc.) or other defining and important information.

11) What (***very*** briefly!) are the "competing" frameworks, perspectives or viewpoints that should be accounted for in adequately positioning your design? (≤ 50 words)

You almost always have to choose between competing frameworks and perspectives. Further, once you choose, there are not only competing possibilities which are fairly complimentary, but there are some which present quite opposing viewpoints. You should mention a few "close confusers" as well as some "clear contrasters" in this section, as well as identifying the category to which each belongs.

12) What fundamental questions might a critical reviewer ask concerning the above design elements and choices? (≤ 50 words)

In debate you quickly learn that the best position is one which has fully, and honestly, accounted for "the opposition." You should anticipate here what opponents to your theoretical assumptions (and

their logical conclusions) and general approach would say to erode the credibility of the work you are proposing. The more honest and clear you are on this point, the stronger your work will be.

Section #2: **Variables & Hypotheses**

13) What research question(s) do you intend to investigate in your study, and how does your chosen perspective, target audience, and research problem justify the question(s) specifically? (≤ 75 words)

⌘

Your questions need to be simple, straight forward, and avoid complex "nesting" of multiple questions (no questions within questions!). Do not propose YES-NO questions! The phrasing of your questions should indicate the types of data and analyses you intend to do. All of the facts that you intend to address, and the problematic aspects of those facts, should be clearly self-evident in your questions. Your perspective group should also be identified and given voice throughout your questions. You should not introduce anything in your questions that has not been included in your facts and problem statements. Following each question, briefly identify the connections between the elements of your question and the elements in your perspective, target audience, facts, and problem.

14) What hypotheses (if any) do you intend to test? (≤ 50 words)

⌘

*Current normative expectations are for **directional** hypotheses, rather than the historically dominant null hypotheses. If you have hypotheses, clearly state the direction of your hypothetical expectations, and make sure that all of the elements in your questions are covered. As before, do not add any new information which cannot be clearly discerned from your facts, problem, and questions. Hypotheses do not introduce new material, they simply structure what you anticipate in hypothetical form.*

15) Indicate how your research question(s) "drive" your hypotheses. (≤ 50 words) If you are not using any hypotheses, thoroughly explain why. (≤ 50 words)

⌘

Present, specifically, how your hypotheses cover the elements of your questions. Make clear that all of the elements from your questions are covered, and where.

16) A hypothesis suggests a relationship between at least two variables. For each hypothesis (or, if you have no hypotheses, do this for each of your questions) identify all of the variables that are involved as being: a) Independent; b) Dependent; c) Predictor; d) Outcome; e) Moderating; or, f) Mediating. Describe how these variables derive explicitly from your question(s), and are clearly applicable to your chosen perspective and target audience. (≤ 150 words)

⌘

Whether you are using variables in kind or degree, make sure that all of your variables are properly categorized. It is often possible to treat any given variable as more than one type (independent, moderating, etc.) of variable. This is not a task on modeling (that will come in item #17), but rather a presentation of the types of variables you propose and a discussion of how they derive from your questions. All variables in your questions should be identified here, and no variables not found in your questions should be included. Sometimes "new" variables appear when hypotheses and questions are first formulated. Nothing new should appear in the hypotheses and/or questions that hasn't been presented earlier. This is an internal check on whether you need to remove some variables in the hypotheses or questions, change/realign the labeling, or whether you need to go back and revise earlier material to better set the stage for all variables mentioned in items #13-#15.

⌘

17) How would you graph or model your variables? (Insert the graphic of your model in the following space)

Don't over complicate your model at this point, but do express a reasonable level of complexity. Make sure that your connecting lines have the correct weight and style (solid or dashed lines, arrowheads, etc.) to communicate what you think is going on with the variables you include. Avoid having every variable interacting with every other variable, and avoid having all relationships between variables of the same type and intensity.

18) Identify the possible confounding or latent variables that might affect your results. Should any of these be included in your model? How do you intend to account for the influence of those not included directly in your model? (≤ 50 words)

There are often (some would say always) influences which are not, cannot, or should not be included in the study, but which may or will have an impact on the outcomes of interest. What are these variables?

19) What chapters are you proposing for your final write-up? What issues have emerged in your work to this point that indicate these are the best chapter topics? Why create these chapters rather than others? (≤ 250 words)

This will help you think through the nature and structure of your topic. For example, are you going to present your content by decade (5 chapters, one for each decade from 1940 through the 1980's), by geographical location (4 chapters, one for each state in the USA where the development of your topic was particularly prominent), etc., etc. This makes a significant difference in how your committee can understand how you view your topic, and how you intend to present your content to, and shape the cognitive view of your audience.

Section #3: **Sampling**

20) Describe (don't just name them) the ***Target*** population, ***Accessible*** population, and ***Sample*** frame for your study. Describe what limitations and/or delimitations led you to these designations, and what implications result for your study. (≤ 75 words)

The target population is that group to which you would prefer to generalize or attribute your findings, if possible. The accessible population is the group to which you actually do have access for your study. The sample are those who will actually be included in your study. Sometimes this is presented as three concentric circles (but not a Venn diagram).

21) Outline the demographics (age, sex, ethnicity, religion, language, socio-economic status indicators, location, etc.) that will be included in your design. Explain why and how you are including them (sampling might directly impact some of them, others may not be involved in your sampling design per se). You should also label the data type you are targeting for each of the demographics. Are there any demographics you are not including that a critic of your research might cite to discredit your work? If so, list them and clarify why you are not including them. (≤ 100 words)

This is pretty straight forward.

22) How would you label (the technical, normative label) the type of sampling you will be doing? How will you actually proceed to draw your sample? <u>Specifically</u>, from what source(s) will you obtain the necessary information and data to implement your sampling procedures? What **ONE** reference can you provide which best describes or clarifies your sampling method? (≤ 75 words)

⌘

Typical labels for sampling are: two-stage proportional random; stratified random; simple random; multi-stage cluster; purposive; extreme case; snowball; theoretical; etc.; etc. Make the description of your actual sampling procedure simple and clear.

23) If you will be interviewing for your collection of information, describe who (individuals and/or groups) you intend to interview, and how they will be chosen and approached to participate. (≤ 100 words)

Non-empirical research, archival research, and other forms of inquiry can use interviews to inform the study. For example, in conducting an historical study you could very well want to meet with content experts on individuals, locations, eras, etc., involved in your archival study who can provide insights and direction for your things like your interpretation of documents, or avenues for location of related documentation. Content from those meetings/interviews could even be excerpted for inclusion in some portions of the final document, or they may simply provide guidance to you and your work. Consequently, you typically don't need to concern yourself with traditional sampling issues necessary to empirical quantitative or qualitative research.

Section #4: **Instrumentation & Analysis**

24) What pre-existing instrument(s) will you use to collect your raw data? Include the figures for the reliability and validity (or equivalent, if qualitative) of your instrument(s). Attach a copy of your instrument(s). (≤ 100 words)

⌘

Make sure that you are clear on the cost profile, delivery mechanisms, and analytical restrictions/possibilities of pre-existing instruments. For example, some pre-existing instruments require that the completed forms are sent to the test originators for scanning and analysis. In some of these instances, no raw data are available to the researcher, and only stock analyses are available.

25) If you plan to develop your own instrument(s) describe the process you will use to do so, be sure to cover how you plan to establish reliability and validity (or equivalent, if qualitative). (≤ 100 words)

⌘

Be clear and specific – present the actual steps you will take in your process. Provide citations parsimoniously, but effectively, to demonstrate that your process is defensible and reasonable.

26) If you plan to develop your own instrument(s) provide examples of questions/items you will include. (≤ 100 words)

⌘

Choose examples from the entire spectrum of your proposed instrument. Include labels for the type of data each questions or item is meant to collect.

27) How are you going to process, scrub, and warehouse your data? (≤ 50 words)

⌘

What software will you use? What steps will you take to ensure fidelity in the creation of your database (numerical and/or narrative content)?

28) Drawing from your information in item #16, describe how you plan to analyze your data. As you mention variables, label them (the first time only, in parentheses) as nominal, ordinal, interval, or ratio. (≤ 100 words)

How you plan to analyze your data needs to be consistent with how you see you variables interacting in your model (item # 17). The categorization of variables indicates the type of data you will be collecting, and this determines the type(s) of analysis which are possible. Any mismatches between the types of questions, hypotheses, variables, and intended analysis, will become clear in this item. Typical variables for the various data types are: Nominal = sex, gender, ethnicity, religion, etc.; Ordinal = Likert-type scale responses, rankings, education levels, etc.; Interval = ACT & GRE scores, I.Q. scores, etc.; Ratio = Income (actual), years of education completed, age, etc.

⌘

In an empirical quantitative study, the types of statistical analysis you can perform is directly related to the types of data you have collected. Some types of data are simply incompatible with some statistical techniques – make sure that your data are compatible with your intended techniques.

If you are conducting an empirical qualitative study you should also categorize any numerical variables you will collect (demographics, etc.) as this has a significant impact on how you code and analyze your data, in some ways similar to a quantitative study, and in other ways different.

Whether qualitative or quantitative, make sure you include what computer-based analytical software you intend to use.

29) If you will be interviewing for your collection of information, describe what you will be asking in those interviews, and why you have chosen to ask these things. (≤ 100 words)

Unlike empirical work, what you ask doesn't need to be systematized across the various individuals you might interview. You could easily ask different questions of various interviewees. The point here is that you may very well need specific and specialized information from each person you interview, and you shouldn't feel the need to as the same things of each person – unless that is what you want or need to do. The questions you ask must simply address your needs and the skill/information set of the person you interview.

30) If you will be interviewing for your collection of information, discuss what you think a critic of your approach might ask in their interviews. Why shouldn't you investigate those things, instead of what you have chosen? (≤ 50 words)

This is very similar to item #12. But here you are clearly choosing to interview some people and not others, and you are pursuing certain types of information and/or help, but not others. Why are you doing what you propose, and you need to anticipate what someone else might say you should have done instead.

Section #5: **Literature**

31) Describe the sources of your data, including interviews, printed material, online sources, etc. (≤ 150 words)

This is reasonably self-explanatory: simply list the types of sources you anticipate using for your study. It would be good to broadly anticipate how much emphasis, proportionally, you anticipate from the various sources you identify (i.e., will you mostly use online sources, or will you mostly use printed trade books, etc. – you could even propose some very broad numerical estimates, but only if it makes sense to you and your chair).

32) Describe the databases and query methods you have used to search out the literature you have and intend to use in your research. (≤ 100 words)

Include search terms that were useful, and examples of those which you thought would be productive but were not. You may attach examples of your queries, if desired.

33) What have you done, and will continue to do, to avoid *confirmatory bias* in your literature search? (≤ 50 words)

We are all influenced by what we think is "true" and "best," and/or what we (sometimes desperately) want to find. It is simply impossible not to have an end in mind as we search the literature. This often leads us to exclude literature which doesn't conform to our pre-conceived notions, and "find" only that which does – this is confirmatory bias. Since this is an influence in all of our work, describe how you have deliberately taken steps to avoid this confounding influence.

34) What patterns have you noted in your literature search? Are there any gaps in the literature you have found which create potential "structural holes" in the narrative? Focus on potential structural holes in areas such as geographical, chronological, or topical representation. (≤ 100 words)

We often discover that our area of interest is bounded by constraints we hadn't anticipated. Perhaps we find that nothing exists in the literature prior to a certain year, or that there are no discussions of our topic in certain regions of the world. These patterns are very important to understanding the scope, reach, and potential impact of your work.

35) What are your concerns regarding to "structural holes" in your literature search, and how are you going to address those? (≤ 50 words)

The issue to first consider here is whether the structural holes identified in item #34 represent an actual, unavoidable pattern, or whether you have inadvertently done something that has disabled your ability to reach into apparent structural holes? If these are indeed structural holes, then what are the implications for your work?

36) Attached a two-page, double-spaced prècise of what you have found in your literature search, as it applies to your study. (Do not include citations or references).

37) Attach an annotated bibliography. This should include no fewer than 25 references, and no more than 50. Choose the most salient references, and those which best express the range of variation in your literature search to date (take into account issues in items #34 and #35).

- 38) Attach a listing of your proposed chapters (from item #19) and include under each chapter title an annotated bibliography of the data sources you intend for that chapter. Each chapter should have no fewer than 5 sources, and no more than 10. Choose the most salient sources, and those, which best express the range of variation in your work to date (take into account issues in items #34 and #35).

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Approval for Dissertation Prospectus Worksheet Defense
Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations

Student: _____ Degree Sought: **Ed.D.**

Title of Dissertation Prospectus: _____

Dissertation major committee member, please remember that department policy states that you are expected to read the prospectus and provide feedback to the student within the next ten working days (excluding holidays and official days out-of-office) after receiving this document. Minor committee members will have three working days. After you have done so, please sign this form and return to Bonnie.

By initialing in the space indicated you are indicating that you are satisfied that <u>in its present form</u> this prospectus: (1) fully meets the standards of the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations, and (2) is approved by you to be scheduled for formal defense.

Dissertation committee member:	**Initials:**	**Date:**
_____ Dissertation Committee Chair	_____	_____ dd/mm/yyyy
_____ Major Committee Member	_____	_____ dd/mm/yyyy
_____ Major Committee Member	_____	_____ dd/mm/yyyy
_____ Minor Committee Member	_____	_____ dd/mm/yyyy
_____ Minor Committee Member	_____	_____ dd/mm/yyyy

In its present form, I cannot recommend scheduling this prospectus document for defense for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____   _____
   Initials   dd/mm/yyyy

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Dissertation Prospectus Worksheet Approval Form
Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations

Instructions to the student: The Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations is committed to high quality in dissertation work and products. Your dissertation committee chair and members should provide you with adequate guidance in the dissertation process. You are expected to do your best work, and comply with all of the guidelines and steps in the dissertation process. You are personally responsible for correctly following the dissertation process guidelines.

This form is intended to help ensure that your prospectus is given the attention it deserves. You cannot proceed with your dissertation work until a signed copy of this approval form, a paper copy of your revised prospectus (as required by the committee in the defense meeting), and an approved BYU IRB document (if required) has been submitted to the Graduate Coordinator, who will make sure that is placed in your file. Proceeding before <u>all</u> of these documents are placed in your file can be construed as a violation of the honor code, leading at least to delays in the completion of your work, and possibly ending in dismissal from the department and university.

Student: _____Degree Sought: **Ed.D.**

Proposed Title of Dissertation: _____

Dissertation Committee Members:

We, the undersigned, met as a committee on _____and have counseled with the candidate, reviewed the attached prospectus and now submit the prospectus to the department certifying that it meets department standards.

_____
Dissertation Committee Chair

_____   _____
Major Committee Member   Minor Committee Member

_____   _____
Major Committee Member   Minor Committee Member

Evidence of Human Subjects Review Approval Attached   Approval Date: _____
(or approved doctoral committee petition)

Department Approval:
The attached prospectus has been approved by the department. The student may proceed with the study as specifically outlined.

_____   _____
Doctoral Program Committee Chair   dd/mm/yyyy

_____   _____
Graduate Coordinator   dd/mm/yyyy

_____   _____
Department Chair   dd/mm/yyyy

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Ed.D. Prospectus Checklist
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

The graduate coordinator works with the department secretary to ensure that the following documents are completed as specified in the *Ed.D. Program Handbook*. Once the documents are completed and placed in the student's file, a copy of this form should be sent to the student so that they can proceed with the conduct of their dissertation.

Item:	Placed in student file:
<u>Completed</u> EDLF *Dissertation Prospectus Approval Form*	☐
Evidence of IRB Approval (e.g. letter or stamped inform consent forms; or approved petition from doctoral committee that IRB is not required)	☐
Paper copy of the complete and revised Prospectus Worksheet (as required by the committee in the defense meeting)	☐

Student name:_____

_____
Graduate Coordinator signature

_____
Date student prospectus file completed (dd/mm/yyyy)

Appendix D: EDLF Dissertation Template

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

[Title: Titles Must Be in Mixed Case and May Not Exceed Six Inches on One Line
and Must Be in the Inverted Pyramid Format When

Additional Lines Are Needed]

[Student Name]

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

[Committee Chair], Chair
[Major Committee Member]
[Major Committee Member]
[Minor Committee Member]
[Minor Committee Member]

Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations

Brigham Young University

[Graduation Month & Year the Dean approves final document]

The Educational Doctorate (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

ABSTRACT

[Title: Titles Must Be in Mixed Case and May Not Exceed Six Inches on One Line
and Must Be in the Inverted Pyramid Format When
Additional Lines Are Needed]

To optimize the discovery of your work for search engines, write a clear and descriptive title including main key terms or phrases; repeat key phrases in a contextually natural way in the abstract, and include variants of key terms or phrases as keywords.

[Student Name]
Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations, BYU
Doctor of Education

[The abstract is a summary of the work with emphasis on the findings. It must be single spaced and no more than one page in length. It must match the same font and size as the rest of the work. The abstract precedes the optional acknowledgement page and the body of the work.]

Keywords: [keyword, keyword, keyword, etc.]

ABSTRACT INSTRUCTIONS: The dissertation abstract (not the journal article abstract) is a brief, comprehensive summary of the contents of the article; it allows readers to survey the contents of an article quickly, and like a title, it enables persons interested in the document to retrieve it from abstracting and indexing databases. The abstract needs to be dense with information. A good abstract is accurate; non-evaluative; coherent and readable; and concise. See the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association 6th Edition item 2.04 for more information. Include in the abstract only the four or five most important concepts, findings, or implications. Follow these standards for theses and dissertations:

- Single-space and indent each paragraph
- Use active rather than passive voice
- Use verbs rather than their noun equivalents
- Use digits for all numbers
- Use present tense for results/conclusions; past tense for variables manipulated
- Use the same font and size as the rest of the work
- No more than one page in length
- Emphasize the findings of the study
- Content of an abstract for an empirical study typically includes the following:
- Description of the problem (in one sentence)
- Description of the participants (with pertinent characteristics)
- Description of the study method (include key measures)
- Report of the findings (the 4 or 5 most important findings; report significance levels)
- Report of conclusions
- Report of implications or applications]

Typically, use no more than six keywords; do not use acronyms. **Find and use keywords that are indexed through ERIC here: http://eric.ed.gov/ . You can also find keywords through BYU's paid version of EBSCO, from the center box on the education subject guide (http://guides.lib.byu.edu/education).** The link to the thesaurus (where the keywords are) is at the top left. These terms also appear after the word subjects in the search results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

[This page is optional and the actual text and acknowledgements are included only in the final version of the dissertation (after the final defense). Students may use the acknowledgements page to express appreciation for the committee members, friends, or family who provided assistance in research, writing, or technical aspects of the dissertation, thesis, or selected project. Acknowledgements should be simple and in good taste.

NOTE: Complete this page *after* the defense of the dissertation]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INSTRUCTIONS:
The Table of Contents should be created using the styles and headings function which allows you to click on one of the headings and move (hyperlink) to that part in your document. Styles also allows you to use the View / Navigation Pane option to see the table of contents on the left side of your screen with hyperlinks. These strategies make it easier to navigate the sections of your thesis. They also make **MUCH** it easier when you turn the MS Word version into a PDF for ETD and need bookmarks for each Level 1, 2, and 3 heading. Make sure that the Table of Contents matches the above format. This means while the APA 6th format prevails in the text of the document, the ToC headings are NOT APA 6th style.
TOC headings format:
- Main section headings are ALL CAPS.

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

DESCRIPTION OF DISSERTATION CONTENT AND STRUCTURE

This manuscript is presented in the format of the hybrid dissertation which is one of several formats supported in BYU's David O. McKay School of Education. Unlike a traditional five- chapter format, the hybrid dissertation focuses on producing a journal-ready manuscript, which is considered by the dissertation committee to be ready for submission. Consequently, the final dissertation product has fewer chapters than the traditional format, and focuses on the presentation of the scholarly manuscript as the centerpiece. This hybrid dissertation also includes other necessary supporting documentation following the manuscript chapter as appendices. Appendix A includes an extended literature review, and Appendix B includes a methodological section sufficient for the requirements of an institutional review board (e.g., use of human subjects review, or requirements of the dissertation committee). Appendix C includes evidence of IRB approval. [If the required journal style format is other than APA 6th: The required journal style format is xxx, which will be used for the journal article portion of this manuscript (see Appendix D for the required journal format style requirements) [also add URL link to journal requirements]. This format requires that tables and figures be placed [in the text / after the references]. The hybrid dissertation format contains two reference lists. The first reference list contains references for citations included in the journal-ready article. The second reference list contains references for all citations used in the journal article and appendices (see Appendix D) [unless Appendix D has journal format style requirements, in which case make second reference list Appendix E].

The targeted journal for this dissertation article is the *International Journal of Urban Educational Leadership (IJUEL) (2015 Impact Factor: __)*. [Provide rationale—

example: The *IJUEL* is sponsored and published by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), which is the primary professional organization for educational leadership in the USA.   The Department of Educational Leadership & Foundations (EDLF) at Brigham Young University is a full institutional member of UCEA, and EDLF faculty members attend the national conference annually to present research and participate in plenary and business meetings of the organization.] The target audience for the *IJUEL* is composed of both academics and practitioners in educational leadership. Articles submitted to the *IJUEL* are double-blind reviewed by three external reviewers, as well as one in-house reviewer. The manuscript length for submission is 5,000 or 7,000 words, [including/excluding] tables and references. The manuscript in this hybrid dissertation targeted the journal's manuscript submission length.

FORMAT INSTRUCTIONS:

1) Follow APA 6th format and the Dean's Office checklist.

2) Use page breaks (On PC: LAYOUT / BREAKS / PAGE… or… Control-Enter) *every time* you want the next page to always start on a new page. This strategy will prevent text from shifting unnecessarily, e.g. preface pages, references, appendices.

3) Use section breaks to create landscaped table/figures (On PC: LAYOUT / BREAKS / SECTION / NEXT PAGE). Add two section breaks. After the first section break, change layout to *landscape*.

4) Be sure you have removed any extra line spaces before/after paragraphs and after the page numbers in the heading (which is often the default for MS Word). (Be sure Paragraph Spacing Before/After is set to "0", not left blank.)

5) Make sure your margins are one inch on all sides and that and make sure all tables & figures fit within the margins.

6) Eliminate all widows/ orphans throughout your document (single lines of a paragraph on a page). On a PC, do this by selecting the entire document, select the Paragraph menu, select Line & Page Breaks, then select Widow/Orphan Control. Review all page breaks before each submission of your document for reviews.

7) Use a 12-point font, Times New Roman is preferred. You can use 10 or 11 point on tables and figures.

8) Make sure all tables & figures are cited in the text [e.g. "(see Table 1)"] and are placed *directly* after the paragraph in which they are cited. If the table/figure does not fit on the page, move it to the *very* top of the next page and move the continuing text *up* to fill in the blank space on the previous page. Before every submission, check that the tables and figures are in their proper location (as they can shift due to editing).

If the journal you are targeting for submission requires tables and figures not to be in the text but placed at the end of the manuscript, place the tables and figures *after* your reference list and include a marker (see below) following the paragraph in which you cite the table:

<INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>

An easy way to check page format (above) is to view two pages at a time; this helps you to check the top and bottom alignment from one page to the next.

Table 2

Title of Table 2

Variable	Mean	SD	t-value
Name of Variable 1	.09472	.44545	1.647
Name of Variable 2	.11824	.50863	1.692
Name of Variable 3	-.04088	.54771	-.543
Name of Variable 4	.07233	.46857	1.124
Name of Variable 5	-.08753	.38909	-1.638

*p < .05 **p<.01 p<.001.

(placed under the figure)

Figure 1. Title of figure 1 here in sentence case, ending with a period. Be sure to italicize your figure heading, number it, and end it with a period.

Article References

Be sure you have inserted a page break (not extra hard returns) to begin your reference list.

Double space reference list with hanging indent.

Follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (Sixth Edition) for formatting your reference list. Be sure to include volume and issues numbers for journal articles, page numbers for articles and book chapters, and DOI numbers if they exist.

If the journal requires a different format (other than APA), use the journal-required format for the article references and include an Appendix C with the reference format instructions.

APPENDIX A: EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

[The review of literature presented in a traditional prospectus defense is placed here AFTER required changes, additions, corrections, and editing is complete.

For the Ed.D. dissertation using the worksheet for the prospectus defense, an expanded review of literature will need to be included here (more depth than the precise).

This section is subject to review and approval by the Dean's Office before the dissertation will be considered accepted.]

APPENDIX B: DETAILED METHODS

[The methods section presented in a traditional prospectus defense is placed here AFTER required changes, additions, corrections, and editing is complete. The tense of this section also needs to be changed to past tense (now that the dissertation work is done) and modified to include any changes in methods and/or procedures that occurred following the prospectus defense.

For the Ed.D. dissertation using the worksheet for the prospectus defense, a detailed methods section (describing what you actually did) will need to be included here.

This section is subject to review and approval by the Dean's Office before the dissertation will be considered accepted.]

APPENDIX C: IRB APPROVAL

APPENDIX D: DISSERTATION REFERENCES

The references in this section include ALL references used in BOTH the article and APPENDICES, without duplication.

References

ALL references cited in the prospectus document should be provided here in fully compliant APA 6th format. Remember that all citations must be in the references, and all references must be cited at least once.

Use EndNote in all of your drafts. If your drafts (cites and references) are not clearly utilizing EndNote, then they will be sent back immediately without review until they are reformed with EndNote. Each submitted manuscript should also be sent with an EndNote library for review along with the manuscript.

After final chair approval, convert the Endnote references to 'plain text.' (PC: Endnote tab / Convert Citations & Bibliography / Convert to Plain text).

Appendix E: Dissertation Defense Scheduling & Approval Form (DDSA)

EDLF Dissertation Defense Scheduling & Approval Form (DDSA)
(aligned with, but in lieu of, ADV Form 8C)

INSTRUCTIONS: Use this form to schedule the final defense and indicate the final dissertation is ready for departmental approval.

Prior to scheduling the final defense:

A. The student must:
   a. Apply for Graduation on AIM (Graduation Application)
   b. Provide completed Dean's Office Checklist (p. 1-2) to Committee Chair.
   c. Ensure that Graduate Committee names on the dissertation title page match the names on the student's progress report.
   d. Submit ADV Form 8d

B. The Committee Chair must complete Sections A, B, C & D.

A - STUDENT INFORMATION

Name _____ Matriculation Semester & Year _____ BYU ID Number _____

Dissertation Title

B - DISSERTATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL FOR SCHEDULING DEFENSE

The Dissertation Committee has read and reviewed a full version of the dissertation document and approves the scheduling of the final defense. Each member of the committee has provided either a signature or an email to the chair indicating approval prior to scheduling the defense. All signatures will be obtained prior to the defense. The Graduate Committee names are listed in the same order and exactly as indicated in the student's progress report and on the dissertation title page.

| _____ | ☐ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Chair | Email (attached) | Email Date | Original Signature of Committee Chair | Signature Date |

| _____ | ☐ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Major Member | Email (attached) | Email Date | Original Signature of Committee Major Member | Signature Date |

| _____ | ☐ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Major Member | Email (attached) | Email Date | Original Signature of Committee Major Member | Signature Date |

| _____ | ☐ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Minor Member | Email (attached) | Email Date | Original Signature of Committee Minor Member | Signature Date |

| _____ | ☐ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Minor Member | Email (attached) | Email Date | Original Signature of Committee Minor Member | Signature Date |

C - COMMITTEE CHAIR FINAL APPROVAL FOR SCHEDULING THE DEFENSE

I have confirmed, on behalf of the committee and department, that the dissertation is ready to be scheduled for defense and that:

☐ The student has applied for graduation.

☐ The committee names above match the dissertation title page and the student's progress report.

☐ The full dissertation (including structure, citations, references) meets APA-6th and Dean's Office Checklist standards.

☐ The journal article is not more than 1,000 words (or 3 pages) beyond the target journal's submission limit.

I have attached the following documents:

☐ Dissertation title page

☐ Completed Dean's Office Checklist

| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Name of Committee Chair | Original Signature of Committee Chair | Signature Date |

Rev. 7/8/2016

D – IDENTIFYING THE DEFENSE DATE

After Sections A, B, and C are completed, the chair coordinates with the student and committee members to identity a mutually acceptable defense date and requests the department secretary to schedule the defense date.

The Final Defense date is requested to be scheduled for _____ (date/time).

☐ I have informed the student to send *Full* Dissertation to all committee members and department reviewer.

_____   _____
Signature of Committee Chair   Signature Date

E – SCHEDULING THE DEFENSE DATE

After the completion of Sections A, B, C and D (above), the department secretary officially schedules the defense date with Graduate Studies, at least __two weeks__ prior to the actual defense date.

The Final Defense has been scheduled to be held on _____ (actual defense date).

The Final Defense date was officially scheduled with Grad Studies on _____ (date submitted).

_____   _____
Signature of Department Secretary   Signature Date

E – DEPARTMENT REVIEW

The Department Reviewer affirms that the *final* dissertation review has been completed and the feedback has been sent to the student.

_____   _____   _____
Name of Department Reviewer   Original Signature of Department Reviewer   Date Feedback Sent to Student

F – FINAL DEFENSE & CHAIR APPROVAL

The Final Defense has been held, and the student has addressed the committee's feedback to my satisfaction. The final dissertation is now ready for department review.

☐ The dissertation research received official IRB approval, if required, and approval evidence is provided in Appendix C.

☐ The ADV Form 8d, with the completed student section and all committee signatures, is attached. I have signed this form as Committee Chair indicating my approval.

☐ I will inform the student to send the *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Office Checklist to the graduate coordinator.

☐ A copy of the completed co-author agreement is attached, with the original in the student's file.

_____   _____   _____
Name of Committee Chair   Original Signature of Committee Chair   Signature Date

G – DEPARTMENT APPROVAL

As Graduate Coordinator, I have reviewed the final dissertation and recommend it for department approval.

_____   _____   _____
Name of Graduate Coordinator   Original Signature of Graduate Coordinator   Signature Date

As Department Chair, I give approval for the final dissertationto be sent to the Dean's Office for review. I have also signed the ADV Form 8d.

_____   _____   _____
Name of Department Chair   Original Signature of Department Chair   Signature Date

A copy of the ADV Form 8d and this *DDSA* form have been placed in the student's file by the Department Secretary.

_____   _____
Date Forms Placed in Student File   Signature of Department Secretary

H – DEAN'S OFFICE REVIEW

The Department Secretary submits the signed FORM ADV 8d to the Dean's Office, along with a copy of the student's completed Dean's Office Checklist. The Department Secretary notifies the student to email the final dissertation to the Dean's Office for review (amber_richardson@byu.edu) and askes for confirmation that the student received their email.

_____   _____
Date Submitted to the Dean's Office   Signature

Rev. 7/8/2016

Appendix F: Ed.D. Program Co-Authorship Agreement Form

EdD Program Co-authorship Agreement
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

1. We the undersigned have read and understand the policies of the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations of Brigham Young University and the APA Ethical Principles related to publication credit, particularly article 8.12 (http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx#8_12b)
2. We agree upon authorship based upon our own projections of individual contributions to the study.
3. We agree that, in case of a dissertation, if the student does not submit a manuscript based on the work within six months following their final defense, the student's advisor may prepare and submit a manuscript based on the student's dissertation. This manuscript will maintain the authorship order as designated in this agreement, as per APA's Ethical Principles.

The following represents our preliminary agreement on authorship of the study initially entitled:

_____

_____

Authors (numbers as needed):

First Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Second Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Third Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Fourth Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Fifth Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Sixth Author: _____   _____
                 Printed Name   Signature

Date: _____
(dd/mm/yyyy)

Department Approval:

_____   _____
Graduate Coordinator   dd/mm/yyyy

Updated: 1 2011

Ed.D. Program Co-Authorship Agreement
Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations

1. We the undersigned have read and understand the policies of the Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations of Brigham Young University and the APA Ethical Principles related to publication credit, particularly article 8.12 (http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx#8_12b)
2. We agree upon authorship based upon our own projections of individual contributions to the study.
3. We agree that, in case of a dissertation, if the student does not submit a manuscript based on the work within six months following their final defense, the student's advisor may prepare and submit a manuscript based on the student's dissertation. This manuscript will maintain the authorship order as designated in this agreement, as per APA's Ethical Principles.

The following represents our preliminary agreement on authorship of the study initially entitled:

_____

_____

Authors:

First Author: _____   _____
                     Printed Name   Signature

Second Author: _____   _____
                     Printed Name   Signature

Third Author: _____   _____
                     Printed Name   Signature

Fourth Author: _____   _____
                     Printed Name   Signature

Date: _____
(dd/mm/yyyy)

Department Approval:

_____   _____
          Graduate Coordinator   dd/mm/yyyy

Appendix G: MSE Dean's Office Checklist & Instructions for Dissertation Format

Checklist for Formats and Conventions of Theses and Dissertations
BYU McKay School of Education

Directions. You are responsible for checking your thesis/dissertation to be sure that formats and conventions follow your program/department requirements, BYU Graduate Studies guidelines, and the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA)*. This checklist highlights some of the most critical formatting elements and common errors; refer to the following pages and the APA manual for more information.

Complete the first two pages (check off that you are ensuring the format) and submit the completed checklist (first 2 pages) to your chair and committee members with your *full* dissertation. Provide a copy to the department chair for submission to the dean's office for their dissertation review.

Name	Date Submitted	Date Returned

BYU Format for Preliminary Pages and Organizational Components
- ☐ Line spacing
- ☐ Spelling of committee members' names and department name
- ☐ Chair identified; committee members just listed
- ☐ Date thesis/dissertation approved by the dean's office (not graduation date)
- ☐ Completeness of abstract
- ☐ Table of contents, list of tables, list of figures; correlation between table and manuscript (wording, page numbers); hanging indent, subheading indentation, number alignment
- ☐ Description of thesis structure (if needed); title of thesis italicized, appendices referred to in order

Numbers and Other Conventions
- ☐ 1-inch margins
- ☐ Double-spacing
- ☐ Times New Roman 12-point font, including page numbers
- ☐ Half inch paragraph indentation (5 to 7 spaces)
- ☐ Items centered on the page appropriately (e.g., Level 1 headings centered without indentation)
- ☐ Page headings
  - o Running head (if required by department)
  - o Preliminary pages unnumbered
  - o Page numbers at top right corner of each subsequent page
  - o Lowercase Roman numerals on pages beginning with the table of contents
  - o Arabic numerals on all pages of the body of the thesis, including appendices
- ☐ Double spaces after periods ending sentences
- ☐ Widows and orphans corrected

Headings

☐ Up to five levels of headings formatted correctly
☐ Subheadings that are clear divisions of sections (at least two for each area subdivided)
☐ No stacked headings (subheadings are introduced with text after each main heading)
☐ Designated chapters (if used) on the same level as chapter titles

Tables and Figures

☐ Tables displaying substantial amounts of data to supplement written text
☐ Table titles above (left side for sideways table); figure captions beneath
☐ Large tables displayed on separate pages
☐ Tables placed as close to the in-text reference as possible (or according to department standard)
☐ Tables and figures mentioned in the text and displayed in chronological order (e.g., 1, 2, 3)
☐ Single or double spacing on tables (see APA manual for other formatting instructions)

Seriation

☐ Use of (a), (b), (c) for horizontal lists
☐ Use of Arabic numerals followed by period for vertical (hanging-indented) lists

References

☐ Double spacing, hanging indent form on reference list
☐ Alphabetical and chronological placement on reference list
☐ DOI, as available
☐ Consistency between citations in the text and items on the reference list
☐ Citations in text and items on reference list formatted according to instructions in the APA manual

Writing Style and Mechanics

☐ Abbreviations
☐ Acronyms
☐ Capitalization
☐ Grammar and usage
☐ Italics
☐ Numbers
☐ Punctuation
☐ Quotations
☐ Spelling
☐ Statistical and mathematical copy
☐ Writing style

Appendices

☐ Clear mention of all appendices in text for traditional theses/dissertations or in "Description of Thesis/Dissertation Structure" for journal-ready theses/dissertations
☐ Listing in text and placement at the end of text designated in alphabetical order

Checklist for Formats and Conventions of Theses and Dissertations (cont.)
BYU McKay School of Education

Information in these guidelines, which is drawn from BYU Graduate Studies and from the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA), 6th edition,* is intended to be a reference for graduate students and a helpful refresher for faculty as they prepare manuscripts for submission to professional journals. These guidelines cover the most common format and convention issues; however, writers should consult the APA manual for more specific and detailed information. Also, refer to your program/department for specific thesis/dissertation requirements.

Manuscript Components

The contents of your thesis/dissertation must conform to the standards determined by your department and those published by BYU Graduate Studies as well. However, most theses and dissertations include the following sections and materials:

Preliminary Pages

1. *Title Page*
2. *Abstract*
   a. Single-space and indent each paragraph. Use active voice, emphasize verbs, use digits for all numbers, use present tense for results/conclusions, use past tense for study procedures and outcomes, and emphasize study findings.
   b. The following content will be expected:
      ● Description of the problem (in one sentence)
      ● Description of the participants (with pertinent characteristics)
      ● Description of the study method (include key measures)
      ● Report of the findings (the 4 or 5 most important findings, including significance levels)
      ● Report of conclusions
      ● Report of implications or applications
   c. At the bottom of the page include no more than six keywords. Find keywords that are indexed through ERIC at http://eric.ed.gov/ . You can also find keywords through BYU's paid version of EBSCO, from the center box on the education subject guide at http://guides.lib.byu.edu/education. (Link to the thesaurus containing keywords at the top left.) Also look for terms that appear after the word subjects when you are looking at search results.
3. *Optional Acknowledgment Page*
   a. EDLF Note: *The acknowledgement page should not be completed until after the dissertation defense.*

Organizational Components

1. *Table of Contents*
   - b. Be sure the page numbers are right aligned.
   - c. Do not put "page #" or "page" as a column header for the page numbers.

   - d. Include in the Table of Contents all of Headings 1-3 in the work.
   - e. Assure that the sub-headings are indented under their respective headings.
2. *List of Tables*, with tables names listed exactly as they appear in the body of the work, title case
3. *List of Figures*, with concise summary of each figure caption, sentence case
4. *Description of Thesis/Dissertation Structure* (only for theses and dissertations with journal-ready article(s), not for traditional 5-chapter theses/dissertations)

Body of Thesis/Dissertation

1. *Introduction*
2. *Method*
3. *Results*
4. *Discussion*
5. *References*
6. *Appendices* (may include extended review of literature and associated references, annotated bibliography, consent forms, instruments, and other related information)

Manuscript Formatting

APA style requires specific formats and conventions regarding numbers and other conventions, headings, tables/figures, and seriation. See the APA manual for specific instructions and examples.

Numbers and other conventions (APA 8.03, pp. 228-231)

1. Margins should be one inch all around.
2. The entire text should be double spaced.
   - a. Double spacing includes blocked quotations, reference list(s), headings, footnotes, and figure captions.
   - b. MS Word has an option for an extra half line space default after each paragraph. Change this default to consistent double spacing (Mac: *Format/Paragraph/ Don't add space between paragraphs of same style;* PC: *Home/Paragraph/Remove Space After or Before Paragraph*).
3. Use the Times New Roman typeface and a 12-point font.
4. Indentation for paragraphs and footnotes should be set at ½ inch.
5. Some journals require authors to identify their manuscript with a running head (see p. 230 and sample manuscript p. 41); for theses/dissertations, this is only required if this is the department standard.
6. Page numbers are placed in the top right corner of every page, with the following exceptions.
   - a. Do not number preliminary pages.
   - b. Starting with the Table of Contents, number the pages in lowercase Times New Roman numerals.
   - c. Beginning with the body of the thesis, use Arabic numerals, beginning with page 1. See the BYU Graduate Studies Preliminary Pages Template, Form 11b or Form 11d for an example.

7. Eliminate all widows and orphans in your document. Widows and orphans are words or short lines at the beginning or end of a paragraph that are separated from the rest of the paragraph by page division (top of the page – widow; bottom of the page – orphan).

Headings (APA 3.03, pp. 62-63)

1. Use headings to identify the logical progression and relationships of sections and subsections. Use the five levels as shown below. Make sure the descriptions are parallel within their sets: all Level 1 headings, all Level 2 headings under each Level 1, all Level 3 headings under each Level 2 heading, etc.

Level 1: Centered, Bolded, Initial Caps

Level 2: Left Margin, Bolded, Initial Caps

> **Level 3: Indented, bolded, paragraph heading, first word capitalized, followed by period.**

> **Level 4: Indented, bolded, italicized, paragraph heading followed by a period.**

> *Level 5: Indented, italicized paragraph heading followed by a period.*

---

2. Whenever you break information from a section to another level of headings/subheadings, be sure there are at least two. You can't break something down and come out with just one.
   a. If you have only one subheading in a section and it is near the beginning, it may be just a slightly more specific rewording of the section heading. Just make it the section heading.
   b. If you have just one subheading and it is close to the middle, it may be that the material preceding it is really a subsection and needs a subheading designating it as a unit as well. Give the earlier material the subheading that it needs.
3. If your document has chapters designated as Chapter 2, Chapter 3, etc., the chapter designation should be on the same level as the chapter title (e.g., Level 1).

Tables and Figures (APA 5.01-5.30, pp. 125-167)

1. Use tables and figures purposefully.
   a. Use tables only when you have substantial amounts of data (more than one or two columns or rows).
   b. Use a table to supplement, not duplicate, the written text.
2. Follow placement and format conventions of APA, as well as those required by your department.
   a. Check on your departmental standard for placement of tables and figures (e.g., within the body of the text, following the reference list, in appendices).
   b. Short tables appear on a page with text; do not have a short table on a page with blank space. Long tables and figures are placed on a separate page immediately after the page on which the table or figure is first mentioned.

> Incorrect: The four suggestions are:
> Correct: Four suggestions are given:
>
> Incorrect: To complete the procedure, teachers must:
> Correct: To complete the procedure, teachers must do the following:

     c. Tables may be single spaced to enhance clarity. Place sideways tables with the top on the left.

     d. Font size may be reduced in tables or appendices. A sans serif type may be used in figures.

3. Be sure that numbers and titles are handled correctly.

     a. The number of the table goes above the table, flush left. The title of the table goes next, double spaced under the table number, flush left, *italicized*. If the title is more than one line, it can be single spaced.

     b. The number of the figure goes under the figure, flush left. The figure caption goes next to the number (APA 5.23, pp. 158-160) and is double-spaced (APA 8.03, p. 229).

     c. Tables and figures are numbered in Arabic numerals consecutively according to their first reference in the text, even though they may be further discussed in a later section (APA 5.05, p. 127).

     d. See the APA manual for additional formatting instructions: table titles, headings, notes and canonical (standard) table forms; and figure types, standards, legends, and captions (APA 5.01-5.30, pp. 125-167).

Seriation (APA 3.04, pp. 63-65)

1. When a series occurs within a sentence or paragraph, set off series items with lower case letters in parenthesis: (a), (b), (c), etc.

     a. Separate items with a comma, unless there is already a comma within one of the items.

     b. If one of the items includes a comma, separate the elements with semicolons.

2. When items are set off as a formal series, introduce the series with a complete statement plus a colon.

   USE A COLON ONLY AFTER A COMPLETE STATEMENT.

     a. If ordinal position is important (e.g., sequence indicates importance or process), use Arabic numerals followed by a period. Do not use parenthesis with an indented series.

     b. If ordinal position is not important, use bullets.

     c. Use MS Word's automatic numbered (or bulleted) list format; set the number indent the same as for a paragraph (usually 0.5 in.); if sentences run over one line, they must be in hanging indent form.

     d. If series items are complete sentences, punctuate them as sentences: Begin each with a capital and end it with a period.

> Positive behavior support is evidence based:
> 　　1. Diagnostic data guide selection of intervention.
> 　　2. Data are collected to track student progress.
> 　　3. Changes and adaptations are made in accordance with data collected.

　　e. If series items are fragments, begin each with a capital but do not end with a period.

> Positive behavior support is based on three levels of intervention:
> 　　1. The universal level, which is considered to benefit all students
> 　　2. The more focused level, targeted for students who are at risk for emotional and behavioral disorders (EBD)
> 　　3. The intense level, designed for students who are currently displaying EBD

> Series is formally introduced with a complete statement and a colon.

> Series items are fragments; they all begin with a capital but do not end with a period.

3. A series of very short, simple, and closely related items can be set off with a sentence stem, which embeds them in a sentence structure.
   a. The stem is not a complete sentence, the items are considered as embEd.D.ed in the sentence, and NO COLON IS USED.
   b. Series items are not capitalized and are punctuated as if they were part of the sentence: Each ends with a comma (or semicolon if there are commas within the items), the second to last item is followed by *and* or *or*, and the last item is followed by a period.

> After appropriate screening, students were grouped as
> 　　1. not at risk for EBD,
> 　　2. at risk for EBD, or
> 　　3. currently showing symptoms of EBD.

> Series is set up with a sentence stem, so items are considered to be within the sentence. No colon is used.

> Series items are not capitalized and are punctuated as if they were part of the sentence.

Note that length, complexity and relationship of items determine which form of seriation is used. If material is complex or important, it needs a formal series introduced by a complete statement and a colon. If items in the series are short, direct, and very closely related, the structure with the sentence stem can be used.

References

Handling of references, including citations and reference lists, is among the most conspicuous aspects of APA format—for many students, the most frustrating. Two chapters of the manual are devoted primarily to these challenges. Keep the manual close by to help you with the nitty-gritty specifics.

Citations

1. When more than one source is given in the same parentheses, arrange them in the sequence they appear on the reference list: in alphabetical order by the first author's surname (APA 6.16, p. 177-178).
2. When a work being cited has two authors, give both names every time. In the text, use *and* between the names; in parenthesis (as on the reference list) use ampersand (&) (APA 6.16, p. 177-178).
3. When citing a work with between three and six authors, use all names on the first reference, then use the surname of the first author followed by et al. (two separate words, PERIOD ONLY AFTER AL.).
4. When citing a work that has six or more authors, use the surname of the first author and et al. and the year in the first citation as well subsequent citations. The year should always appear inside a parenthetical citation and the first time the author is cited outside the parenthetical in a given paragraph, even if it has already been mentioned inside parentheses. The year may be omitted when the author appears later in that paragraph only if the source can't be confused with another (APA 6.11-6.29, pp. 174-185).

Reference List (APA 6.01- A7.07, pp. 169-224)

1. References in the text must match references in the reference list (APA p. 174). Check this very carefully.
2. The reference list must be double-spaced with hanging indentation (approximately 5-7 spaces) (APA 2.11, p. 37).
3. Be sure that authors are listed correctly.
   a. Use the first and middle (if any) initials of all authors; do not write out the first name. There should be a space between the initials. Use the ampersand (&) rather than *and* between two authors or before the last author if there are more than two. Separate all authors with commas.
   b. All authors must be listed unless a work has eight or more; for works with eight or more, list the first seven, after the comma use ellipsis [. . .], then give the last author (APA 6.27, 7.01, pp. 198-199, example 2).
   c. When there is more than one work by the same author, the author's name must be written out for each listing, and the listings should appear in chronological order, earliest first (APA 6.25, p. 182).
4. Titles for books, journals, and journal articles are all handled differently.
   a. For book titles, use italics and capitalize only the first word of the title, any proper nouns, and the first word following a colon which indicates the subtitle (e.g., *Writing from A-to-Z: The easy-to-use handbook*).
   b. For the titles of journal articles, capitalize only the first word of the title, any proper nouns, and the first word following a colon (subtitle) (APA 7.01, p. 198, example 1). Italics, of course, are not used; neither are quotation marks.
   c. The titles of journals are italicized and capitalized using title case (APA 7.01, p. 198, example 1).
5. Formatting is strict and specific for publication information.
   a. The abbreviations *Vol.* and *No.* are not used in identifying journals. The volume number should be italicized, and the issue number (for a journal with continuous pagination)

should be in parentheses, followed by a comma and the page numbers. Include the issue number only if the journal is paginated separately by issue. (APA 6.30, p. 186).
   b. Page numbers of journal articles, WHICH MUST BE INCLUDED, should not be preceded by "p" or "pp" (APA 6.30, p. 186).
   c. Provide the city and state (or country) of publication followed by the publisher's name.
      ● The standard two-letter U.S. Postal Service abbreviation should be used for the state (APA 6.30, p. 187). States must now be given for all US cities.
      ● Two-letter postal abbreviations can be found online for other countries.
6. Retrieval date is no longer required on electronic sources unless the source is subject to frequent change.
   a. Do not use a period after the URL on the reference list. (It might be misinterpreted as part of the URL.)
   b. Remove all hyperlinks from citations.
7. Include the digital object identifier (DOI) for items that have this identification number, which will help readers find valuable materials online. The following example is quoted directly from the sixth edition of the APA manual (APA 7.01, p. 198).

> Herbst-Damm, K. L., & Kulik, J. A. (2005). Volunteer support, marital status, and the survival times of terminally ill patients. *Health Psychology*, *24*, 225-229. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.24.2.225

   a. Do not place a period after the DOI. As with the URL, readers might misinterpret the period as part of the DOI
   b. If an electronic source has a DOI, you need no further retrieval information.

Writing Style and Mechanics

APA does not treat a wide swatch of mechanics and style in depth and specificity, as does the 1026-page tiny-print *Chicago Manual of Style*. But the points that are treated by APA are points on which you need to be particularly careful. Although common problems with usage, grammar, punctuation, and basic accuracy are treated here, the manual should be consulted for ways in which these practices should be specifically applied.

General Items of Usage

1. Abbreviations
   a. Statistical abbreviations are usually italicized: *n, t, SD, p.* etc. Uppercase *N* is total sample; lowercase *n* is subsample. The correct form is *t* test—no hyphen, italicized *t*.
   b. Latin abbreviations such as "e.g.," "i.e.," and "cf." should be used only in parentheses and are always followed by a comma. Outside parentheses, the English equivalent should be used: (e.g., a Tier 2 intervention) = for example, a Tier 2 intervention (APA 4.26, p.108).
2. Acronyms (APA 4.02, p.88)
   a. When using the acronym for the first time, write the words out completely and follow this with the acronym in parentheses (APA 4.23, p. 107).
   b. Afterward, use the acronym alone (don't toggle back and forth).
3. Capitalization (APA 4.15-4.20, pp.101-104)
   a. Do not capitalize job titles unless they immediately precede a person's name (John Doe, a professor; Professor John Doe).

b. Do not capitalize the names of models, laws, hypotheses, theories, disorders, or diseases, but in most cases capitalize terms taken from a personal name (e.g., Down syndrome).
   c. If a complete statement (which could stand alone as a sentence) follows a colon, capitalize it (APA 4.14, p. 101).
4. Italics (APA 4.21, pp. 104-105)
   a. Italicize (not quote or bold) a key word or term introduced for the first time in the text.
   b. Italicize titles of long works (books, plays, journal titles (not article titles).
   c. Italicize words that anchor a scale [1 (*never*) to 5 (*almost always*)].
5. Numbers (APA 4.31-4.38, pp. 111-114)
   a. Write numbers below 10 as words. Write numbers 10 or above as numerals unless they begin a sentence (avoid this). Exceptions include a series including numbers both under and over 10 and numbers preceding elements of time or measurement (unless approximate). Other exceptions are found in (APA 4.31, 4.33-4.34, pp. 111-114).
   b. Use numerals in numbers like 6 million.
   c. Use a comma in numbers like 2,396.
   d. The percent symbol (%) is used only if it follows a numeral. If no number is involved, use the term *percentage* (APA 4.45, p. 118).

Writing Style (APA 3.05-3.23, pp. 65-86)

1. Use gender-neutral language (APA 3.12, pp. 73-74).
2. Be sure that verbs and pronouns agree with their subjects.
   a. Verbs must agree with their subjects (singular or plural). Data and media are plural nouns. (The data are. . .).
   b. Pronouns must agree in number and in gender with the nouns they replace (APA 3.19-3.20, pp. 78-79). Remember that the words *each* and *every* are singular; they can often be replaced with *all*, which is plural.
3. Report the literature in past tense, as in "Jacobsen (2003) argued," not "Jacobsen (2003) argues" (APA 3.18, p.78).

Punctuation (APA 4.01-4.11, pp. 87-96)

1. Placement and spacing of punctuation involve specific conventions.
   a. Commas must be used to separate items of a series consisting of three or more (including before *and* and *or* when they join series items) (APA 4.03, p. 88).
   b. Periods and commas go inside closing quotation marks (double or single); colons and semicolons go outside. Question marks and exclamation points go inside the quotation marks only when they refer directly to the quoted material. They go outside when the entire statement containing the quotation is a question or exclamation.
   c. Double space after periods ending sentences and after colons that are followed by a complete statement. Space once (a) after commas and semicolons, (b) after periods within a reference citation, (c) after the period before a page numbers (p. 21), and (d) after periods which follow the initials in personal names (e.g., J. F. Smith).
   d. Avoid common errors with apostrophes.
      ● Add an apostrophe + *s* to form a possessive of a singular noun (e.g., Jones's study, the child's desk).
      ● Add an apostrophe after the existing *s* to form possessives of plurals ending in s (e.g., the students' projects) (APA 4.12, p. 96).

- Do not use an apostrophe with plurals that are not possessive (not "assessments' were completed" or "teachers' were prepared").
- Do not use an apostrophe when forming the plural of a number (e.g., 1990s, 40s).

2. Distinguish between various formats for handling quotations (APA 6.01-6.05, pp. 170-172).

a. Use double quotation marks around words taken directly from other sources, and cite the page of the text from which they were taken (APA 4.08, p. 92). DO NOT TAKE EVEN TWO SIGNIFICANT WORDS IN SEQUENCE WITHOUT QUOTATION MARKS; this is plagiarism. Use citations to indicate authors of ideas that are not your own but are in your own words. Failing to credit the original author is also plagiarism (APA 6.01, p. 170 and APA 1.10, pp. 15-16). Plagiarism is a serious violation of scholarly and professional ethics. Careers have been ruined when plagiarism has been found.

b. Use *single* quotation marks for a quotation within a quotation that is in double quotation marks (the author you are quoting quotes someone else) (APA 4.08, p. 92).

c. Put quotations of 40 or more words in double-spaced block form, indenting the block the same width as a new paragraph (about .5 in.) (APA 6.03, p. 171).

d. Following a block quotation, place the citation after the closing period (APA 6.03, p.170).

e. To indicate you have omitted words in a quotation, use ellipsis (three spaced periods). If the omission occurs between two sentences, use four periods (the fourth representing the period that was omitted). Do not begin or end a quotation with ellipsis (APA 6.08, pp. 172-173).

3. Avoid common misuses of hyphens (APA, 4.13, p. 97).

a. A hyphen is used for a compound modifier that precedes a noun—**except when it includes an *ly* adverb or a comparison or superlative.** So *typically developing child* does not take a hyphen, but *ten-year-old child* does. An at-risk child includes a hyphen, but a child who is at risk does not, since the phrase does not precede a noun.

b. Some words, such as the *self-* words (self-concept, self-conscious, etc.), always use a hyphen no matter where they are or what they do (APA 4.13, pp. 97-100).

c. If a compound adjective cannot be misread or if its meaning is *established* (widely known), a hyphen is unnecessary (e.g., health care reform, grade point average) (APA 4.13, p.97).

d. Compound modifiers that share a base word can be placed in a series preceding the base word with the hyphens indicated (full- and part-time employees) (APA 4.13, p.97). e. Many prefixes do not require hyphens, including *anti*, *non*, *inter*, *intra*, *extra*, *semi*, *mini*, *pseudo*, and *under* (e.g., nondisabled, extracurricular, international, pretest, posttest (APA 4.1- 4.2, pp. 98-99).

e. Do not confuse hyphen, dash, em dash, en dash (APA 4.13, p. 97).
- Use a hyphen (shortest line) to divide a word, indicate a relationship between parts of a compound adjective preceding a noun (e.g., "an at-risk child"); do not space before or after a hyphen.
- Use an en dash (about the length of an *n*) between equivalent words constituting a compound adjective; it has no space before or after (e.g., "an APA–MLA format question").
- Use an em dash (about the length of an *m*) to set off an item for emphasis or to digress from the main clause; do not space before or after an em dash (e.g., "like this—or that").

Style Matters

1. Paragraphing (APA 3.05-3.11, pp. 65-70)
   a. Paragraphs should be longer than a single sentence and no longer than one page (APA 3.08, p.68).
   b. Paragraph length should vary.
2. Attend to standards and clarity with regard to statistical and mathematical materials (APA 4.41-4.49, pp.116-124).
3. Appendices should be designated alphabetically in the text in the same order they appear in the Appendices section. Appendix A should be mentioned first in your text, followed by Appendix B, Appendix C, and so forth.

Completion

After you have completed your thesis/dissertation and have it approved by your advisory committee, graduate coordinator, and dean, you will upload it to the Electronic Theses and Dissertations website. Support is available for you as you prepare your work for approval and dissemination.

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

All theses and dissertations must now be submitted as Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETD). See the BYU Graduate Studies Checklist for Preparing ETD (PDF) for Submission (ADV Form 11) for details.

Available Support

In addition to the sixth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, you can consult the following:

1. American Psychological Association style manual website for APA style products, free tutorials, and an online course.
2. Other universities' websites (e.g., excellent online writing labs at Purdue and Indiana University)
3. McKay School of Education's book *APA for Novices A Struggling Student's Guide to Theses, Dissertations, and Advanced Course Papers* written by Sharon Black, available at http://education.byu.edu/research/dissertation_aids.html
4. Citation Builders: EndNote, RefWorks, Son of Citation Machine
5. MSE departments' and programs' graduate handbooks and web pages
6. Harold B. Lee Library resources, including the Education librarian, Rachel Wadham.
7. External editors, who have volunteered themselves to be employed to edit theses and dissertations, posted on the McKay School Website.
   a. Not endorsed by the MSE, but listed for students' convenience
   b. Communicate thoroughness of edit desired

Appendix H: Summary of Dissertation Review & Approval Processes

EDLF Department Dissertation Review & Approval Processes

Dissertation Phases	
Development Phase	Students work with chair and major committee members to develop *full* dissertation. Students are highly encouraged to engage an editor in this phase (see MSE Dissertation Aids for list of MSE-approved editors).
Review Phases	**FULL DISSERTATION REVIEW**—FOR DEFENSE APPROVAL: Chair approves *full* dissertation (fully formatted) for defense; student sends it to major and then (after chair approval) to minor committee members for defense approval. All committee members have 10 working days for each review and may request to review it again.
	FINAL COMMITTEE DEFENSE REVIEW: Student sends defense version of *full* dissertation, accounting for all prior feedback to committee at least two weeks prior to defense.
	DEPARTMENT REVIEW (pre-defense) ● Purpose: Full dissertation receives a technical/format review prior to the defense preparatory for chair and department final approval and submission to the Dean's Office for review. ● Submission Deadline: Students submit their full dissertation to the Department Reviewer after committee defense approval (at least two weeks prior to the defense). ● Review Process: The Department Reviewer reviews dissertations in the order received within two weeks providing feedback using track changes and comments. If Department Reviewer has more than three dissertations under review, he/she will notify the student that the review may take longer, meaning feedback may come after the defense.
	FINAL DISSERTATION REVIEW (post-defense): ● Student works with chair to address feedback from defense and department review ● Chair reviews *final* dissertation for chair approval.
Specific Roles & Responsibilities	

Students	● Engages an MSE-approved editor to review dissertation for style, APA format and Dean's Checklist requirements before sending *full* dissertation to chair for defense approval.
	● Submits *full* dissertation and completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to chair.
	● After the chair's approval, submits *full* dissertation to major committee members for defense approval and addresses their feedback. After major committee member defense approval, sends revised *full* dissertation to minor committee members for defense approval and addresses their feedback.
	● After all committee members have approved *full* dissertation for defense:
	   ○ Sends revised defense-version of the *full* dissertation to committee members
	   ○ Sends revised defense-version of the *full* dissertation and the completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to department reviewer (at least 2 weeks prior to the defense).
	   ○ Sends completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) and dissertation title page to department secretary.
	● After passing the defense:
	   ○ Completes student section of ADV Form 8d, including all signatures (same day as the defense).
	   ○ Receives feedback from committee members and department reviewer. Works with chair to address feedback and receive chair's final approval for *final* dissertation.
	● Submits chair-approved *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to Graduate Coordinator for review & department approval.
	● Submits department-approved *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to Dean's Office for review. Makes required revisions.
	● Completes Survey of Earned Doctorates (see ADV Form 14).
	● Submits PDF of MSE-approved dissertation to ETD (see ADV Form 11). Makes required revisions.
	● Submits ETD-approved PDF of dissertation to ProQuest (see ADV Form 13).
	● Ensures that the ADV Form 8d is submitted to Grad Studies before the deadline.

Dissertation Chairs	- Works with student and major committee members to facilitate *full* dissertation. - Approves student to send *full* dissertation to major committee members for defense approval. After their approval, approves student to send *full* dissertation to minor members for defense approval. - After committee defense approval, initiates and completes DDSA to schedule defense date. Requests student to send defense version of *full* dissertation to committee members and department reviewer. - Brings DDSA and ADV Form 8d to the defense for committee signatures upon approval. - After defense, works with student to address feedback and facilitate *final* dissertation. - Signs DDSA indicating chair approval of the *final* dissertation. - Informs student to send *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Office Checklist to Graduate Coordinator for department approval. - Works with student as needed on committee, Graduate Coordinator, Dean's Office and ETD feedback.
Department Reviewer	- Receives *full* dissertation and Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) at least two weeks before defense. - Provides a technical review with a focus on meeting the specific requirements on the Dean's Office Checklist, including APA format and style/grammatical issues. This review does not focus on content (which has already been approved by the committee). - Returns entire dissertation document to the student, with feedback indicated in track changes and comments. Feedback may be provided section by section within the entire document (to preserve formatting), with the full review completed within the two-week review period (prior to defense). - Signs DDSA indicating that department review has been completed.
Department Chair	- Receives and signs the completed DDSA Form. - Receives and signs the completed ADV Form 8d.
Department Secretaries	- Track students' progress and updates Doctoral Student Tracking Sheet. - Facilitates chair requests for help with paperwork and signatures. - Walks ADV Form 8d and completed Dean's Office checklist to Dean's Office for dissertation review. - Communicates student progress to Graduate Coordinator during final dissertation approvals. - Walks ADV Form 8d to Graduate Studies, upon request from chair or student.
Dissertation Approvals	
Committee Approval	The committee provides their approval for the final dissertation after the defense by signing ADV Form 8d either at the defense or after reviewing any requested revisions.
Chair Approval	The chair provides approval for the *final* dissertation by signing both the DDSA and the ADV Form 8d. The chair is the last committee member to sign the ADV Form 8d. The chair gives both forms to the department secretary.
Department Approval	- The student submits the *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to the Graduate Coordinator who provides a final review, checks the DDSA and ADV Form 8d for completion and signs the DDSA—indicating dissertation is ready for Department Approval. - Department Chair receives and signs completed DDSA and the ADV Form 8d. - The Department Secretary takes the signed ADV Form 8D and completed Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) to for the Dean's Office review.
Dean's Office Approval	- The student submits the chair-approved dissertation and the completed Dean's Office checklist (pgs 1-2) to the Dean's Office for initial review by the Dean's Office reviewer. The student receives feedback from this initial review and works directly with the Dean's Office reviewer to make required revisions. - After the initial review, the Associate Dean reviews the dissertation and provides feedback to the student. The student works directly with Tina to address her feedback. - Upon the approval of the Associate Dean, the Dean's Office provides approval by signing ADV Form 8d.
ETD Approval	- After the Dean's Office approval, the student submits the final dissertation as a PDF online to ETD (http://etd.lib.byu.edu/). (See ADV Form 11.) - The Graduate Coordinator and Dean's Office review and approve the ETD. They provide any necessary revisions to the student who may need to repost the dissertation to ETD before final ETD approval.
Final Grad Studies Submission	After ETD approval, the student picks up the signed ADV Form 8d from the Dean's Office. The student checks off on ADV Form 8d to indicate completion of the Survey of Earned Doctorates and submission of the ETD-approved PDF of the dissertation to ProQuest. The student is then responsible to ensure that the ADV Form 8d, along with the certificate of survey completion, is taken to Graduate Studies.

Appendix I: Dissertation & Graduation Deadlines

DISSERTATION & GRADUATION DEADLINES (MSE & EDLF)

These dates assume no need for student revision of the dissertation along the way, which is virtually never the case.
It is wise to plan on this process taking longer that the "ideal scenario" presented below.

| BYU GRADUATION | | | | | | | | DEADLINE | DESCRIPTION | LINK & FORMS |
| Jun 2016 | | Aug 2016 | | Dec 2016 | | Apr 2017 (estimated) | | | | LINK: Grad Studies ADV Forms |
EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies			
11-Mar		1-Apr		2-Sep				**CHAIR FINAL REVIEW**	Last day student may submit full dissertation to chair. The chair has 2 weeks (10 working days) for review. However, if the chair has compelling personal, familial, or professional reasons, the amount of needed time for review may be extended.	
25-Mar		15-Apr		16-Sep				**MAJOR MEMBER REVIEW**	Last day student may submit full dissertation to major committee members who have 2 weeks (10 working days) for review.	
8-Apr		29-Apr		30-Sep				**MINOR MEMBER REVIEW**	Last day student may submit full dissertation to minor committee members who have 2 weeks (10 working days) for review.	
	29-Apr		20-May		21-Oct			**GRADUATION APPLICATION**	Last day student may apply for graduation online in AIM.	LINK: Application for Graduation
	13-May		10-Jun		18-Nov			**SCHEDULING OF DEFENSE**	Last day chair may submit EDLF Dissertation Defense & Approval Form (DDSA) to department secretary who schedules the defense date. University policy requires defense date be scheduled (put on the calendar) 2 weeks prior to defense of dissertation or thesis.	LINK: EDLF DDSA Form (instead of ADV Form 8c)
								COMMITTEE DEFENSE REVIEW	Last day for student to send digital "final defense version" of the full dissertation to all committee members.	
								DEPARTMENT REVIEW	Last day student may submit final dissertation to Department Reviewer for review. Student must also send completed copies of: 1. "Checklist for Preparing ETD (PDF) for Submission" (ADV Form 11, pgs 1-2 (Section A up through Other #1); 2. The MSE Dean's Checklist (pgs 1-2) Check off all boxes on both forms as you ensure that you are in compliance with these format criteria. The department review helps ensure the dissertation follows MSE & ETD guidelines and the article follows the target journals' format. This review also provides feedback on grammar and written style (but not content). As such, this departmental review is a strictly technical review. Feedback will be provided to the student within two weeks (prior to the defense).	LINK: ADV Form 11 LINK: MSE Dean's Dissertation Checklist

| BYU GRADUATION | | | | | | | | DEADLINE | DESCRIPTION | LINK & FORMS |
| Jun 2016 | | Aug 2016 | | Dec 2016 | | Apr 2017 (estimated) | | | | LINK: Grad Studies ADV Forms |
EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies	EDLF	Grad Studies			
	27-May		24-Jun		2-Dec			**FINAL DEFENSE**	Last day student may hold the final oral examination (defense) (at least 1 week before Department Review deadline). Ample time should be allowed after defense to make revisions to dissertation before the deadline for submitting for chair approval. Students should complete and sign ADV Form 8d after passing the defense.	LINK: ADV Form 8d - Approval for Final Dissertation or Thesis
8 Jun		29 Jun		7 Dec				**CHAIR APPROVAL**	Last day student may submit *final* dissertation to chair for approval. Chair signs DDSA upon approval.	
9 Jun		30 Jun		8 Dec				**DEPARTMENT APPROVAL**	Last day student may submit *final* dissertation and completed Dean's Office Checklist to Grad. Coordinator. Graduate Coordinator and Chair sign DDSA upon approval.	
	10-Jun		1-Jul		9-Dec			**DEAN'S OFFICE REVIEW**	Last day student may submit (email) digital dissertation or thesis with the Approval for Submission of Dissertation or Thesis form (ADV Form 8d) to the MSE Dean for signature.	LINK: ADV Form 8d
13-Jun		5-Jul		13-Dec				**ETD REVIEW**	Last day student may submit PDF of dissertation for ETD Review (see ADV Form 11). Graduate Coordinator and Dean's Office review ETD. Students must make any required revisions and resubmit the PDF to ETD for approval.	LINK: ADV Form 11 / LINK: BY (U ETD Submission
	16-Jun		8-Jul		16-Dec			**SURVEY OF EARNED DOCTORATES**	Last day student may complete the required "Survey of Earn Doctorates" (SED) (ADV Form 14). Students will request a confirmation email and print the certificate of completion. The certificate needs to be attached to ADV Form 8d for Graduate Studies. (Check box on ADV Form 8d.)	LINK: ADV Form 14
	16-Jun		8-Jul		16-Dec			**PROQUEST SUBMISSION**	Last day student may submit ETD-approved PDF to ProQuest (ADV Form 13). (Check box on ADV Form 8d.)	LINK: ADV Form 13
	16-Jun		8-Jul		16-Dec			**GRAD STUDIES**	Last day student may complete all degree requirements including payment of fees, submitting grade changes (for T's), and for departments to enter exam results (oral or written) in AIM. / Last day student may take the ADV Form 8d to Graduate Studies (105 FPH) -- after the ETD status shows "Grad Office Review" and survey and ProQuest submission are completed.	
	28-Jul							**PETITION TO WALK**	Last day student may submit "Petition to Walk" to department.	LINK: Petition to Walk Form
	4-Aug							**APPROVAL FOR PETITION TO WALK**	Last day student may receive MSE-approval for the "Petition to Walk" at graduation. Students can walk in April or August graduation, even if they haven't met all the deadlines, as long as: (a) dissertation has been successfully defended and requires only "minor revisions" and (b) "Petition to Walk" has been approved	
	None		11-Aug		None				Graduation—University Commencement	
	None		12-Aug		None				Graduation—College Convocations	