

**PhD in Education (EDUC) Program**  
Updated Sept 26, 2019

**Context/Introduction**

COE doctoral programs prepare students to become researchers, scholars, and leaders in various disciplines related to education. The college-wide PhD in Education program includes seven tracks: Curriculum & Instruction, Educational Administration, Educational Foundations, Educational Policy, Exceptionalities, Global and International Education, and Kinesiology. With guidance and mentorship from faculty, students are trained to be scholars and researchers in their specific areas of focus.

The PhD in Education program includes three core research courses that all students enroll in. The remaining courses that students take are tailored to their specific topical areas and interests and based on their background and needs. During the program, students complete coursework, take examinations, and have field-based research experiences. Through these experiences, students gain an understanding of the foundations of their field and become experts in their specific areas of focus.

With guidance from faculty mentors, doctoral students complete an independent dissertation project that contributes to the scholarly literature in their field. Graduates of the program are prepared to address local, regional, national, and international issues in their respective fields. COE doctoral program graduates typically pursue careers as:

- Higher education faculty and researchers in education and related fields
- Educational administrators at national, state, district, and school levels
- Leaders in non-profit, for-profit and non-governmental agencies
- Program developers and evaluators

***In light of the context of the advanced programs described above, the UHM COE found it necessary to provide an advanced program perspective/reinterpretation of some of the AAQEP aspects in order for them to apply to the Doctor of Philosophy in Education, and the Masters and Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology. The original AAQEP aspects along with the advanced program perspective are included in the standard 1 and standard 2 tables below.***

***DIRECTIONS: All six aspects of the standard must be addressed, and the evidence set for the standard (not necessarily for each aspect) must include multiple measures, multiple perspectives (including those of program faculty, P-12 partners, program completers, and graduates' employers), and direct measures and evidence of performance in a field/clinical setting appropriate to the program.***

**STANDARD I: Completers perform as professional educators with the capacity to support success for all learners.**

Aspect	Aspect-Advanced Program perspective	Admission	Program	Exams, Research & Scholarly Experiences	At Time of Completion	Post-Completion
Content, pedagogical, and/or professional knowledge relevant to the credential or degree sought	Same as original	Sample of Scholarly Writing		Comprehensive Exams		Program Completer Survey
Learners, learning theory including social, emotional, and academic dimensions, and application of learning theory	Same as original		<i>Core coursework</i> Multiple Research		Dissertation (Introduction and Literature Review)	
Culturally responsive practice, including intersectionality of race, ethnicity, class, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, and the impact of language acquisition and literacy development on learning	Implications of culturally responsive practice in the conduct of research and dissemination of scholarly work			Proposal Assessment (Methods/Participants )		
Assessment of and for student learning, assessment and data literacy, and use of data to inform practice	Same as original		<i>Core Coursework</i> Quan Research Qual Research		Dissertation (Analysis)	
Creation and development of positive learning and work environments	Same as original			Individualized Development Plans (IDPs)		Employer focus group
Dispositions and behaviors required for successful professional practice	Same as original	3 Letters of Reference			Dissertation (Oral Defense)	

**Standard 2: Program completers adapt to working in a variety of contexts and grow as professionals.**

Aspect	Aspect-Advanced Program perspective	Admission	Program	Exams, Research & Scholarly Experiences	At Time of Completion	Post-Completion
Understand and engage local school and cultural communities, and communicate and foster relationships with families/guardians/caregivers in a variety of communities	Understand varied contexts of stakeholders (e.g., schools, students, families) involved in educational research; communicate research procedures and findings in appropriate ways and foster relationships with stakeholders		<i>Core Coursework</i> Qual Research	CITI Modules/IRB Application		
Engage in culturally responsive educational practices with diverse learners and do so in diverse cultural and socioeconomic community contexts	Apply a critical understanding of the role of culture and diversity in educational contexts and in relation to the stakeholders of their research and scholarship		<i>Core Coursework</i> Qual Research	CITI Modules/IRB Application		
Create productive learning environments, and use strategies to develop productive learning environments in a variety of school contexts	Conduct research and develop scholarly ideas on productive learning environments in a variety of educational contexts.			Comprehensive Exams		Program Completer Survey
Support students' growth in international and global perspectives	Contextualize their research and scholarship within an international and global perspective; Disseminate their research and scholarly work in the international and global realm			Proposal (Literature review)	Dissertation (Discussion)	
Establish goals for their own professional growth and engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection	Same as original		Individualized Development Plans (IDPs)			Program Completer Survey
Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning	Collaborate with colleagues to support professional learning and conduct/disseminate research		Individualized Development Plans (IDPs)			Employer Survey

Reliability and Validity of Assessments

Measure	Validity	Reliability	Reduction of Bias
Sample of Scholarly Writing (Admission)	The criteria faculty use to judge scholarly papers of master's level papers (a Master's degree is a pre-req for doctoral program admission).	All faculty individually judge candidates' application and then meet to discuss discrepancies	The faculty meet to discuss discrepancies regarding individual judgments and come to a unanimous decision regarding whether they are acceptable.
Letters of Reference (Admission)	The criteria faculty use to judge acceptability are similar to those of other programs.	All faculty individually judge candidates' recommendation forms and then meet to discuss discrepancies	The faculty meet to discuss discrepancies regarding individual judgments and come to a unanimous decision regarding whether they are acceptable.
Core coursework grades	Grades are based on the course objectives. The course is based on other graduate introductory statistics courses taught by others at our University and at the University of Maryland.	Criteria for grade determination are consistent with that of instructors of similar courses at UHM and other universities	Course grades are based on criteria stated on the syllabus. Any exceptions that differ from the course syllabus are offered to all students. Students are able to calculate their grades, as the course unfolds over the semester. Students evaluate the course instructor for fairness and bias, so the faculty has feedback on these aspects of the course.
Comprehensive Exams	Rating criteria developed by a panel of faculty.	Multiple faculty rate students on criteria independently. The final scores are calculated as the mean of individual ratings.	The faculty meet to discuss discrepancies regarding individual judgments and come to a unanimous decision regarding whether they are acceptable.
CITI Modules/IRB application	The CITI online modules are based on well-accepted criteria regarding research on humans.	The CITI online quizzes have been piloted and are used in many institutions.	Scoring is automated. If students do not achieve the needed score on a quiz, they may review the material and take the quiz again until they receive a passing grade.
Individualized Development Plans	Based on format used by NIH for graduate students and postdocs.	This assessment is a progress monitoring and self-reflection tool; it is not rated however students are required to complete it annually.	A faculty committee will review IDPs annually and discuss how the tool can be improved to meet objectives (self-assessment and self-reflection in regard to scholarly development)
Proposal Assessments (Methods)	Criteria were based on APA and AERA standards.	Multiple faculty rate students on criteria independently. The final scores are	Students receive feedback on drafts before assessment. The criteria were reviewed for

		calculated as the mean of individual ratings.	language and bias.
Dissertation Assessments (Introduction, Literature Review, Data Analysis, Discussion Oral Defense)	Criteria were based on APA and AERA standards.	Multiple faculty rate students on criteria independently. The final scores are calculated as the mean of individual ratings.	Students receive feedback on drafts before assessment. The criteria were reviewed for language and bias.
Alumni Survey (Post Completion)	Criteria will be based on program objectives and goals.	We will review patterns of results	Feedback solicited from participants to inform future surveys
Employer Focus Group (Post Completion)	Criteria will be based on program objectives and goals.	Coding of comments by two raters	Feedback solicited from participants to inform future focus group discussions

### Information for Measures

#### 1. Letters of reference (in use)

When students apply for admission, they submit three letters of reference from professors and other professional references. Three (3) Letters of Recommendation may be from professors, immediate supervisors in employment, and/or close associates attesting to the applicant's capacity for leadership and scholarship in the field of education.

#### 2. Sample of Scholarly Writing (in use):

Applicants include a sample of scholarly writing, for example, an excerpt of their Master's thesis or other professional/scholarly work.

#### 3. CITI Modules (in use)

The Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI Program) provides high quality, peer-reviewed, web-based educational modules on responsible conduct of research with human participants.

These materials are designed and regularly updated to:

- Enhance the knowledge and professionalism of investigators, staff, and students conducting research in the United States and internationally
- Educate members, administrators, and leadership of ethics committees that review and oversee research
- Promote ethical research at organizations through the education of research administrators and organizational leadership

In order receive CITI certification, students must pass quizzes embedded in the online instruction. The CITI modules are an accepted standard for research on human subjects and are used at most U.S. research universities.

#### **4. Individualized Development Plans (IDPs) (planned)**

We plan to develop and pilot the use of IDPs for doctoral students in the PhD in Education program. After conducting a small-scale pilot, we will extend the use of IDPs for all students. IDPs will serve as a way for advisors and mentors to have structured conversations with doctoral students, addressing areas of scholarly and professional growth beyond the core doctoral requirements. IDPs provide the opportunity for students to establish goals for their own professional growth, engage in self-assessment, goal setting, and reflection. IDPs can also serve as an annual progress monitoring measure and serve as a way for students and advisors to connect on a regular basis in the latter stages of the doctoral program, when students have completed coursework and are required to do a lot of work independently on their own dissertation work

#### **5. Proposal Rating Form (in use)**

The Form IIa: Proposal Rating Form was designed as a PhD Program Evaluation tool. Use this form to assess the student's written proposal and oral defense of the proposal. This rating form was developed to contribute to the Manoa Assessment process and focuses on the effectiveness of the PhD Program in developing educational research competencies. Each item aligns to UH Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) and program Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). As a program evaluation tool, the completed form need not be shared with the student (although the committee may do so if they believe the comments on the form would be useful to the student). If a student has more than one proposal defense, this form should be completed for each defense.

Please see rating directions and criteria here: [https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSf86kNgsRj3x3f\\_0rVoKsxA5-q0k-cPBTe4xUkMujGA-msuw/viewform?usp=sf\\_link](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSf86kNgsRj3x3f_0rVoKsxA5-q0k-cPBTe4xUkMujGA-msuw/viewform?usp=sf_link)

#### **6. Dissertation Rating Form (in use)**

The Form IIIa: Dissertation Rating Form was designed as a PhD Program Evaluation tool. Use this form to assess the student's written dissertation and oral defense of the dissertation. This rating form was developed to contribute to the Manoa Assessment process and focuses on the effectiveness of the PhD Program in developing educational research competencies. Each item aligns to UH Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs) and program Student Learning Objectives (SLOs). As a program evaluation tool, the completed form need not be shared with the student (although the committee may do so if they believe the comments on the form would be useful to the student). If a student has more than one proposal defense, this form should be completed for each defense.

#### **7. Employer Focus Group (planned)**

We plan to work with the Dean's office to hold a focus group of a sample of our employers to find out what they think about how our program prepares graduates to be successful in their organizations.

### **Innovations**

The National Institutes for Health (NIH) training program describes the effectiveness of IDPs as such: "At its best, research training is an intentional and purposeful activity that is the product of a thoughtful analysis of the background, interests and needs of each student and postdoctoral trainee. This includes developing a mentoring plan that assesses the needs and goals of each student and postdoc, describes short- and long-term career objectives, and identifies professional development activities needed to reach them. The individual development plan (IDP) is a tool to help in this planning process and also to facilitate communication between mentees and mentors. An IDP should be viewed as a dynamic document that is periodically reviewed and updated throughout an individual's training. IDPs are of proven value at any stage, from the undergraduate to the postdoctoral level." (from <https://www.nigms.nih.gov/training/strategicplanimplementationblueprint/pages/individualdevelopmentplans.aspx>)

]The Phd in Education program is planning to develop a system for using Individualized Development Plans (IDPs) within the program. We plan to do the following over a two-year period:

- Convene a committee to develop IDPs for the program; committee will work on an IDP template that is relevant for our program and for scholars in Education
- Conduct a small-scale pilot with a group of advisors/students
- Based on results of pilot, revise the IDP process
- Roll out IDPs at a larger-scale (program wide)
- Continue to seek feedback on implementation and effectiveness of IDPs and make iterative changes if needed