MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

DOCTORAL PROGRAM

2025 - 2026

Department of Educational Policy and Leadership

Updated August 20, 2025

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

Dear EDPL Doctoral Student:

Congratulations on your admission to the doctoral degree program in Educational Policy and Leadership (EDPL) Studies at Marquette University. As a new doctoral student, you represent a very important member of the College of Education learning community. At the outset, you should know that our community deeply values academic rigor, the pursuit of scholarly excellence, and a life of caring for others. We subscribe to the tenet that our professional and personal lives should be centered in social justice and commitment to community.

The doctoral program in EDPL is intended to be challenging, stimulating, and personally relevant. Your work will occur in a context that balances theory, research, and practice in ways that will inspire you to value the respective contributions of each. You will have the opportunity to tailor your studies to fit a wide range of career paths in education. Regardless of your goals, you will be held to a high standard. You will be expected to expand, intensify, and sharpen your thinking and to experience the world in ever more considerate, profound, and socially conscientious ways – and to apply all of this to your academic pursuits. Marquette values scholarly distinction is the norm, and doctoral students in the College of Education aspire to leadership that betters the human condition. If these goals genuinely resonate with you, then your choice to study here was an astute one.

If you approach your doctoral studies with passion and conviction, you will experience unprecedented professional and personal growth. In fact, the opportunity afforded by graduate school to immerse oneself in the 'life of the mind' represents a great privilege and honor. It is a time when your knowledge will expand enormously and your reasoning will become keenly analytical and uncommonly broad, yet intricately unified. Under the guidance of EDPL faculty who are educators and mentors, prominent scholars, and exemplary models of service, you can be transformed: intellectually, affectively, and communally. Seize the moment and savor the experience.

Your educational experience at Marquette can be further enriched through participation in the many intellectual and cultural events that occur at the University. Go beyond your discipline. Seek the perspectives of those who are different from you. Cross borders. By engaging in these special learning opportunities, you will expand your horizons in ways that will ultimately benefit those you serve.

In sum, a Marquette doctorate in Education Policy and Leadership will set you apart. If we've done our work properly, you will leave here as a sharpened professional, an intellectually curious and demanding consumer of research, a creator of vital new knowledge, and a steadfast advocate for justice. In the Marquette tradition, you will become "the Difference" and, in so doing, join the ranks of our most distinguished alumni.

CONTENTS

* NOTE: This Doctoral Handbook serves as a contract for incoming students. Unless indicated otherwise, **all** students are expected to follow the guidelines and policies as outlined in the current handbook. Major revisions that affect students' programs will be communicated directly. As applicable, continuing students will be allowed to choose between following the original handbook or adopting changes. This option will not be available for all program changes.

EDPL DOCTORAL PROGRAM MISSION STATEMENT

The doctoral program in Educational Policy and Leadership is designed to foster the development of scholar-practitioners. It asks students not only to inquire deeply into the process of teaching and learning, but also to examine how the organization of schools and other educational spaces shapes that process. In addition, the program asks students to acquire adjacent disciplinary strengths that provide contexts for considering what knowledge is of most worth, how forms of knowledge are socially distributed, and what educational measures might help bring about a more just society. Students are expected to gain expertise in research that will enable them to contribute to the ways we think about education and to develop technological and other practical skills that will enable them to implement strategies for change.

PROGRAM GOALS

- Develop habits of scholarly inquiry grounded in knowledge of history, sociology, politics, and culture
- Extend understanding of a discipline to inform educational research
- Conduct research that contributes to a more just society
- Refine theory-driven, evidence-rich persuasive skills

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Evaluate scholarship in relevant field(s) of education (assessed in DQE 1: Critical Literature Analysis)
- Construct focused, logically coherent proposal for an early research project that is theoretically-grounded, derived from salient literature, and methodologically sound (assessed in DQE 2: Foundations of Research)
- Construct and orally defend focused, logically coherent proposal for a dissertation research project that is theoretically-grounded, derived from salient literature, and methodologically sound (assessed in DQE 3: Dissertation Proposal and Defense)
- Make an original contribution to research in education (assessed in Dissertation)

EDPL DOCTORAL PROGRAM POLICIES

To fulfill doctoral program requirements, a minimum of 30 credits of coursework in the College of Education (COED) must be completed after acceptance into the doctoral program. Determinations about course credit transfers happen in consultation among student, advisor, and DGS **in alignment with doctoral program needs**. Generally, these determinations take place in or after a student's second year in the program when research interests, plans, and needs become clearer.

TRANSFERRING CREDITS FROM OTHER INSTITUTIONS

MASTER'S LEVEL CREDITS

Up to fifteen (15) credits of master's-level work from Marquette or another accredited program in a field directly related to the current doctoral program may be accepted. Credits will be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on their relevance, rigor, and support of the student's program. Additional transfer credits from closely related Marquette master's programs may be considered. These credits must be specified on the **EDPL PHD Planning Form** (see Appendix) and approved.

DOCTORAL LEVEL CREDITS

Doctoral credits taken at another institution are considered on an individual basis, in consultation with the students' advisor and the doctoral committee, for potential acceptance into a Marquette program.

Graduate credits both from other institutions and from Marquette are accepted for a doctoral program when a **EDPL PHD Planning Form** is approved. Any graduate student seeking use of prior coursework from another institution in the EDPL doctoral program must gain prior approval from the advisor and the Chair of the Doctoral Committee before including the courses in the **EDPL PHD Planning Form**. Final approval comes from the Marquette Graduate School. Credits from another institution accepted into a Marquette doctoral program on the **EDPL PHD Planning Form** typically will not appear on the student's official Marquette transcript.

ELECTIVES RECIPROCITY

Ph.D. students may choose electives from other departments/colleges at Marquette or at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) through the Inter-University Exchange Program https://www.marquette.edu/grad/inter-exchange.php. Marquette has a reciprocity agreement with UWM that allows students to take 2-3 specialized graduate courses (Masters or PhD level) from UWM under a Marquette course number, GRAD 6933. All financial aid from Marquette is applied to UWM courses taken through the exchange program. Advisors must approve elective options to be sure the program of study adheres to regulations related to how many 6000-level courses are allowed and how many COED courses are required after beginning doctoral program.

Courses of interest, in addition to EDPL, are frequently found in the following departments:

Marquette University	**UWM**

Counseling Education and Counseling Psychology	Administrative Leadership
History	Anthropology
Philosophy	Curriculum and Instruction
Political Science	Educational Psychology
Social and Cultural Sciences	Sociology
	Urban Studies

TIME LIMITATIONS

Students must complete all requirements for the doctoral degree within eight **(8)** years of their first semester of registration in the program. Extensions of time will be granted **only** for students who are making "sufficient progress" toward their degree but who have extenuating circumstances preventing completion in eight **(8)** years. "Sufficient progress" is defined by these criteria:

1. By the end of five years, the student has completed coursework and advanced to candidacy (passed all DQE requirements).
2. By the end of six years, the student has an approved dissertation proposal and a reasonable timeline for completion.
3. Beyond seven years, the student is making progress on the dissertation, and the advisor and student have agreed upon a reasonable timeline for dissertation completion.

Students who need an extension of time for degree completion **must discuss this with their advisor**, submit appropriate document (i.e., "Request for Extension of Time"), and work with EDPL Student Service coordinator to submit extension and have it approved by the Graduate School. The student is responsible for filing the completed and signed "extension of time" form with the graduate school before the end of their eighth year of enrollment.

RESIDENCY

The residency requirement for EDPL doctoral students will be met when the student has completed three consecutive semesters with a minimum of three credits each semester. Summer can be, but is not required to be, used to meet the residency requirement.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF PROGRESS

Doctoral students are reviewed annually by the advisor, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the Doctoral Program Committee to evaluate their progress in the program.

A student is making satisfactory progress if the following benchmarks are met:

1. At least six hours of coursework have been completed and a 3.0 GPA has been maintained.
2. There are no grades below a B (i.e., B-, C, F, NS, or I).
3. DQE1 (Literature) and DQE2 (Research) are completed and passed within a year of relevant course completion—EDPL 8956 and EDPL 8715, respectively.

Commented [BD1]: confirm with Grad Skl, including reference to appeal in second section

Commented [BD2R1]: RWAR requirements
cumulative GPA below 3.0 automatically dismissed from university
can appeal
noted in graduate bulletin
subject to academic censure per Grad School policy

Commented [BD3R1]: REVISED
Doctoral students are reviewed annually to evaluate their progress in the program. This is done qualitatively within the department with conversations between advisors and DGS. More formally, the Graduate School conducts annual reviews based on coursework. Students who fall below the minimum 3.0 GPA are subject to academic censure by the Graduate School.
https://bulletin.marquette.edu/policies/academic-censure/graduate/

4. All written and oral requirements for DQE3 (dissertation proposal) have been completed within one year of coursework completion.
5. If not enrolled for credits during any given semester, the Continuous Enrollment (CE) requirement has been met (see description of CE requirement in EDPL Graduate Student Handbook.)

In addition, the Graduate School conducts annual reviews based on coursework completion. Students who fall below the minimum 3.0 GPA are subject to academic censure. More information is available on the Graduate School's website [https://bulletin.marquette.edu/policies/academic-censure/graduate/]

EDPL DOCTORAL PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Summary

Program Element		Credits
• Doctoral Skills Foundations Unit (6 credits) • Content Foundations Unit (6 credits) • Research Foundations Unit (9 credits) • Elective(s) (6 credits)		Coursework = 27 credits
• Dissertation Electives (follow research / dissertation needs)		18
• Dissertation Credits		12
	Total Credits	**57**

Course Completion

Doctoral Skills Foundations (6 credits)	Term	Qualifying Exam
• EDPL 8955 Seminar Social Contexts and Educational Policy I	Fall	
• EDPL 8956 Seminar Social Contexts and Educational Policy II	Spring	DQE1
Content Foundations * (6 credits)		
• EDPL 8730 History of Education in the U.S.	Fall	
• EDPL 8330 Sociological Foundations of Education	Spring	
Research Foundations (9 credits)		
• EDPL 8710 Multiple Paradigms	Fall	
• EDPL 8715 Interpretive & Critical Research in Education I	Fall	DQE2
• EDPL 8050 Quantitative Literacy and Research	Spring	
Research Electives (6 credits)		
• EDPL 8720 Interpretive & Critical Research in Education II	Fall	
• Intermediate/Advanced Statistics^	TBD	
• EDPL 8040 Advanced Program Design	Summer	

Dissertation Electives (18 credits)

- **Six (6)** approved courses in an area of concentration with coherent conceptual focus that can support dissertation research. *Students may take some of these electives at other institutions or in other departments at Marquette. Advanced doctoral students may arrange for a directed reading course (independent study) as part of the elective sequence with advisor's approval.*

Dissertation Proposal DQE3

Dissertation Credits (12 credits)

- EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation

* Courses offered in 16-week format. All other EDPL courses, unless otherwise indicated, offered in 8-week course modules.

^ Course selection must be approved by advisor and DGS **prior to enrollment.**

SUMMARY OF MILESTONES

ITEM	DEADLINES	STUDENT (w/ Advisor/Dissertation Chair consultation)	ADVISOR/DISSERTATION CHAIR
Application	January 15 of each year	Complete file turned into Graduate School	None
Initial Meeting with Advisor	Upon notification of admission	Make appointment with assigned advisor	Orient student to program; start planning individual program
EDPL Doctoral Program Orientation	Fall of each year	Attend orientation in year one.	Attend orientation
Coursework	Register for courses	Meet with Advisor each semester to discuss upcoming coursework	Meet with student each semester to discuss upcoming coursework & general progress
EDPL PHD Planning Form (draft)	After two semesters or 12 hours of coursework (whichever comes first)	Complete form with advisor; file with EDPL Office	Review with student and sign
EDPL PHD Planning Form (revised)	After six semesters or 18 hours of coursework (whichever comes first).	Complete form with advisor; file with DGS (submit updates as changes occur.)	Review with student and sign. Updated version(s) must be filed with DGS
Annual Review of Progress	May of each year	Complete at least 6 credits; maintain 3.0 GPA	Review progress & report to Doctoral Committee. Submit information (courses/DQE/etc.) to EDPL office
Residency	Three consecutive semesters, minimum three credits each. Summer can be included but not required.	Discuss requirements with advisor.	Make sure evidence of residency is documented, as required
Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 1: Critical Literature Analysis	Fall deadline as set by the department, usually mid-September, following completing of EDPL 8956	Submit paper from the products for EDPL 8955 or EDPL 8956	Work with Doctoral Program Coordinator for evaluation (on rubrics) from readers. Guide any required remediation. See DQE1 section below
Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 2: Foundations of Research	Fall deadline as set by the department, usually mid-September, following completing of EDPL 8715	Submit required portion of research report completed in EDPL 8715	Work with Doctoral Program Coordinator for evaluation (on rubrics) from readers. Guide any required remediation. See DQE2 section below
Selection of Dissertation Chair and Assembly of Dissertation Committee (minimum: 3 members)	Before completing DQE Component 3: Proposal	Choose dissertation chair. Select Dissertation committee, 3 members including chair. At least 2 must be from EDPL. The 3rd can be from other MU units or external to the university.	Discuss chair selection. Consult with and advise student on composition of committee. Submit names of chair and committee to EDPL Office. Send CV of any external member to Graduate School.
Doctoral Qualifying Exam (DQE) Component 3: Dissertation Proposal (Written Evaluation & Oral Defense)	After completion of coursework, before beginning dissertation research (can be done while enrolled in dissertation credits)	Register DQE Continuous Enrollment. Write proposal. Schedule oral defense; submit proposal to committee, 2 weeks prior. Defend proposal	Support proposal writing; submit to committee with evaluation rubrics. Schedule and oversee oral defense. Report evaluations from rubrics.
Doctoral Candidacy Forms (immediately after proposal defense)	Within first semester that dissertation credits are taken; after completion of Proposal defense	Submit Advancement to Candidacy and Outline/Proposal for Dissertation forms (and external committee member Graduate School approval and CV, as necessary).	Review, approve, and Advancement to Candidacy and Outline/Proposal for Dissertation forms.

ITEM	DEADLINES	STUDENT (w/ Advisor/Dissertation Chair consultation)	ADVISOR/DISSERTATION CHAIR
Institutional Review Board Proposal (IRB)	Before beginning any research that involves human subjects and after completing Human Subjects Tutorial	Submit approval forms to Office of Research Compliance & Graduate School; Copy of approval to EDPL Office	Complete Human Subjects Tutorial. Advise student on IRB procedures and proposal
Dissertation Credits	Complete minimum 12 credits while working on dissertation proposal, research and writing. If dissertation work continues beyond 12 credits, sign up for Continuous Enrollment	Enroll for dissertation credits	Advise student regarding dissertation credits; notify EDPL Office so that student can register for credits
Dissertation Completion	Within 8 years of first semester of registration in Ph.D program. Extensions possible on individual basis.	Conduct research and complete dissertation according to procedures in Dissertation Directives, Graduate School website. Schedule dissertation oral defense; submit copies to committee 3-4 weeks in advance of defense	Advise student throughout dissertation process; approve final version of dissertation.
Announcement for Public Defense	Four weeks before the public defense	Prepare Dissertation Defense Program and Announcement for Public Defense Forms; get necessary signatures and submit to Graduate School (emailed signatures sent to Graduate School allowed for faculty not on campus.)	Sign forms
Public Defense	Before specified deadline each semester (if graduation is desired same semester)	Defend dissertation before committee. When approved, format according to Graduate School guidelines and submit to Graduate School	Consult with student on defense procedures; schedule and chair public defense, providing rubrics. Fill out and file appropriate forms with Graduate School. Report evaluation from rubrics.
Application for Graduation	See current academic calendar - Sept. (for Dec), Feb. (for May), June (for August)	Submit application to Graduate School – paper or online	Notify EDPL Director of Graduate Studies; review graduation audit sheet
Graduation	May, August or December	Celebrate!	Celebrate!

DOCTORAL QUALIFYING EXAM (DQE)

Overview of Research Development Process
Dissertations are opportunities for students to make unique arguments and contributions to relevant field(s) of scholarship; however, this contribution must fundamentally **emerge from and contribute to existing scholarship**. Doctoral Qualifying Exams, as part of a student's research development journey, are designed to, collectively, document a student's ability to identify, review, analyze, and build upon existing scholarship in service of their own knowledge production. Upon satisfactory completion of Critical Literature Analysis (DQE1), Foundations of Research (DQE2), and Dissertation Proposal (DQE3), the student moves to candidacy and may proceed to dissertation research. While sample rubrics are included below, **DQEs will be assessed according to the rubric being used at the time of a student's submission**.

DQE 1: Critical Literature Analysis

Description: A preliminary literature review that builds on academic work in paper produced in EDPL 8955/8956: Social Contexts and Educational Policy (i.e., Doctoral Seminar I or II) and reflects the skills "to read and write with and against text." DQE1 should demonstrate 1) engagement with and comprehension of relevant bodies of scholarship, 2) critical analysis of literature, 3) sound, consistent argumentation skills based on close, critical reading of scholarship, and 4) writing proficiency (e.g., clarity, alignment, cogency).

Process
- DGS determines deadline (generally mid-September in the fall semester following completion of Seminar II) and provides official rubric to students.
- Student develops paper that builds on work and feedback from EDPL 8955 and 8956: Social Contexts and Educational Policy (i.e., Doctoral Seminar I or II), in consultation with the advisor. (Throughout both Seminar I and II, the instructor will provide feedback and evaluation on related assignments and skills, but these are not the official DQE assessment.)
- Critical Literature Analysis (DQE 1) submitted by deadline.
- Based on assessment and feedback, students either pass DQE1 or are required to revise and resubmit. Resubmission is evaluated based on DQE1 rubric and incorporation of reviewer feedback.

Assessment
- Faculty readers use rubric to evaluate DQE1 and provide feedback.
- Feedback, including rubrics, is submitted to DGS who will share it with the student.
- If the DQE 1 is proficient, student continues with core courses in program.
- If the DQE 1 is not proficient, student revises and resubmits DQE1, continuing with core courses if the revision is rated proficient.

Opportunity to Revise and Resubmit
- If paper is not proficient, the student is placed on Conditional Continuation (a departmental designation) and cannot proceed in core sequence coursework unless otherwise approved. Student can enroll in a dissertation elective. Advisor should confer with DGS if next steps for student are unclear.

- Student is expected to revise the DQE submission. Revision is due by the deadline communicated by DGS after evaluation of DQE 1 is provided.
- Students are strongly encouraged to talk with advisor about the feedback and how to respond and to use the services of the Marquette Writing Center, with a specialist with graduate level expertise. The student may wish to talk with reviewers and/or consult with the DGS.
- Faculty readers will assess the revision, per process outlined above. The DGS will communicate the results to the student.

Final Decision

- If the revised paper is not proficient (or student declines the opportunity to revise the original paper), the student meets with the DGS and their advisor to discuss options outlined below.
- Student chooses one of the following options and communicates their choice (intent) to the DGS:
  - Withdraw from the university; or
  - Apply transfer coursework into a (second) master's program at Marquette – within EDPL or beyond with program approval; or
  - Submit letter of appeal with a clear plan for remediation to the DGS.
- If the student chooses to appeal, the Doctoral Committee reviews the appeal and makes a determination. This may include acceptance of the appeal with specified requirements and timeline to move out of EDPL Conditional Continuation (if requirements are not met, no further appeal is available), termination from the program, or termination from the doctoral program with the option to transfer to a designated EDPL master's program with earned credits.

DQE 2: Foundations of Research

Description: A mini-research proposal that demonstrates student's ability to 1) identify a problem based on critical analysis of existing scholarship, 2) synthesize, critique, and apply relevant educational and methodological literature, 3) utilize literature to formulate research question(s), 4) apply a conceptual or theoretical framework that supports interrogation of the identified problem, 5) design and detail a clear, feasible research study appropriate to the research question(s) and that contributes to existing scholarship, 6) identify the contributions of such a research study, 7) successfully maintain and articulate the logical links among each of the elements above, and 8) demonstrate writing proficiency (e.g., clarity, alignment, cogency).

Process

- DGS determines deadline (generally mid-September in the fall semester following completion of EDPL 8715) and provides official rubric to students.
- Student develops mini-research proposal that builds on work and feedback from EDPL 8715: Interpretive and Critical Research in Education I, in consultation with advisor. DQE2 includes only problem formation, synthesis and critique of relevant literature, theoretical framework, research question, research design, contributions, and successful articulation of the logical links among each of these elements. (Throughout EDPL 8715, the instructor will provide feedback and evaluation on related assignments and skills, but these are not the official DQE assessment.)
- Foundations of Research (DQE 2) submitted by deadline.
- Based on assessment and feedback, students either pass DQE2 or are required to revise and resubmit. Resubmission is evaluated based on DQE2 rubric and incorporation of reviewer feedback.

Assessment

- Faculty readers use rubric to evaluate DQE2 and provide feedback.
- Feedback, including rubrics, is submitted to DGS who will share it with the student.
- If the DQE2 is proficient, student continues with core courses in program.
- If the DQE2 is not proficient, student revises and resubmits DQE2, continuing with core courses if the revision is rated proficient.

Opportunity to Revise and Resubmit

- If paper is not proficient, the student is placed on Conditional Continuation (a departmental designation) and cannot proceed in core sequence coursework unless otherwise approved. Student can enroll in a dissertation elective. Advisor should confer with DGS if next steps for student are unclear.
- Student is expected to revise the DQE submission. Revision is due by the deadline communicated by DGS after evaluation of DQE 1 is provided.
- Students are strongly encouraged to talk with advisor about the feedback and how to respond and to use the services of the Marquette Writing Center, with a specialist with graduate level expertise. The student may wish to talk with reviewers and/or consult with the DGS.
- Faculty readers will assess the revision, per process outlined above. The DGS will communicate the results to the student.

Final Decision

- If the revised paper is not proficient (or student declines the opportunity to revise the original paper), the student meets with the DGS and their advisor to discuss options outlined below.
- Student chooses one of the following options and communicates their choice (intent) to the DGS:
  - Withdraw from the university; or
  - Apply transfer coursework into a (second) master's program at Marquette – within EDPL or beyond with program approval; or
  - Submit letter of appeal with a clear plan for remediation to the DGS.
- If the student chooses to appeal, the Doctoral Committee reviews the appeal and makes a determination. This may include acceptance of the appeal with specified requirements and timeline to move out of EDPL Conditional Continuation (if requirements are not met, no further appeal is available), termination from the program, or termination from the doctoral program with the option to transfer to a designated EDPL master's program with earned credits.

DQE 3: Dissertation Proposal

Description: The students' proposal for dissertation research which addresses elements congruent with type of dissertation outlined below. The student and advisor must select a date for the defense during weekday working hours and avoid public or religious holidays. Completion of DQE3 includes a final, approved dissertation proposal and a dissertation proposal defense that is evaluated as proficient by a committee of three faculty.

Process
In consultation with advisor, student develops a dissertation proposal that adheres to one of the following formats:

Proposal for **Traditional Empirical Dissertation**

I. Rationale:
   a. Statement of problem, research focus
   b. Rationale and significance of addressing problem
   c. Reference to salient literature.
   d. Research questions.
II. Literature Review/Theoretical Framework:
   a. Critical, synthesized review of empirical literature salient to topic
   b. Clear indication of how research can address an existing gap.
   c. Research questions growing out of that "gap"
   d. Theoretical or Conceptual Framework (thorough discussion of the theory that will ground/guide the research)
III. Research Method:
   a. Research questions
   b. Description why research method (qualitative, quantitative, case study, historical, etc.) is well-suited to answer the questions posed.
   c. Description of research context and why selected
   d. Description of participants and how selected
   e. Description of data sources and how they will provide insight into research questions
   f. Description of data analysis methods, including how theory connects to analysis.
IV. Conclusion
   a. Include discussion of potential implications of the study
V. Writing Proficiency, including articulation of logical links within and among the sections, clarity, and correctness.

Proposal for **"3-Publishable Papers" Dissertation**:

- Tailored to student research goals and educational subfield(s). See DGS for format and specific requirements.
- Advisor must agree on final proposal approach before submission.

Proposal for **Non-Empirical Dissertation**

- Tailored to student research goals and educational discipline (e.g., history, philosophy). See DGS for format and specific requirements.
- Advisor must agree on final proposal approach before submission.

Assessment

- At least two weeks before the oral defense, dissertation committee receives DQE3 to evaluate the dissertation proposal using appropriate rubric.
- Student defends proposal in oral defense with dissertation committee, as guided by advisor using rubric.
- Student is notified by chair and Chair of the Doctoral Committee.
- Dissertation chair reports performance on Dissertation Proposal DQE to DGS.
- After a successful defense, students submits the following to EDPL and the Graduate School: Advancement to Candidacy form and Outline/Proposal for Dissertation form.

a. Final Decision

i. If successful, student proceeds to candidacy.
ii. If unsuccessful, student will take feedback from oral defense and work with advisor to revise written proposal and do a second oral defense.
iii. If not successful after second attempt, the Doctoral Committee has the option to terminate student and, possibly, encourage application for a designated masters.

DISSERTATION DIRECTIVES

Doctoral students must complete dissertation milestones in accordance with Graduate School dissertation directives (https://www.marquette.edu/grad/documents/dissertation-directives.pdf). The Graduate School website (www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml) has detailed information and directions for planning the dissertation, assembling a dissertation committee, formatting the dissertation, arrangement order and detail in the dissertation, copyright law, and submission of the dissertation to the Marquette University Graduate School.

All dissertations submitted to the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership must follow the most recent edition of APA Style Guidelines.

DISSERTATION DIRECTOR/CHAIR

The dissertation chair guides the student through all work during official doctoral candidacy – the dissertation outline, proposal writing and hearing, dissertation study, writing, and public defense. The dissertation chair is selected by mutual consent between the student and the faculty member. The student should notify their academic advisor and the DGS upon selection of a dissertation chair. As outlined in the Graduate School Dissertation Directives, tenure track and clinical professors can serve as dissertation, chairs and co-chairs, respectively. **If a participating faculty member or an emeritus professor chairs a dissertation committee, an employed tenure-line faculty member must also serve as co-chair.**

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Doctoral candidates select their dissertation committee with the assistance of their dissertation director/chair. All members of the dissertation committee must be active scholars who hold earned terminal degrees. The committee must include at least three members, including the chair. At least two members of the committee must tenure-line faculty at Marquette and two must be faculty in the Department of Educational Policy and Leadership. Additional members of the committee can be selected from tenure-line faculty at Marquette University and may include one member from outside of the university**. If the committee includes a non-Marquette member, the department must submit current curriculum vitae for that member to the Graduate School for approval prior to proposal defense.** Documentation of approval and CV must be included in the Advancement to Candidacy form.

DISSERTATION PROPOSAL DEFENSE (DQE 3)

Typically, the dissertation proposal includes the components of content in the first three chapters of the traditional dissertation:

- Problem Statement/Rationale and Research Questions
- Literature Review and Theoretical Framework
- Research Method.

Non-empirical dissertations (such as a historical or philosophical dissertations) will have different chapters and student should work with dissertation director to construct appropriate proposal.

Proposal for a "3-Publishable Papers" dissertation will be modeled after typical grant proposal requirements.

With the help of the dissertation director, the student prepares a dissertation proposal for review by the dissertation committee and subsequent discussion with the committee in a scheduled proposal hearing where all members of the committee have an opportunity to question the student about the planned research, offer suggestions, and either approve the research plan or ask the student to do further work on the proposal. The dissertation chair has the appropriate form ("Proposal Approval Form") indicating successful defense signed by the committee members and submits it to the Graduate School. Doctoral committee members must receive the completed dissertation proposal **at least two weeks** before the set oral defense date.

DISSERTATION OUTLINE

Students must submit an outline for their proposed dissertation using the Outline for Dissertation, Thesis, or Professional Project form available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml
This form is typically submitted to the Graduate School during the first semester in which dissertation credits are taken and after the dissertation proposal has been approved by the student's dissertation director and committee. The student's dissertation director, committee, and department chair must register their approval of the student's research plan on the dissertation outline form which is then submitted to the Graduate School for approval, along with the dissertation proposal.
Once the outline form is completed and signed by all parties, it is an agreement between the student, the dissertation committee, and the Graduate School for the student's planned research. Any significant changes in the outline must be approved by all parties (dissertation director, committee, department chair, Graduate School).

IRB APPROVAL for RESEARCH

If the student's research involves human subjects, the student is required to obtain written institutional review board (IRB) approval of the research from the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) PRIOR to initiating dissertation research. The approval forms for human research may be obtained through ORC and must be submitted to the Graduate School upon approval. ORC requires the STUDENT to submit the necessary protocol forms for review and approval of the research project. Additionally, students **AND dissertation chairs** must have certification of successful human subjects research training. Information for this certification is available on the OCR website, under "Training and Education."

For more information about the research compliance process, students may check the ORC website at www.marquette.edu/researchcompliance or contact ORC at (414) 288-1479.
Approval of the student's Dissertation Outline form by the Graduate School does NOT constitute approval by the Office of Research Compliance.

DISSERTATION CREDITS

Doctoral students must take 12 hours of dissertation credits and may enroll for these while working on their dissertation outline and/or while working on the dissertation research. Students work with their dissertation director/chair to determine how many credits hours they should take during any

one semester during the dissertation work. At times, students enroll in dissertation credits while preparing the dissertation proposal. However, students who enroll in, and pay for, dissertation credits before actually beginning work on their dissertation project will not be entitled to any tuition refund of these credits even if they should subsequently drop out of or are withdrawn from the program.

If the student has already completed the 12 dissertation credits required for graduation, but is still working on the dissertation, registration in dissertation continuation is required using the "Dissertation/Thesis/Professional Project Continuation Registration Form" which is available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml. The student may register for less than half-time, half-time, or full-time, based on the amount of work that is being done.

DISSERTATION WRITING WORKSHOP

Among the professional development resources it provides for graduate students, the Marquette University Graduate School offers three, annual one-week periods of intensive research, reflection and writing for doctoral students writing their dissertations. Dissertation Writing Workshops provide a dedicated time and location for students to come together and work towards the completion of their dissertations. Faculty facilitators are available throughout the week to monitor progress and offer suggestions. Each dissertator is assigned a facilitator with whom they meet daily.

Writing support for graduate students is also available through the Ott Memorial Writing Center, including weekly drop-in writing sessions with a graduate tutor Writing Center.

PUBLIC DEFENSE & EVALUATION OF THE DISSERTATION

A public defense of the dissertation is conducted after the candidate has completed all other formal requirements for the doctoral degree. Students must submit the **Announcement for Public Defense of the Dissertation form**, available online at www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml, along with an electronically submitted dissertation abstract in MS Word format to the graduate School. Each committee member must sign the form confirming the date and time of the defense. Email signatures are acceptable from committee members not on campus. **The form must be submitted at least four weeks prior to the scheduled defense date.** The Graduate School uses this form to announce the upcoming defenses to the campus community.

Before a public defense of the dissertation, a copy of the dissertation must be given to each member of the committee **at least three and preferably four weeks before the defense date.** The student and advisor must select a date for the defense during the weekday working hours and must avoid public or religious holidays. If the student intends to graduate the same semester in which they defend, the defense must be held before the deadline listed in the Academic Calendar.
Evaluation of both the written and oral defense of the dissertation is based on the following criteria:

- Provides well-reasoned rationale for research problem
- Grounds research in salient theory directly related to research problem
- Demonstrates understanding of main arguments in literature related to research topic
- Evaluates the quality, representativeness, and interplay of arguments/evidence in literature
- Identifies a gap or gaps in the literature

- Formulates a question/questions that can challenge/extend current wisdom on research subject
- Uses an appropriate research methodology and well-implemented research methods to address the research question(s)
- Develops an evidence-based, persuasive argument and presentation of findings/conclusions, grounded and informed by theoretical framework, that contributes to the literature in a field
- Articulates and interprets the interplay of their own research argument and evidence with those found in relevant literature
- Explains how future researchers and/or practitioners can draw on the work to improve education.

GRADUATION

There are deadlines to register for graduation in May, August, and December (**determined and posted by the Graduate School**), but a single graduation ceremony is held each spring.

See general graduate student handbook and the graduate school website for information related to graduation (date for registering, renting academic apparel, times for hooding ceremonies, etc.)
NOTE: During the semester in which they intend to graduate, doctoral candidates must be enrolled (either in dissertation credits or submit a Dissertation/Thesis/Professional Project Continuation Registration Form" www.marquette.edu/grad/forms_index.shtml).

EDPL PHD PLANNING FORM

(must be completed **with advisor** by the end of the second semester or 12 course credits)

Student Name _____
MU ID# _____
Email _____
Phone _____
Expected program completion _____

PROGRAM ELEMENT	SEMESTER PLANNED	SEMESTER COMPLETED
Doctoral Skills Foundations (6 credits)		
EDPL 8955 Seminar Social Contexts and Educational Policy I		
EDPL 8956 Seminar Social Contexts and Educational Policy II		
Content Foundations * (6 credits)		
EDPL 8730 History of Education in the U.S.		
EDPL 8330 Sociological Foundations of Education		
Research Foundations (9 credits)		
EDPL 8710 Multiple Paradigms		
EDPL 8715 Interpretive & Critical Research in Education I		
EDPL 8050 Quantitative Literacy and Research		
Research Electives (6 credits)		
EDPL 8720 Interpretive & Critical Research in Education II		
Intermediate/Advanced Statistics^		
EDPL 8040 Advanced Program Design		
Program Electives (18 credits)		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
Doctoral Qualifying Exam		
Component 1: Critical Literature Analysis		

Component 2: Foundations of Research		
Component 3: Dissertation Proposal and defense		

Dissertation Credits (12 credits)

EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation		
EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation		
EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation		
EDPL 8999 Doctoral Dissertation		

Dissertation

Defense of Doctoral Dissertation		

Signatures

Student		
	Signature	Date
Advisor		
	Signature	Date
DGS, PhD		
	Signature	Date

DQE #1: Critical Literature Analysis

SAMPLE RUBRIC: For planning purposes only. Students will receive the current rubric in advance of their DQE submission.

Pass: Student is proficient when paper meets level 3 or 4 in all criteria. In consideration of developmental process, papers with up to two criteria scoring level 2 are acceptable.

DQE #1: Critical Literature Analysis Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Constructs compelling, original argument about relevant bodies of academic scholarship	Discusses individual scholarly texts in isolated fashion.	Discusses sources with some attention to connections across scholarly texts, though these are not clearly articulated.	Presents a clear and evidence-based analysis of convergences and divergences in bodies of scholarship, may be missing critical texts.	Crafts an effective, clear and well-integrated analysis of bodies of scholarship.
Demonstrates understanding of literature related to the central argument.	Understanding of landscape of literature is shallow.	Understanding of landscape of literature is partial, but incomplete.	Understanding of landscape of literature is evident.	Demonstrates command of the literature related to student's central argument. Landscape of literature is concise and nuanced.
Portrays accurate depiction of literature related to the central argument.	Depiction of literature related to central argument is inaccurate or mostly inaccurate.	Depiction of literature related to central argument is mostly accurate.	Depiction of literature related to central argument is accurate.	Depiction of literature related to central argument is accurate and well stated.
Identifies key arguments in the literature related to the central argument.	Misidentifies or fails to identify key arguments in the literature.	Identifies some key arguments in the literature but makes few connections to the central argument.	Identifies key arguments in the literature and makes some connections to the central argument.	Clearly identifies the key arguments in the literature and connects them to the central argument.
Demonstrates a critical analysis of authors' arguments.	Student simply reports content of texts/data with little to no critical analysis.	Student demonstrates limited critical analysis of the strengths and weakness authors' arguments, partially supported by references to logic of text and quality of supporting evidence/data.	Student critically analyzes strengths and weakness of authors' arguments, supported by appropriate references to logic of text and quality of supporting evidence/data.	Student provides logical, persuasive critical analysis of strengths and weaknesses of authors' arguments, referencing logic of text and quality of supporting evidence/data and incorporating an appropriate range of additional sources to support analysis.
Synthesizes relevant arguments from the literature, bringing together multiple sources to support central argument.	Source ideas are discussed sequentially.	Source ideas are presented with occasional discussion across sources.	Sources are grouped appropriately to build an argument and discussed across different dimensions of the argument, highlighting	Sources advance student's argument by drawing on and skillfully synthesizing across multiple groups of source documents to support claims and address disagreement,

			significant and relevant nuances from specific works.	situating work within a thoroughly addressed body of literature.
Expresses argument and logic in a clear, concise, coherent, gracefully written essay.	Writing fails to express student's logic effectively, lacks clarity, conciseness, and coherent structure.	Writing partially expresses student's logic, but lacks consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure.	Writing expresses student's logic with consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing demonstrates some elegance and fluidity.	Writing expressing student's logic with particular and consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing is consistently elegant, fluid, and dynamic.
Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	Writing inconsistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	Writing is mostly consistent with standard writing conventions although minor inconsistencies are observed throughout (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.).	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.). Writing includes use of carefully selected and effectively incorporated quotations.

DQE #2: Foundations of Research

SAMPLE RUBRIC: For planning purposes only. Students will receive the current rubric in advance of their DQE submission.

Pass: Student is proficient when paper is "Emerging" or "Meets" in criteria 1-5 AND "Meets" or Exceeds" in criteria 6-8.

DQE #2: Foundations of Research Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations	Emerging	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
1.Identifies a significant problem grounded in relevant bodies of scholarship	Student identifies a diffuse, ill-defined problem or identifies a problem that lacks significance to the field	Student identifies a moderately focused problem, but the problem lacks significance OR Student identifies a generally significant problem/topic, but the problem lacks sufficient focus and delineation	Student identifies a clear, focused problem that holds significance for the field	Student identifies a clear, focused problem that is fresh and original, with deep significance for the field, with the possibility of justice/equity implications
2. Identifies key relevant texts, synthesizing and accurately critiquing the arguments therein, to support development of research project.	Identified texts are not significantly relevant to topic.	Key relevant texts are identified, but synthesis and critique of arguments provide limited support for research project	Key relevant texts are identified and clearly synthesized and critiqued at a satisfactory level, providing support for proposed research project.	Texts significantly relevant to project are identified and clearly, insightfully synthesized and critiqued, developing compelling support for proposed research project
3.Develops a compelling theoretical framework well-suited/aligned to the research focus	Theory grounding research is missing, presented inadequately or inaccurately (perhaps indicating a lack of comprehension) and/or lacks alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research is somewhat aligned to research focus and is presented accurately but description is shallow, with modest alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research aligns compellingly with research focus, and is presented in accurate, complex manner, including a clear description of alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research aligns seamlessly and compellingly with research focus and is accurately described in a complex, nuanced manner, including a clear, robust articulation of alignment with research focus
4.Formulates a research question/s logically derived from the synthesis of literature, that is focused and evocative, with possibility for expansive, open-ended exploration	Research question does not flow logically from the reviewed literature And/Or Research question is insufficiently focused and/or does not allow for expansive exploration	Research question has a modestly logical connection to the reviewed literature, but needs more focus and improved wording to increase possibilities of exploration	Research is logically grounded in reviewed literature, is clearly focused, and is worded in a way that allows for open-ended exploration	Research is logically and solidly grounded in reviewed literature, is clearly and crisply focused, and is worded in a way that allows for expansive, open-ended exploration

5. Constructs and describes a clear, complete research method well- suited to elicit and analyze data appropriate for research questions.	Research method is missing significant portions (context, participant selection, etc.) And/Or Research method is not suitable to answer the research questions formulated.	Research method is missing minor elements and/or is not clearly explained. And/Or Suitability of methodology to answer research questions is not clearly described	Method contains all the necessary elements and is suited to research questions formulated	Method is clear, complete, detailed, and well-suited to the research questions formulated
6.Successfully maintains and articulates the logical links among each of the elements above	Student fails to maintain and articulate the logical links among each of the elements above	Student makes simple, partial logical links among some of the elements above	Student maintains and articulates the logical links among each of the above elements	Students maintains and articulates logical links among each of the above elements that are compelling, fresh, insightful
7.Expresses one's own thinking in a clear, concise, coherent, gracefully written essay	Writing fails to express student's thinking effectively, lacks clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure	Writing partially expresses student's thinking, but lacks consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing is frequently pedestrian	Writing expresses student's thinking with consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing demonstrates some elegance and fluidity. At other times, writing is pedestrian	Writing expressing student's thinking with particular and consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing is consistently elegant, fluid, and dynamic
8.Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Writing inconsistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	NA	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.). Writing includes use of carefully selected and effectively incorporated quotations

DQE #3: Dissertation Proposal Assessment

SAMPLE RUBRIC: For planning purposes only. Students will receive the current rubric in advance of their DQE submission.

Pass: Proposal "Meets" or "Exceeds" in all criteria. Permissible to have "Emerging" in 1 category.

DQE #3: Dissertation Proposal Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations	Emerging	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
1.Identifies a significant problem	Student identifies a diffuse, ill-defined problem or identifies a problem that lacks significance to the field	Student identifies a moderately focused problem, but the problem lacks significance OR Student identifies a generally significant problem/topic, but the problem lacks sufficient focus and delineation	Student identifies a clear, focused problem that holds significance for the field	Student identifies a clear, focused problem that is fresh and original, with deep significance for the field, with the possibility of justice/equity implications
2. Identifies key relevant texts, synthesizing and accurately critiquing the arguments therein, to support development of research project.	Identified texts are not significantly relevant to topic.	Key relevant texts are identified, but synthesis and critique of arguments provide limited support for research project	Key relevant texts are identified and clearly synthesized and critiqued at a satisfactory level, providing support for proposed research project.	Texts significantly relevant to project are identified and clearly, insightfully synthesized and critiqued, developing compelling support for proposed research project
3.Develops a compelling theoretical framework well-suited/aligned to the research focus	Theory grounding research is missing, presented inadequately or inaccurately (perhaps indicating a lack of comprehension) and/or lacks alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research is somewhat aligned to research focus and is presented accurately but description is shallow, with modest alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research aligns compellingly with research focus, and is presented in accurate, complex manner, including a clear description of alignment with research focus	Theory grounding research aligns seamlessly and compellingly with research focus and is accurately described in a complex, nuanced manner, including a clear, robust articulation of alignment with research focus
4.Formulates a research question/s logically derived from the synthesis of literature, that is focused and evocative, with possibility for expansive, open-ended exploration	Research question does not flow logically from the reviewed literature And/Or Research question is insufficiently focused and/or does not allow for expansive exploration	Research question has a modestly logical connection to the reviewed literature, but needs more focus and improved wording to increase possibilities of exploration	Research question is logically grounded in reviewed literature, is clearly focused, and is worded in a way that allows for open-ended exploration	Research question is logically and solidly grounded in reviewed literature, is clearly and crisply focused, and is worded in a way that allows for expansive, open-ended exploration

5. Constructs and describes a clear, complete research method well- suited to elicit and analyze data appropriate for research questions.	Research method is missing significant portions (context, participant selection, etc.) And/Or Research method is not suitable to answer the research questions formulated.	Research method is missing minor elements and/or is not clearly explained. And/Or Suitability of methodology to answer research questions is not clearly described	Method contains all the necessary elements and is suited to research questions formulated	Method is clear, complete, detailed, and well-suited to the research questions formulated
6.Successfully maintains and articulates the logical links among each of the elements above	Student fails to maintain and articulate the logical links among each of the elements above	Student makes simple, partial logical links among some of the elements above	Student maintains and articulates the logical links among each of the above elements	Students maintains and articulates logical links among each of the above elements that are compelling, fresh, insightful
7.Expresses one's own thinking in a clear, concise, coherent, gracefully written essay	Writing fails to express student's thinking effectively, lacks clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure	Writing partially expresses student's thinking, but lacks consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing is frequently pedestrian	Writing expresses student's thinking with consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing demonstrates some elegance and fluidity. At other times, writing is pedestrian	Writing expresses student's thinking with particular and consistent clarity, conciseness, and logically coherent structure. Writing is consistently elegant, fluid, and dynamic
8.Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Writing inconsistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	NA	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.)	Writing consistently follows standard writing conventions and specific format for quotations, citations, and references (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.). Writing includes use of carefully selected and effectively incorporated quotations
9. Oral defense of proposal is clearly and cogently articulated, showing deep understanding of proposed research	Defense is unclear and unorganized, showing a lack of understanding of the proposed research	Defense is somewhat clear and organized, showing an emerging understanding of the proposed research	Defense is clear and organized, showing a clear understanding of the proposed research	Defense is clear and organized, showing a deep, nuanced understanding of the proposed research.