

Department of Special Education

Doctoral Advisement Manual

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC)

September, 2006

Organization of This Manual

This manual is organized to provide quick access to information for doctoral student advising and self-advising in the Department of Special Education at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). The table of contents lists where the following information can be found:

<u>Table of Contents</u>	<u>Sections</u>
I. Alphabetic listing and brief description of program milestones and cross-references to UIUC publications/web sites to which they relate.	I
II. Annotated bibliography of publications/web sites that relate to doctoral education.	II
III. Guidelines and forms for special education doctoral students.	III
A. Being a Good Citizen in the Department of Special Ed	
B. Policies and procedures pertaining to temporary advisers	
C. Professional development and supervision requirement	
D. Guidelines for the first year review and student progress review	
E. Guidelines for formation of research committees	
F. Early research requirement	
G. Policy for Qualifying Examinations	
H. Policy for Academic Credit for Early Research Requirement and Qualifying Exams	
I. Assistantship Information	
IV. Appendices	IV.
A. What makes a good mentor?	
B. How to choose a thesis adviser	
C. The Five Virtues of Successful Graduate Students	
V. Guidelines for Ph.D. program activities	V.

I. Alphabetic listing and brief descriptions of program milestones with cross-references to UIUC publications that relate to them; important additional information is available via the UIUC Web site and College of Education Web site.

Item and description	Reference
<p>Advisement. Each semester you should</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check Ph.D. Activities Checklist “Doc Plan” 2. Consult your adviser 3. Pre-register for next semester http://www.oar.uiuc.edu/current/registration/register.html 4. Evaluate funding <p>Adviser See permanent adviser, temporary adviser</p> <p>Admission requirements</p> <p>(See UIUC Graduate College (http://www.grad.uiuc.edu) and Department of Special Education Websites)</p> <p>Assistantship General information about UIUC graduate assistantships is located in the Graduate College Handbook, Chapter VI. See Graduate College Handbook (http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/index.asp)</p> <p>Certificate of Advanced Study (CAS) <i>COE Graduate Programs Handbook:</i> http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/g handbook_dr_cas.html</p> <p>Certificate of Committee Approval For more information please see: http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/forms/certificate/CertCommitteeApproval.pdf www.grad.uiuc.edu/thesis/thesisGC.html</p> <p>Chair Chairman, chairperson. See Head of the Department</p>	<p>This manual, Section V</p> <p>See Registration information, Office of Admissions and Records</p> <p>See: <i>COE Graduate Programs Handbook</i></p> <p>This Manual, Section I</p> <p><i>COE Graduate Programs Handbook</i></p> <p>Formerly known as “Red Border Sheets”</p>

College of Education Graduate Programs Handbook

Web site: COE Graduate Programs Handbook

<http://edwebfiles.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/grad/documents/GradHdk07-08.pdf>

College of Education Student Academic Affairs Office

Located in Rm. 110 Education Building, directed by Associate Dean Jim Leach. This office is the most convenient and comprehensive source of information about doctoral requirements.

<http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/>

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Dissertation requirements

See *Graduate College Handbook*

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/index.asp>

OR

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

<http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/g handbook.html>

Dissertation Abstracts requirement

The requirement to provide an abstract of one's dissertation.

<http://edwebfiles.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/grad/documents/GradHdk05-06forWEB.pdf>

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Dissertation Award

This is a financial award to assist a doctoral student with his or her doctoral dissertation. There are two competitions each semester, one within the College of Education and one within the Graduate College. The same application, due early in the semester, may be used for both competitions. Information is available from the Bureau of Educational Research website www.ed.uiuc.edu/ber

Dissertation committee

See formation of committees

This manual, Section III. D

Dissertation filing requirement (see: *Thesis Handbook*)

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/thesis/thesis handbook>

Thesis Handbook

Dissertation format check

The final check of one's dissertation to make certain that the mechanical format is correct

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/thesis/thesis handbook> or

Thesis Handbook
or

[COE Graduate Programs Handbook](#)

(<http://edwebfiles.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/grad/documents/GradHdk05-06forWEB.pdf>)

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Doctoral program plan

The list of course work in the major subject area (at least 4 but no more than 32 hours may be thesis research credit), Research Specialization (up to 24 hours) and other activities that satisfy the Department, College, and University doctoral requirements.

This manual, Section V

Early Research Requirement

A substantial research project completed at the UIUC prior to one's preliminary oral examination. Many students also use this project to meet a project requirement for completion of their Research Specialization.

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

This Manual, Section F

Emergency

Health: Call McKinley "Dial-a-Nurse"
24 hours a day: 333-2700

Student counseling center: <http://www.couns.uiuc.edu/>

The 24-hour personal crisis number to reach the Emergency Dean is 333-0050. Web site: <http://www.odos.uiuc.edu/emergency/>

Fellowships

A fellowship is an award that requires only full-time enrollment not contracted hours of labor as is required for assistantship support. Some of the available fellowships are:

- University of Illinois Fellowships
- Letitia Walsh Fellowship
- Bagley Graduate Student Awards
- W. E. A. & C. C. Young Scholarship (limited to Special Education graduate & undergraduate students)
- Henderson, Jordan & Heal Awards
- Reinoehl Memorial Scholarship

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

UIUC Office of Student Financial Aid <http://www.osfa.uiuc.edu/>

First-year review in special education

This manual, Section D

Final oral examination

The examination for the final defense of the doctoral candidate's dissertation. Two forms are required. The final oral request form is used to document that the meeting is scheduled and the final oral completion form is used to document the completion of the defense.

COE Graduate Programs Handbook.

Graduate College

The UIUC unit that has jurisdiction over all graduate programs regardless of department <http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/index.htm>

Graduate College Handbook

The handbook of requirements of the UIUC Graduate College
These requirements supersede those of the College of Education
<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/index.asp>

Grievance procedures

Academic Staff Handbook is available at:
<http://www.ahr.uiuc.edu/ahrhandbook/default.htm>

Graduate College Handbook is available at:
<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/index.asp>

**Head of the Department of Special Education
Adelle Renzaglia, Ph.D.**

Under the UIUC system a Head has more decision-making authority than a chairperson. A chairperson must consult the faculty on all departmental decisions; a head need not.

Health Services

Medical services are prepaid by UIUC fees and provided at the McKinley Health Center (24 hours a day; 333-2700)
<http://www.mckinley.uiuc.edu/>

Human subjects protection

Every student and faculty member must secure prior approval for their use of human subjects in any research that he or she directs. This information is collected and updated by the Bureau of Educational Research. For information and forms visit
<http://www.irb.uiuc.edu/?q=regulation-policies/uiuc-policies.html>

For School Research Form visit
www.ed.uiuc.edu/ber/webpages/School_Research_Form.html

Intent-to-Graduate

Students indicate intent to graduate when they register for their final semester.

International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS)

This office is devoted to international students; the aim is to create an environment that allows for successful educational and personal experiences through orientation, advising, programs and outreach. Information is available at:
<http://www.ips.uiuc.edu/iss>

Also:
*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Bureau of
Educational Research,
Rm. 236 Ed. Bldg.

Contact:
Dept. of SpEd
Admissions Secretary
(333-0260)

Office: 400 Student
Services Bldg. 610
E. John St.
Champaign, IL

Limited status

Status of a student who has been admitted without meeting all of the admissions requirements or has fallen below a "B" average. The student has one semester to advance to full graduate student status.

See also: *Graduate College Handbook*

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/index.asp>

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Major department and areas of specialization

Special Education (SpEd). Other departments in the College of Education are: Curriculum & Instruction (C & I), Educational Policy Studies (EPS), Educational Psychology (EPSY), Human Resources Education (HRE), and Educational Organization and Leadership (EOL).

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Master's thesis

Not required for Special Education. See Early Research Requirement, which has some features of a master's thesis.

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Office of Educational Technology (OET)

The OET offers a variety of technology resources and support for students in the College of Education. OET offices are located on the lower level of the Education Building. Services include technical support, software help, computer lab, equipment check-out, and workshops.

See: <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/oet>

Part-time enrollment

See *Graduate College Handbook* Chapter III:

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/chapterIII/section03.asp>

Personal counseling

The student counseling center: <http://www.couns.uiuc.edu/>

The 24-hour personal crisis number to reach the Emergency Dean is 333-0050. Web site: <http://www.odos.uiuc.edu/emergency/>

Permanent adviser

The adviser agrees to provide professional and scholarly counsel to the student for the duration of their compatibility or until the student's completion of his or her doctoral degree. This adviser is selected by the student during his or her first year of doctoral study and may be changed at any time thereafter (See also temporary adviser).

This manual, Section
B

Petition, Appeals, and Other actions

A UIUC student may petition for exemption to any UIUC rule (e.g., transferring credit for work completed outside the graduate college, changing graduate college department, adding or dropping courses after the deadline dates, registering for an overload, registering in absentia, changing degree status). Petition forms are available at:

http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/admissions/petition_instruct.cfm

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Preliminary oral examination

The exam during which the student proposes his or her dissertation research. The Preliminary Exam may not be conducted until the Qualifying Exam is passed. The adviser is responsible for submitting forms (preliminary oral request form and completion form) to document that the meeting is scheduled and exam completed.

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Graduate College Handbook

SpEd Department
Admissions Secretary

Qualifying Exams

Written comprehensive examinations administered to doctoral students near the completion of their course work.

This Manual Section
G

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Registration

Students at UIUC are responsible for registering themselves each semester:

<http://www.oar.uiuc.edu/current/registration/register.html>

Requirement, credits

For doctoral students, a total of 64 credit hours beyond the master's degree must be earned in course work from UIUC. In addition, the equivalent of 16 credit hours must be earned to complete the Research Specialization requirement.

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Research Specialization Committee (Ph.D.)

Any one of several faculty committees that regulate and certify that a student is qualified to conduct scholarly inquiry. Currently, the areas are Evaluation, Interpretive, Qualitative, and Quantitative. Each student must, in consultation with the Advisor, declare the Research Specialization selected, obtain approval for the proposed courses, and obtain approval of a completed research project.

http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/phd_res_spec_req.html

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

also contact the

COE Office of
Student Academic
Affairs Rm. 110 Ed.

Residency, continuous full-time requirement

The minimum continuous residence requirement for a Ph.D. candidate is completion of at least 12 hours of coursework for each of two consecutive semesters. For Ed.D. Candidates, participation in an approved full-time combination of academic courses and professional experiences over 4 consecutive semesters is required. (See hours in residence; requirement, credits).

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Research Specialization requirement

(See also Research Specialization Committee)

The requirement that every Ph.D. student complete the equivalent of 16 hours in one of the methodologies recognized by the College of Education. Courses taken to satisfy the Research Specialization requirement are not counted as part of the 64 hours minimum credit requirement.

http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/phd_res_spec_req.html

*COE Graduate
Program Handbook*

Sexual harassment

The offer to barter academic or professional favors as payment for sexual favors. Any dating or intimate relationship in which one member has professional or academic authority over the other is suspect. Sexual harassment is not tolerated at UIUC. Procedures for reporting incidents are described in The Code of Policies and Regulations Applying to All Students.

<http://www.admin.uiuc.edu/policy/code/>

Special Education Graduate Student Work Space

*This manual, Section
III.A.*

Special Education Graduate Students Association (SEGSA)

Special Education Graduate Students Association. The formal association through which graduate students in special education at UIUC function collectively.

Specialization courses (Ed.D. requirement)

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Supervision requirement (Department of Special Education)

*This manual, Section
III. C*

Requirement for Graduate Assistantship

For information visit: <http://www.oir.uiuc.edu/Did/ITAs/index.htm>

and <http://www.oir.uiuc.edu/Did/TAs/index.htm>

*COE Graduate
Programs Handbook*

Department Evaluation Form for TAs, RAs, and Supervisors

Graduate students serving as Teaching Assistants, Research Assistants, or on Traineeships in the Department of Special Education are evaluated by their direct supervisor. Copies of this evaluation are kept in the student's permanent file.

*This manual, Section
III. I*

*TA/RA Evaluation
Form*

Temporary adviser (See also permanent adviser)

The adviser appointed at the beginning of one's doctoral program in special education at UIUC, to be replaced by a permanent adviser during the first year of doctoral study.

This manual, Section III. B

Thesis (See master's thesis)

An optional requirement for a master's degree
See also, Early Research Requirement

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Thesis format check

See dissertation format check

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Travel Grants

Conference Travel Grants for Students

<http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/policies/travelgrant/index.html>

COE Graduate Programs Handbook

Graduate College Dissertation Travel Grants

See: <https://www.grad.uiuc.edu/Fellowship/index.cfm>

II. Annotated bibliography of UIUC and other publications that relate to doctoral education.

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed)*. Washington, DC: Author.

The authoritative source on APA style, which is the required style for nearly all written work in a UIUC College of Education doctoral program (Order from: <http://www.apa.org/publications/> or purchase at any campus book store.

College of Education, UIUC.
http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/phd_res_spec_req.html

The periodically updated authoritative source of information on The UIUC College of Education Research Specialization Area (Research Specialization) requirement.

The University of Illinois. *Policy and Procedures on Academic Integrity in Research and Publication*. Champaign, IL : Author. <http://www.research.uiuc.edu/ai/index.asp>

A brochure describing the UIUC procedures for evaluating charges of abridged integrity by its staff. (Available from the office of Vice Chancellor for Research, 4th floor Swanlund Bldg., MC-304, 333-0034).

Office of School-University Research Relations. <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/ber/OSURR.html>

A web site for University of Illinois faculty members and graduate students who are planning to do research in the schools (Available in Room 236C Education, 333-3023, or from the Bureau of Educational Research at www.ed.uiuc.edu/ber).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *UIUC Student Code*. Champaign, IL

See: <http://www.admin.uiuc.edu/policy/code/index.html>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Thesis Handbook*. Champaign, IL: The UIUC Graduate College. <http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/thesis/thesishandbook/index.asp>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Investigator Handbook*. Champaign, IL: Institutional Review Board. <http://www.irb.uiuc.edu/?q=investigator-handbook/down.html>

A regularly updated publication describing the UIUC procedures for protecting human subjects who participate in UIUC research (Available in Room 404, Swanlund Bldg., MC-304, 333-2670. IRB web site: <http://www.irb.uiuc.edu>).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Academic Staff Handbook*, Champaign, IL: Office of Public Affairs, Office of Publication. <http://www.ahr.uiuc.edu/ahrhandbook/default.htm>

A bi-annual publication describing UIUC policies and procedures that affect academic staff. Sections on support services and cultural opportunities also are featured (Available from Academic Human Resources, Illini Union Bookstore, Suite 420, MC-310, 333-6747).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Campus Information Technologies and Educational Services (CITES)*. Champaign, IL: CITES. <http://www.cites.uiuc.edu/>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *UIUC Graduate Student Handbook*. Champaign, IL: The Graduate College. <http://www.grad.uiuc.edu/gradhandbook/>

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *COE Graduate Programs Handbook*, Champaign, IL: Graduate Programs Office, College of Education.

An annual publication describing the requirements, policies, procedures, and supports for graduate education at the UIUC College of Education (Available in Room 110 Education, MC-708, 333-2267 or on the web at: <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/saao>).

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. *Programs of Study*, Champaign, IL: Office of Public Affairs, Office of Publication. <http://courses.webtools.uiuc.edu/cis/programs/urbana/>

III. Guidelines and Forms for Special Education Doctoral Students

- A. Being a Good Citizen in the Department of Special Education
- B. Policies and Procedures Pertaining to Temporary Advisors
- C. Personnel Preparation and Supervision Requirement
- D. Guidelines for the First Year Review
- E. Formation of Research Committees
- F. Early Research Requirement
- G. Qualifying Examinations
- H. Policy for Academic Credit for Early Research Requirement and Qualifying Exams
- I. Assistantship Information

A. Being a Good Citizen in the Department of Special Education

The secretaries in the Department of Special Education are the best source for information about department procedures. Doctoral students are issued keys to the building and department to allow 24-hour access to the department's considerable resources: library, computers, kitchen, and telephones.

Five general rules should be observed:

- 1) Department resources are for professional, not personal, use
- 2) Students must furnish their own supplies with few exceptions
- 3) The last person to leave the office at any time is responsible for turning off all lights, computer equipment, unplugging and cleaning the coffee pot, and locking the office doors
- 4) The main office door (288 Ed.) must be kept locked after 5:00 PM
- 5) Everyone is responsible for maintaining a clean kitchen, sink, refrigerator, counters, and microwave oven
- 6) Permission is asked before one uses another's property

Special Education Graduate Student Work Space

Graduate students in the Department of Special Education will be assigned a department work space according to the following guidelines:

1. First priority for a desk space in the department will be given to doctoral students whose assistantship duties are associated with departmental functions: a) teaching assistant for a special education course; b) graduate assistant working on a course or other department related business (e.g., supervision of practicum students).
2. Department desk space will be given to graduate students whose traineeships are associated with these department functions: a) providing course assistance and/or b) special education department related work (e.g., special education department librarian).

3. Desk space will be assigned to research assistants that are funded by University funds and do not have allocated space elsewhere in the university.

4. Other doctoral students will be assigned desk space in the department based on availability.

B. Policies and Procedures Pertaining to Temporary Advisers

Every doctoral student is assigned a temporary adviser once s/he is admitted to the Department of Special Education. The Admissions Committee chooses the temporary adviser, usually someone outside the student's area of interest. Students will select permanent advisers with interests similar to their own; the assignment of a temporary adviser allows incoming students to get to know faculty outside their area of interest. This does not preclude a student from selecting the temporary adviser to be his or her permanent adviser. The student must select a permanent adviser by the time of the First Year Review (second semester of the first year). Responsibilities of the temporary adviser include: a) meeting with and advising the first year student until a permanent adviser is selected, and b) running the First Year Review, unless the permanent adviser has been selected prior to the semester of the review or has offered to assume this duty.

An agreement form completed by the student and the permanent adviser, once selected, attests that both parties agree to this important partnership. The completed form should be given to the secretary who manages student admissions and files (no later than First-Year Review). The completed agreement forms then will be placed in the students' files.

DOCTORAL STUDENT – ADVISOR AGREEMENT FORM

I, _____, would like to declare
_____ as my advisor. We have
discussed our mutual interests and have agreed to enter into this relationship.

Signatures:

Student: _____

Temporary Advisor: _____

Permanent Advisor: _____

Date: _____

C. Personnel Preparation and Supervision Requirement

Rationale

Personnel preparation is a significant component of special education in higher education and at all levels of service from infant education through post-secondary services. While various terms are used (e.g., teacher education, professional development, staff development, technical assistance, continuing education, ongoing development), personnel preparation is an umbrella term that encompasses all of these. Professors and educational leaders often hold positions in which they are responsible for not only the preparation of personnel who provide direct services but also for the initial and ongoing development of professionals who provide training for others. In some contexts, individuals will have the opportunity to design, coordinate, and evaluate new models of personnel preparation. One goal of the doctoral program in special education is to ensure that graduates have the knowledge and competencies that they need to be a leader in personnel preparation.

The diverse backgrounds and focal areas of doctoral students mirror the wide range of special-education services that are available to persons with disabilities across the lifespan. Therefore, entering doctoral students will be variously prepared to step into positions in which they supervise others. While all doctoral students are required to complete a professional supervision experience, the nature of that experience will be shaped by the student's focal area and prerequisite skills and knowledge that he/she brings to the doctoral program.

Requirements

Content Knowledge

Doctoral students will have completed a minimum of two-three courses in the curriculum and instruction of their designated content area. Students who have not completed comparable coursework prior to admission will need to complete the coursework early in their programs in order to prepare for the supervision experience.

Decisions about coursework will be made with the advisor and submitted as part of the Supervision Contract. While other courses may also be appropriate, some examples are

SPED 414	Assessment in Early Childhood Special Education
SPED 416	Perspectives on Gifted Education
SPED 440	Instructional Strategies I
SPED 441	Instructional Strategies II
SPED 444	Career Development and Individuals with Disabilities
SPED 446	Curriculum Development for Students with Disabilities I
SPED 447	Curriculum Development for Students with Disabilities II
SPED 448	Curriculum Development for Students with Disabilities III
SPED 465	Curriculum & Methods in Early Childhood Special Education
SPED 545	Transition & Vocational Planning
CI 575	Corrective Reading Instruction
CI 576	Clinical Diagnosis & Remediation in Reading
SPED 590	Advanced Topic Seminars (related to content specialization)

Teaching/ Field Experience

Some doctoral students may need to supplement their teaching experience due to limited prior teaching experience or to become familiar with the context of teaching in the U.S. Students may complete one or more supervised practical experiences through enrollment in an Independent Study or SPED 524

Supervised Practice in Special Education. Arrangement for supervision of the doctoral student in the practicum setting is the responsibility of the advisor. When resources are available and negotiated prior to the semester that the student is to enroll in the independent study or supervised practice, the ECSE or LBS Programs may be able to provide supervision along with or in lieu of the advisor. Please note that such requests for resources must be clearly stated in the Supervision Contract. Comparable alternatives for field experience in community settings other than schools may also be designed and follow similar guidelines.

Supervision Experience

Doctoral students will be responsible for supervision of pre- or in-service professionals in field settings for 50% time for one semester or 25% for two semesters. Practicum supervision in the ECSE or the LBS Program is the recommended way of fulfilling this requirement. Graduate assistantships are often available for qualified practicum supervisors. Comparable alternatives for supervision in other service-delivery settings in the community may be designed.

Some students may also complete the Advanced Topics Seminar on Supervision (SPED 590-S) in addition to or as an alternative to the Supervision Experience. This course will be offered periodically according to need and available resources.

Supervision Contract

Each student will complete a contract (see attached form) with his or her advisor that includes:

- A statement of how the student will fulfill the supervision requirement
- A description of the individual's competencies relative to the task or plan for obtaining the necessary prerequisite knowledge and competencies through coursework, practica, independent studies, or related activities
- A timeline
- An explanation of any special considerations, requests, and exceptions
- Signature of student and advisor.

The contract will be submitted for approval to the Doctoral Program Committee anytime from entry to the program to the end of the first year. Signatures of Program and Practicum Coordinators and the Department Head on the contracts are needed to ensure that these individuals have received advance notification of supervision activities for the purpose of planning and resource allocation. The approved contract will be attached to the student's Doctoral Plan, addressed during the First-Year Review, and included in the student's Annual Progress Review. Significant changes in the plan require new approval by the Doctoral Program Committee. The faculty recommends that students complete activities to meet the Supervision Requirement prior to taking Qualifying Exams.

Supervision Contract

1. Statement of how the student will fulfill the supervision requirement

2. Description of the individual’s competencies relative to the task or a plan for obtaining the necessary prerequisite skills and knowledge through coursework, practica, independent studies, or related activities. (Note: Completion of requirements prior to taking Qualifying Exams is strongly recommended.)

Statement of Competencies:

Needs	Planned Action	Projected Timeline

3. Explanation of any special considerations, requests, and exceptions

APPROVAL
PLANNING

NOTIFICATION FOR

Student signature

Practicum Coordinator

Advisor signature

ECSE/LBS Program Coordinator

Chair, Doctoral Program Committee

Department Head

D. Guidelines for First Year Review and Student Progress Review

First Year Review

The first year review of doctoral students is intended to provide an individual assessment of the student's progress. This process is a way for the student to design an activity plan that will guide the student's activities. Additionally, the first year review provides faculty the opportunity to become familiar with doctoral students.

The first year review is conducted early in the second semester of study, or after the semester in which the student completes SPED 592. The review consists of four parts: (a) the student's review of his/her background and reasons for pursuing an advanced degree, (b) the student's critique of a research article, (c) the student's presentation and committee discussion of a single authored, original paper, and (d) a discussion of the student's basic knowledge of special education. Each of these components should provide the student and committee members with information regarding the student's strengths and potential needs in the doctoral program. On occasion, the committee may determine that the student's current strengths or interests do not indicate that s/he should continue in doctoral studies in the Department of Special Education. In this case, the committee may recommend alternative courses of action on the first year review evaluation form, completed at the close of the meeting.

The recommended format for the First Year Review is:

1. Overview and Introductions

The student's temporary (or permanent) adviser should chair the meeting, introduce participants, and review the sequence of activities (e.g., student presents his or her background and goals, student reviews article and addresses questions, etc.).

2. Student Background and Goals (15 minutes)

The student is allowed up to 10 minutes to review his/her background, reasons for pursuing studies at UIUC, and employment goals. The student may use his or her academic vita to share this information. Following this period, the committee may ask questions for up to 5 minutes.

*3. Research Article Review (30-35 minutes)

The student presents a review of the assigned research article for up to 15 minutes. The review should consist of an overview of the purpose, methods, and findings of the study, and the student's opinion regarding strengths and weaknesses. Faculty should hold questions until the student completes the review. The committee then spends approximately 15-20 minutes on questions and discussion.

*4. Student Presentation of Original Paper (25 minutes)

The student presents an overview of the purpose and major conclusions of the original paper (10 minutes). Committee members should hold questions until the student completes the overview, at which time they will spend approximately 15 minutes for discussion and questions regarding the paper.

5. General Issues in Special Education (15 minutes)

Committee members and the student discuss general issues in special education. The student should be prepared to discuss his/her basic knowledge in special education in response to committee members' questions. The purpose of this discussion is to reflect on the scope and depth of the student's knowledge and identify potential needs.

6. Committee Discussion

The student is asked to leave the room while committee members discuss their recommendations as an outcome of the review. The student is asked to return to discuss these recommendations and subsequent events or actions to be taken. The First Year Evaluation Form is completed and signed by the committee members.

7. Post Review Activities

- The adviser should meet with the student to discuss the committee's recommendations and how the doctoral activities plan can be revised to respond to the recommendations.
- Under the direction of the advisor, the student should send a revised doctoral activities plan to all committee members within 30 days of the review.
- The advisor should provide a copy of the First Year Evaluation Form to the student and to the department secretary for placement in the student's permanent file.

*Items 3 and 4 can be reversed in order, based on student preference. Time may vary across students on individual parts of the First Year Review.

Participant Responsibilities for the First Year Review

Responsibilities of Doctoral Programs Committee:

1. Acquire the names of students to be reviewed each year.
2. Select a First Year Review Committee for each student. This committee should be comprised of up to four people: (a) the student's temporary adviser, (b) a faculty member with interests that overlap with the student's interests, (c) a randomly selected faculty member outside the student's areas of interest, and (d) the permanent adviser, if different from the temporary adviser

Responsibilities of the Student:

1. Two weeks prior to the review, the student will submit an original, single-authored paper, up to 15 pages, to be examined by the committee. This paper may be selected from previous coursework, but should not have been revised, such as the first draft of a paper submitted in SpEd 592. The paper should be one that the student feels adequately reflects his/her current writing skills. The student should be prepared to discuss the purpose and major conclusions of this paper.
2. Two weeks prior to the review, the student should submit a copy of his or her vita and completed Doctoral Activity Plan to the temporary advisor.
3. During the review, the student will present a critical analysis of a research article selected by the adviser, including the purpose, methods, findings, strengths, and weaknesses of the study.
4. The student will discuss his or her basic knowledge of special education, but should not attempt to study for this component of the review.
5. Two weeks prior to the review, at a minimum, the student will select a permanent adviser.

Responsibilities of the Temporary Adviser:

1. Arrange a meeting time with committee members and the student. A minimum of 1.5 hours should be scheduled.

2. Select a research article for the student to critically analyze. Distribute this article to the student and members of the committee two weeks prior to the review.
3. Prepare and distribute 4 copies of the materials submitted by the student for the meeting (i.e., the student's original paper, vita, and doctoral plan); one for each committee member and one for the student.
4. Arrange a room for the review.
5. Meet with the student to prepare and advise him/her of first year review procedures.
6. Participate as a member of the review committee.
7. Complete and sign the first year evaluation form.
8. Give a copy of the First-Year Review evaluation form to the student and place the original in the student's file.

Note: In the case that a permanent adviser has been selected prior to the semester of the review, the permanent adviser will assume these responsibilities.

Responsibilities of the First Year Review Committee:

1. Prior to the review meeting read the student's original paper and the assigned research article; review the student's Doctoral Program Activity Plan and vita.
2. During the review meeting, individually and collectively reflect on the student's discussion of the original paper, oral critique of the article, Doctoral Program Activity Plan, vita, and knowledge of special education as a field of study.
3. At the conclusion of the review meeting, confer with committee members to determine recommendations for the student's Doctoral Program Activity Plan, based on the student's strengths and needs.
4. The committee and/or the adviser should explain the recommendations and identified strengths to the student. Subsequently, either the Advisor or Committee members summarize the recommendations on the First Year Review Evaluation form.
5. Sign the First Year Review Evaluation Form.

FIRST YEAR REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Department of Special Education

Student's Name _____ Date _____

Advisor (Temporary) _____ Advisor (Permanent) _____

Committee Members: 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

Strengths and recommendations based on original paper:

Strengths and recommendations based on critique of research article:

Strengths and recommendations based on knowledge of the field:

Discuss:

- Plan for meeting the Personnel Preparation and Supervision Requirement
- Portfolio Option for Special Field Qualifying Exams

Signatures of Committee Members:

Annual Student Progress Review

The purpose of this policy is to provide doctoral students in Special Education with an annual faculty review of their progress after formal admission to doctoral candidacy (see policy for first year review). This annual review will focus on student progress toward completion of program milestones and other professional activities, and will include recommendations with respect to monetary support for continued study.

University policy regarding student appeals, satisfactory performance, and specific timelines for the completion of the Doctor of Philosophy and Doctor of Education degrees are outlined in the following publications:

- *Graduate College Handbook*
- *COE Graduate Programs Handbook*

The Department of Special Education process for review of student progress is outlined below:

- This review process is used in years subsequent to the student's completion of a first-year review.
- During the spring of each year, the Special Education faculty will allocate a portion of at least one faculty meeting to discuss doctoral student progress. The date for this review will be announced to faculty members at least two months prior to its occurrence.
- After the date for review is selected, the adviser is responsible for scheduling a meeting with his/her doctoral students to discuss their progress during the previous year. The purpose of the meeting is to review the student's activities and accomplishments for the preceding year. During this meeting, the student will provide the adviser a current vita and updated Doctoral Program Plan, which will be used to review the student's progress. The student is also responsible for providing evidence of activities from his or her Doctoral Program Plan if requested by the adviser.
- During the meeting with each student, the adviser will use the *Special Education Doctoral Student Progress Summary* to record and summarize each student's progress in the following areas:

Program Milestones

- Completion of coursework
- Research methodology requirement (RMAS)
- Early research requirement
- Qualifying exams
- Preliminary defense of dissertation proposal
- Final defense of dissertation research
- Dissertation deposit

Professional Activities

- Recommendations from the First Year Review
 - Supervision
 - Teaching
 - Conference presentations
 - Publications
 - Involvement in professional organizations
- At the designated faculty meeting, each adviser will briefly summarize each of their advisee's progress for the faculty. The adviser will also offer recommendations for either faculty or student actions if appropriate.
 - The faculty as a whole will reflect on the adviser's summary and recommendations, and generate discussion as needed.
 - The faculty will then make (a) consensus recommendations relevant to each student's program and progress and (b) establish a funding priority for student monetary support.
 - The adviser will record the faculty recommendations and designation of funding priority on the *Special Education Doctoral Student Progress Summary* and sign this form.
 - Within 30 days, the adviser will meet with the student to accomplish the following:
 - 1) Inform the student of faculty recommendations, and
 - 2) Obtain the student's signature on the progress summary form.

Subsequently, the adviser will take whatever actions are appropriate, as indicated on the progress summary.

- The adviser will provide the student with a photocopy of the progress summary and forward the original to the departmental secretary for placement in the student's permanent file.

Special Education Doctoral Student Progress Summary

Student: _____ Advisor: _____

Date of Summary: _____ Semester & Year Entered Program: _____

A. For each item, please place a check in the column that best indicates the student’s progress. If appropriate, record comments in the space provided.

Area	No Activity	In Progress	Expected Completion Date	Complete	Comments
<p><i>Program Milestones</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coursework • Research Specialization Core • Early Research Requirement • Qualifying Exams • Preliminary Defense • Final Defense • Deposit <p><i>Professional Activities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervision • Teaching • Presentations • Publications • Professional Organizations 					

B. Advisor Recommendations/Comments: _____

C. Faculty Recommendations/Comments: _____

D. Date of Faculty Review: _____

E. Priority for Funding Support:
_____ High _____ Medium _____ Low

F. Potential Funding Source: _____

Advisor Signature: _____ Date: _____

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

E. Formation of the Student's Research Committees

The student, in conjunction with his or her adviser, decides on committee membership for the Early Research Study and/or the Doctoral Dissertation as outlined below. The following advising options are available to the student: (a) one permanent adviser who oversees one or both research projects; (b) co-advisers who oversee one or both research projects; or (c) a research adviser, who is different from the permanent adviser, with the research adviser overseeing one or both research projects. In the case where a research adviser is overseeing one or both research projects, the permanent adviser or co-advisers should be identified as committee members.

Early Research Committee

- 3 to 5 members
- All members may be from within the Department of Special Education

(See COE form: http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/sao/handbooks/grad/g handbook_dr_phd.html).

Dissertation Committee

The Dean of the Graduate College shall appoint voting members of doctoral committees, upon recommendation of the executive officer of the student's unit. Upon unit request, the Dean may also appoint non-voting members of doctoral committees, such as an external reader, a UIUC faculty member who is on leave off campus, or others who have made a significant contribution to the dissertation but who cannot be present at the examination.

1. A doctoral committee shall include at least four voting members. At least three of the voting members must be members of the Graduate Faculty, and at least two must be tenured.
2. Emeriti faculty who have been awarded continuing membership on the Graduate Faculty may chair committees.
3. All members of a committee need not be present in person at an examination. If not present, they must participate in the examination via an appropriate electronic communication technology.
4. At least one member must be from outside the Department of Special Education.

F. Guidelines for the Early Research Requirement

The Early Research Requirement is a research project that must be completed at UIUC prior to one's qualifying exams. The student selects a committee of three to five faculty members. All committee members can be from within the Department of Special Education. Some committee members can be from outside of the Department of Special Education. Tenure-track as well as grant-funded Ph.D. level faculty may serve on the committee. (See:

http://edwebsfiles.ed.uiuc.edu/saao/handbooks/grad/phd_early_research_requirement.pdf).

Before the preliminary proposal meeting occurs, the Human Subjects Research form should be completed and approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee in the College of Education. After this approval, and two weeks prior to the proposal meeting, the student should present to committee members a written proposal consisting of the rationale for the study, a literature review, and the methods section. Implementation of the study should not begin until the student has received approval from the both the Human Subjects Review and Early Research Committee. Students cannot take qualifying exams until their early research study is completed and defended.

The adviser should schedule a room for the proposal meeting and he/she should assist the student in preparing for this meeting. The faculty member who leads this meeting (the permanent adviser or a research adviser if this person is different from the permanent adviser) should follow the same format used during dissertation proposal meetings (e.g., ask the student to leave the room prior to beginning the meeting and following the student's presentation).

After the study has been conducted and written, the student presents the findings to the Early Research Committee. Again, the written study should be given to the committee two weeks prior to the oral presentation. If the study is successfully defended, and the student "passes", committee members sign the Early Research Requirement form and the adviser submits it to the Student Academic Affairs Office in the College of Education and the department secretary for placement in the student's file.

G. Policy for Qualifying Examinations

Department of Special Education

University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana

Approved by faculty, May 7, 2004, May 3, 2005 finally revised September 1, 2005

The purpose of qualifying examinations is to assure that students' core knowledge is sufficient to permit them to contribute to the scholarly community in their chosen area, and to determine their qualification for admission to the dissertation stage of doctoral study. The examinations provide information concerning students' ability to:

- a. Demonstrate an acceptable knowledge base in the field of special education and in areas of specialization;
- b. Integrate material from various sources in formulating responses;
- c. Constructively critique writings, practices, and/or research designs;
- d. Utilize research findings, expert opinion, and logic in a suitable manner in building arguments;
- e. Formulate statements which are logically organized, persuasive, and grammatically sound.

Overall Guidelines

1. Qualifying examinations will be offered twice per year, once in October and once in March.
2. Early Research studies must have been defended and the paper signed by the committee before the student is eligible to take qualifying examinations; at the Advisor's discretion, the student also may be required to complete any revisions of the Early Research project prior to being eligible to take the qualifying examinations. Written verification of the completion of the Early Research Experience requirement must be on file in the Student Academic Affairs Office. Students taking qualifying examinations also must have satisfactorily completed 40 hours of their required doctoral coursework, including the research specialization requirements, prior to taking the examinations.
3. General Field and Special Field exams four-hour format will be completed within one week of each other. If the Special Fields Portfolio option is selected in lieu of the four-hour format, it must be completed no later than the end of the semester following the one in which general fields were completed.

4. The Department Qualifying Examination Committee will be responsible for notifying students/advisors of specific dates for the upcoming qualifying examination prior to the end of the previous semester.

General Field

1. The Qualifying Examination Committee will distribute a list of revised topical areas from which examination questions will be drawn to all doctoral students and faculty a minimum of 2 months prior to the date selected for each examination if there are changes. Topical areas include research design, policy development and legislative issues, general knowledge and issues, assessment, service delivery, and personnel preparation.
2. The Chair of the Qualifying Examination Committee is responsible for working with the Department Admissions Secretary to process paperwork for the General Field examination (including paperwork prior to taking the qualifying examinations and paperwork subsequent to qualifying examinations), and distributing it to the appropriate offices/files in Special Education and in the College of Education; this responsibility includes assigning and following up on readers (to include three members of the Qualifying Examination Committee and the student's Advisor) for General Field exams. Evaluations by readers will be returned to the Chair of the Qualifying Examinations Committee or Departmental Secretary.
3. The standard format for the General Field examination is a four hour on-site examination. The Qualifying Examinations Committee along with the Advisor will work together to find a quiet office in which the student can work. No resources (notes, books, etc.) are permitted. Accommodations will be considered upon written request to the department Qualifying Examination Committee by the student and advisor 30 days prior to the examination date.

Special Field

The Special Fields portion of Qualifying Examinations is available in two formats. The student must decide with their advisor which format they will complete. The following describes each format.

– Standard Format

1. The Advisor is responsible for working with the student to form a committee of 3 members (including the advisor) to develop and read Special Field examinations, and providing this information to the Qualifying Examination Committee Chair, who completes the necessary paperwork. Standard format for the Special Field examination is a four-hour on-site examination (same as general field above).
2. The Advisor is responsible for informing the individual student of potential topical areas from which Special Field examination questions will be drawn, and/or for negotiating special emphases to be included on the examination; topics will be identified and discussed during the semester prior to the examination.
3. The Qualifying Examination Committee is responsible for distributing and collecting the Special Field examinations, and for distributing the completed examinations to readers. Evaluations by readers are returned to the Qualifying Examinations Committee Chair or the Department Admissions Secretary. The Special Fields portion of quals should be completed within one week of General Fields (i.e., four-hour format)

– Portfolio Format

1. The portfolio option of three high-quality manuscripts is available for those students for whom joint decision between the advisor and student has determined can be completed without delay of progress through the doctoral program. The portfolio format consists of assembling a focused collection of three high-quality papers and/or projects which are then defended before three faculty readers. The subject and length of the required papers or projects are decided by the adviser in consultation with the student. A written proposal for the portfolio option describing the three papers and identifying readers must be submitted to the Qualifying Examination Committee for approval the semester prior to beginning the exam.

2. The format for the Special Field Portfolio submissions can include collaborative work on which the student would be the senior author, but independent work must also be reflected in the portfolio. The portfolio may include content from other work completed to satisfy other requirements for the doctoral degree such as course papers, early research papers, master's theses, and Research Specialization papers. Suggested manuscripts for the Special Field portfolio include the following:
 - a. Early research paper revised for publication
 - b. Collaborative paper with other faculty and the student should be the first author
 - c. Individual effort which student completes specifically for the portfolio

The portfolio must be submitted with an original, independently written synthesis paper (maximum of five pages) that defines the special field and articulates how each piece of the portfolio connects or contributes to the special field and its literature. If the portfolio option is selected, the student will discuss this work at an oral defense before the three faculty readers, after which the readers will determine whether the student has demonstrated competence in the special field, or whether revisions are needed.

3. The portfolio option should be completed no later than the end of the semester following the one in which the general fields were completed.

A faculty member, upon agreeing to become any student's Permanent Advisor, should discuss the Special Fields options with that student. Both Advisor and student should target the First-Year Review as the point at which they will negotiate and propose their plan and timeline for completion. The student should develop a proposal for presentation to the First-Year Review Committee to include: a vita, a rationale for selecting the portfolio option, and a timeline for completing the portfolio option. The proposal will be presented in person to the First Year Review Committee and later to the Qualifying Examination Committee. Note: extra time will be scheduled into the first-year review of individuals if a portfolio proposal is to be considered.

Evaluation of Qualifying Examinations

1. The four-hour examination is based on the procedures of the College of Education; all examinations will be graded as exceptional, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. For each of these options, the final designation of exceptional, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory will be based on responses to the set of questions as a whole, based on the committee's judgment with respect to the student's knowledge and information of the broad field being sampled (i.e., General Field or Special Field).

Criteria used for grading include:

- a. Are responses factually correct and drawn from an adequate fund of information?
- b. Does the student demonstrate the ability to synthesize, to draw from various field, sources, and/or disciplines in formulating answers?
- c. Does the student demonstrate analytical thinking?
- d. Does the student make adequate use of research findings and other sources in the literature to buttress arguments?
- e. Does the student demonstrate a suitable grasp of skills in designing and critiquing research?
- f. Does the student communicate in a professional writing style?

The overriding criterion for assigning a grade is therefore whether the student demonstrates broad knowledge and the ability to organize and present it in a logical manner.

Time Frames - 4-hour examination

1. Completed examinations will be distributed to readers within 2 days of completion of the exam
2. Evaluations should be completed and results returned to the Qualls Committee within three weeks of receipt
3. Advisors will be informed of results within 2 days of receiving all evaluations; if all evaluations are satisfactory, students will also be informed.

Time Frames - portfolio

1. Portfolios (including the 3 person meeting) should be completed no later than the end of the semester following the one in which general fields were completed.

Follow-up Procedure for Unsatisfactory Examinations

1. The student will be given one opportunity to sit for a second set of examination questions for one or both of General Fields or Special Fields, based on the results of the evaluations from any of the options above, including the 3-paper portfolio option. This second examination is available in the 4-hour sit-down format. Students in the portfolio option will meet with the committee to decide whether to continue with revisions.
2. A new set of questions will be prepared for any re-taken examination; as with the original set, these new questions will be designed to sample the student's base of knowledge, and will be developed by the respective General and Special Fields committees, based on their collective judgment of the most appropriate content for that student.
3. Arrangements for any examinations to be re-taken should be made by the Advisor within two weeks of receiving the evaluations for either General or Special Fields, using the following procedure:
 - a. Advisor arranges to meet with the appropriate committee(s)
 - b. A new set of questions is developed (by the appropriate Committee) for one or both exams
 - c. Advisor makes arrangements with the student for re-taking the examinations, to occur within one month of discussions with the Advisor

Timelines for distribution, reading and evaluation are the same as above.

Any unsatisfactory evaluation on any part of the re-take will be taken by the Advisor to the readers as a committee, and then, if there is not general agreement for passing the examination, to the full faculty for discussion; this will occur at the first scheduled faculty meeting after the meeting of the team of readers, or at a specially called meeting if the Advisor judges this to be necessary. After discussion, the full faculty will make a recommendation as to the final outcome of the qualifying examination. It will be the responsibility of the Advisor to bring all relevant information to the meeting. Once all steps are completed, responsibility for forwarding all information to the College lies with the Qualifying Examination Committee Chair and the Department Admissions Secretary.

H. Policy for Academic Credit for Early Research Requirement and Qualifying Exams

1. Doctoral students the Department of Special Education may take no more than 8 hours (SP ED 591 or SP ED 595) for the Early Research Requirement of the Department and College of Education.
2. Independent Study hours (SP ED 595) may NOT be used for purposes of studying for Qualifying Exams.
3. Individual faculty advisors are responsible for monitoring these provisions.

I. Assistantship Information

An assistantship is an arrangement under which a student works a contracted percent of a 40-hour week for four months (Fall: August 16 - December 31; Spring: January 1 - May 15), in return for a monthly salary of the same contracted percent of about \$1500.00. In addition to paying a salary, the University pays nearly all the tuition and fees of the semesters worked plus the summer following any spring semester worked. Assistantships need not be from Special Education resources or from one's adviser. Graduate assistantships in the College of Education are typically not to exceed 50% FTE. For a graduate student to receive an assistantship appointment above 50%, the advisor and employing faculty or staff member must make a request to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The request should justify the need and stipulate that the additional work will not impede the student's progress toward his/her degree. Once the request is received, the student's academic record will be reviewed to ensure that he/she is making satisfactory progress. Requests for students that are not making satisfactory progress are unlikely to be approved.

Requests for approval of appointments over 50% should be submitted to the Student Academic Affairs Office (Rm. 110 Education Building). Requests can be made via email to Dean Leach (jleach@uiuc.edu) or Brenda Clevenger (bmclvnger@uiuc.edu). Hard copy requests may also be submitted. The expected turn around time for review and approval is 24-48 hours. No blanket approvals will be granted. Please note that even with Dean Leach's approval, there may be reasons other than academics that would prohibit a student from being appointed over 50%, such as visa and fellow status.

Teaching Assistant Orientation

All doctoral students serving as a teaching assistant for a special education course must attend the UIUC Teaching Assistant Orientation Sessions held at the beginning of the first semester they are employed in this position. International teaching assistants must attend the International Teaching Assistant Orientation as well as the UIUC Teaching Assistant Orientation Sessions.

The Office of Instructional Resources web site provides details about both of these Orientation Sessions and subsequent follow-up activities (<http://www.oir.uiuc.edu/Did/TAs/index.htm>).

Evaluation

Teaching Assistants and Research Assistants in the Department of Special Education are evaluated by their immediate supervisor each semester. The completed evaluation is shared with the student and a copy of the evaluation is kept in the student's permanent file. Student assistantship evaluation ratings are taken into consideration when students are being recommended for continued funding.

Semester _____ Year _____

Evaluation Form (TA/RA/ GA Supervision)

Evaluator _____ Student being evaluated _____

Student Position (i.e., Course TA, Grant-RA, Supervisor, Other) _____

Rating scale: 1.....2.....3.....4 NA – not applicable

1 = Falls well below expectations

2 = Falls below expectations

3 = Meets expectations

4 = Exceeds expectations

Please rate the student’s performance on the following items:

<p>1. Demonstrates initiative in completing tasks.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>2. Is reliable (shows up on time, attends necessary meetings, contacts supervisor if needs to miss or rearrange hours).</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>3. Completes tasks in a timely fashion.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>4. Exercises care and thoroughness in completing tasks.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>5. Maintains positive, pleasant, and professional interactions with others.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>

<p>6. Is flexible in completing the demands of the job.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>7. Communicates well with the faculty supervisor (including seeking additional information when needed).</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>8. Is accountable for work hours.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>
<p>9. Maintains confidentiality in interactions with others.</p> <p>Comments:</p>	<p>1 2 3 4 NA</p>

I would _____ would not _____ recommend that this student serve as a:

_____ Teaching Assistant _____ Research Assistant
 _____ Supervisor _____ Other (describe) _____
 _____ Graduate Assistant

I have read and been given a copy of this completed evaluation form.

Student's Signature _____ Date: _____

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date: _____

IV. Appendices

- A. What makes a good mentor?
- B. How to choose a thesis adviser
- C. The 5 Virtues of Successful Graduate Students:

(Visit <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2003/09/2003090201c.htm>)

A. What Makes a Good Mentor

**Co-authored by University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Graduate College Assistant Deans
Lamar Riley Murphy and Gaye Wong
April 30, 1997**

The Graduate College Award for Outstanding Mentoring of Graduate Students is a new award, created upon recommendation of the Graduate Student Advisory Council. The award recognizes exemplary efforts by the graduate faculty in advising and serving graduate students. This award was presented for the first time in 1996 - 1997.

What is it about the nominees and winners that make them regarded as excellent mentors? What special qualities do they have? In the nomination materials -- which included letters from students, faculty, and essays by the nominees themselves -- several characteristics appeared repeatedly.

Respectful: Good mentors treat their students with respect and trust, viewing them as invaluable but inexperienced junior colleagues. They see graduate students as apprentices; it is their responsibility, privilege, and reward to guide students successfully through that apprenticeship. As one nominee phrased it, "Working closely with one's adviser is more than a supplement to formal instruction; it is the core of the matter." Good mentors act in accordance with their vision that their students are, in the words of a nominee, "important partners in learning, teaching, and research."

Committed: Good mentors make "an investment of faith in the growth potential of students," starting at the beginning of graduate school -- or earlier -- and continuing well beyond graduation, eventually evolving into a collegial relationship. This commitment manifests itself every day and in every facet of graduate training and professional socialization. As one nominee put it, "That commitment must be very broad, including not only counsel on acquiring intellectual skills likely to be of later value, but direct guidance on everything from public speaking style to the management of career details such as nuances of interaction with journal editors and academic/corporate politics, to name only two."

Demanding: Good mentors have high standards for themselves and their students, and they constantly strive for excellence. Wrote a former student, "He always guided me in a direction that was within my reach to complete the work, but clearly had me challenged to the maximum extent of my abilities." Good mentors are sensitive to the toll such high expectations can take on students' self-confidence, and they consciously endeavor to build rather than erode self-esteem. Explained one former student, "[My mentor's] distinctive mentoring style allowed me room to stumble, to take blind alleys and wrong turns, but always made me know I was accompanied on the journey. [My mentor] encouraged even as he criticized, and he criticized frequently."

Adaptable: Good mentors recognize that different students have different needs and strengths. In fact, the best mentors capitalize on such differences by tailoring training opportunities to the needs and

aspirations of each student. Good mentors do not force students to adapt to their own styles; rather, good mentors adapt their approaches to the needs of individual students. A former student said his mentor had an "uncanny ability to match his style of mentorship to the student's disposition. He seemed to know exactly how to critique and motivate each of us in ways that revealed our deficiencies but left us invigorated for the next attempt." Since students are continually developing throughout their graduate careers, effective mentoring also requires a process of continual reassessment and readjustment. What is common to all effective mentoring, however, is, in one mentor's words, "very personal attention" and "quick and detailed feedback."

Available: Despite their own busy schedules, good mentors are accessible, and approachable, not only to their own current and previous advisees but to other students as well. Their doors are literally always open to their students, and they are available at nights, on weekends, and while on sabbatical. Marveled one student, "[My mentor] always gave me his undivided attention, although he had countless other commitments." Another wrote, "One of [his] students once told me that he worked so hard to turn around a draft of his dissertation proposal in a timely manner because it embarrassed him that [his adviser] was working harder on it than he was."

Encouraging: Good mentors encourage students to develop their own ideas by giving the kind of feedback that promotes a sense of independence, responsibility, and self-confidence. They encourage students to experiment and teach them not to fear mistakes. Said one former student about his mentor, "He hands his students the rope and shows them how not to hang themselves." Another mentor was said to have the "knack of giving comments in a way that elicited rather than imposed ideas." Another student attested to the importance of this approach: "[He] was the first teacher in my entire college career to take my work seriously. His encouragement, regard, rigor, and attention to my work were contagious, and I began for the first time to take myself seriously because he took me seriously." Indeed, the intellectual passion and enthusiasm that good mentors communicate to their students is contagious. Students find inspiration in their examples, and are further inspired when they realize that they are being encouraged to pursue topics far beyond the particular expertise of the mentor.

Proactive: Good mentors do not wait for their students to seek them out with questions or problems. Good mentors have frequent formal and informal meetings with their students, and they aggressively make available and encourage participation in meaningful professional development activities. The nominating materials abound with anecdotes about students whose lack of self-confidence, experience, or foresight would -- without the intervention of a mentor -- have kept them from pursuing an opportunity that later proved to be extremely beneficial. Good mentors also provide opportunities for other students in their programs. One nominee, for instance, has improved professional development opportunities for all of the students in his department by instituting such programs as a graduate "buddy" system, faculty-graduate student round tables on graduate and professional issues, and various colloquia on job search and interview techniques.

Nurturing: "Good mentors," wrote a former student, "nurture the careers of their students. They introduce them to the right people, they are generous with credit and praise, they put in good words in the right ears which result in the earliest professional opportunities, they encourage after setbacks. In short, they spend the credit of their hard earned reputations to advance their students." Good mentors spend significant amounts of their time promoting the careers of their students, beginning with the earliest days of graduate school and continuing well beyond the first job.

Holistic: Good mentors view the educational process as encompassing much more than mastery of a particular academic subject. As a former student explained about his mentor, "after spending my graduate career with [him], I know now that an educated individual knows more than the contents of numerous text books and journal articles. An educated individual is knowledgeable about the world around him, tolerates any and all views, goes out of his way to make others a better person and accepts nothing less than the best possible effort."

Influential: "An adviser," wrote one finalist, "has the responsibility to be a positive role model..." Good mentors, as she and the other finalists suggest, practice what they preach. Noted another professor, "students learn at least as much by first-hand observation of you... as they do by what you tell them." Good mentors have influence that extends far beyond the students with whom they have personally been involved, so that their influence ripples through succeeding generations of students. Wrote one student about the three years he spent studying with one nominee, "Three years is not a long time in my life. However, three years studying with [her] has changed my whole life." Another of this professor's students made a similar testimonial, concluding that her "impact over the generations is immeasurable."

B. How to Choose a Thesis Adviser

Michael C. Loui
Associate Dean of the Graduate College
Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering
February 5, 1997

Choosing a thesis adviser is the most important decision of your life—perhaps more important than choosing a spouse—because your choice affects everything you will do in your career. Indeed, choosing an adviser is similar to getting married: it is making a long-term commitment. Unlike marriage, however, a good advising relationship should end successfully within a few years. Also, unlike husband and wife, the adviser and student do not start as equals. At first, the relationship is essentially an apprenticeship. But although you start as an apprentice, ideally, you should end as a colleague.

As you consider which professor might serve as an adviser, you should first formulate your goals in undertaking thesis research. A thesis demonstrates your ability to make an original, significant contribution to the corpus of human knowledge. Through your thesis project, you develop skills useful in any career: critical reading of the scholarly or scientific literature, formulation and solution of a problem, clear written and oral communication of the results. Furthermore, you learn the practices of a particular scholarly community: theoretical frameworks and experimental paradigms, publication processes, and standards of professional behavior. You learn how to present a paper at a seminar or a conference, and how to give and receive criticism. You should seek a thesis adviser who can help you meet your goals, and whose working style is compatible with yours. Here are some specific steps that you can take to find an adviser.

Take a course with a potential adviser, possibly individual study. In an individual study course, you can learn about the professor's working style, with a limited, one semester commitment between you and the professor. The individual study course might involve directed reading, with the goal of producing a survey article that could serve as the basis for a thesis. Or the individual study course might involve a small project in the professor's laboratory.

Ask for copies of grant proposals that describe research projects of possible interest to you. A grant proposal states research problems, explains the importance of the problems in the context of other research, and describes recent progress, including the professor's contributions. Usually, a proposal includes references to journal articles and books that you can look up. You do not need the budget part of the proposal, which contains confidential information about salaries.

Consider working with two advisers. If you are interested in an interdisciplinary project, then you could engage two official advisers, one in each discipline. Even if you choose only one official adviser, you may occasionally seek advice from a second professor, who can provide an alternate perspective. Some departments institutionalize this practice by requiring that the chair of a doctoral committee be different from the thesis adviser. Discuss these arrangements with both professors openly, to minimize possible misunderstandings about each professor's role.

Interview a potential adviser. What are the adviser's standards and expectations for the quality of the thesis, such as the overall length? Will the adviser help formulate the research topic?

How quickly will the adviser review drafts of manuscripts? Will the adviser help you improve writing and speaking skills? Will the adviser encourage publication of your work?

Will the adviser provide equipment and materials? Will the adviser obtain financial support such as funds to travel to conferences or research assistantships? Will the adviser help you find appropriate employment? Where have former students gone?

What will your responsibilities be? Will you write proposals or make presentations to research sponsors?

How frequently will you meet with the adviser? *The most common problem in the humanities and social sciences is insufficiently frequent contact with the adviser.* I meet with each of my own thesis students individually for one hour each week, in addition to a weekly group meeting.

What are the obligations to the project funding source? How frequently are reports required? Are deliverables promised? Could publications be delayed by a patent filing? Are there potential conflicts of interest?

How will decisions on co-authorship of papers be made? In engineering and natural sciences, co-authorship is common, but practices vary by discipline. Sometimes, the adviser's name always goes last. Sometimes, the order of names is alphabetical. Sometimes, the first author is the person whose contribution was greatest.

Interview former students. Students who have graduated are more likely to answer your questions candidly than current students. Ask a potential adviser for names and e-mail addresses of former students, whom you can contact.

Was a former student's project unnecessarily prolonged? Did anyone not finish? Why not? Many projects suffer unanticipated delays. Occasionally, for various reasons—not always the adviser's fault—students do not finish theses and dissertations.

How were conflicts resolved? When you work closely with someone else, disagreements are inevitable. The key question is whether conflicts were handled respectfully, with satisfactory resolutions.

If you have a major conflict with your adviser, first attempt to find solutions within your department, consulting another trusted professor, other members of your committee, or the department head. Should you be unable to find a solution by working with people in your department, be assured that we in the Graduate College are available to help mediate conflicts. Fortunately, major conflicts are rare. It is most likely that you will enjoy a successful, intellectually satisfying thesis project.

V. Guidelines for Ph. D. Program Activities and Program Activities Checklist (Doc Plan)

1. The Ph.D. Program Activities Checklist is to be completed by the student in conjunction with the student's temporary adviser during the student's first semester in the program. The completed Checklist should include details of the first year with a general outline of the following years.
2. The following sequence of program requirements must be followed.
 - A. The First Year Review is to be completed prior to defense of the Early Research Requirement.
 - B. The College of Education Early Research Requirement and at least 32 hours of substantive coursework must be completed prior to admission to the Qualifying Exams.
 - C. RMAS requirements must be completed prior to admission to the Qualifying Exams.
 - D. The Qualifying Exams must be successfully completed before the Preliminary Oral Examination will be scheduled.
3. The checklist should be updated by the permanent adviser and the student at least once each semester.
4. The checklist is to be kept in the student's file in the main office.
5. The adviser will report to program faculty on the student's progress at least once each year until the student successfully defends his/her dissertation.