September 2018

Information School
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Doctoral Student

P R O G R A M

P L A N N I N G

G U I D E

I. PHD PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES

The Graduate School establishes the basic requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy degree at the University of Wisconsin. According to the Graduate School:

> The doctor of philosophy [and other doctorates] are the highest degrees conferred at UW–Madison. None are conferred solely as a result of any prescribed period of study, no matter how faithfully pursued. The Ph.D. degree is a research degree and is granted on evidence of general proficiency, distinctive attainment in a special field, and particularly on ability for independent investigation as demonstrated in a dissertation presenting original research or creative scholarship with a high degree of literary skill. (http://guide.wisc.edu/graduate/)

The Graduate School's regulations for doctoral programs can be found at: The requirements and guidelines in this document are specific to the Information School, and developed and approved by the iSchool faculty.

A. PURPOSES AND SCOPE OF PROGRAM

The doctoral program in library and information studies is designed to meet two major professional needs: (a) the development of the body of principles and theory that will elaborate and make effective the field of library and information studies, and (b) the preparation of research-competent scholars who will exercise their understanding and skills in a diversity of teaching and research functions in the field.

Learning goals and objectives of the doctoral program are as follows:
1. Prepare students to be effective researchers in library and information science (LIS) and cognate fields.
   a. Students will be able to employ specific methodologies appropriate to areas of study.
      i. By having papers accepted at recognized conferences and journals
      ii. By passing mastery demonstration (MD) papers
      iii. By including a research methods statement in the portfolio
   b. Students will be able to demonstrate basic capacities to employ new digital data collection and analysis methodologies.
      i. By including a digital data collection and analysis methodologies statement in the portfolio
   c. Students will be able to demonstrate mastery of scholarly writing genre.
      i. By having papers accepted at recognized conferences and journals
      ii. By passing MD papers
   d. Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of a range of theories in research areas as well as core LIS theories.
      i. By completing breadth requirements
      ii. By completing minor requirements
      iii. By including a theoretical approaches statement in the portfolio
   e. Students will be able to add to existing bodies of theory, scholarship or scientific knowledge through critique, testing or extension in scholarly output.
      i. By completing a satisfactory dissertation
      ii. By having papers accepted at recognized scholarly journals
   f. Students will be able to demonstrate scholarly excellence.
      i. By having papers accepted at recognized conferences and journals
2. To prepare students to be effective postsecondary teachers in LIS and cognate fields.
   a. Students will be able to demonstrate strong oral communication skills.
      i. By completing teaching practicum
      ii. By giving presentations in conferences or workshops
   b. Students will be able to demonstrate skills and experience in teaching.
      i. By completing teaching practicum
      ii. By completing a teaching assistantship or lectureship successfully
3. To prepare students to participate as professionals and provide effective service to the LIS academic community.
   a. Students will be able to demonstrate involvement in the LIS academic community.
      i. By attending conferences
      ii. By participating in university academic activities (e.g., STS, interdisciplinary programs)

B. ADMISSIONS TO THE PROGRAM

The specific admissions requirements are set forth in:

The Information School must recommend to the Graduate School admittance of all applicants to the doctoral program in library and information studies. The admission requires a completed application form and official transcripts from all colleges and universities that the applicant has attended. At present, the Graduate School requires an undergraduate grade point average of 3.00 or better based on a 4.00 scale. In addition, the Information School requires the following:

- A grade point average of 3.00 or better in the last 60 hours of academic credit earned.
- A completed master's degree in library and information studies or another appropriate field.
- Valid GRE scores
- TOEFL scores that meet the UW Graduate School minimum
- A written statement of the area of research interest and the purpose for pursuing doctoral study (see application)
- An interview with the PhD Committee or other faculty members serving on the committee's behalf.

For applicants whose grade point average is below 3.00, other requirements mentioned above must provide evidence of academic ability. (Advice on additional type of evidence appropriate to the applicant should be requested from the Director.) While a master's degree in library and information studies and professional experience are often considered the most useful preparation for the programs of doctoral students, equivalent background in related fields that point to the student's scholarly interests and potential may also be appropriate.

The applicant's qualification for admission will be reviewed by the School's PhD Committee, which will make an admission recommendation to the Director. The Director or designee, in turn, will make a recommendation to the Graduate School. The criteria used in this review are the probability that the School's doctoral program will meet the goals of the applicant and that the applicant will be able to complete the program successfully. Under certain circumstances, admission may be approved on a probationary basis or with deficiencies. Students will not normally be permitted to continue longer than the first year in a probationary status.

Applicants will be notified of the School's admission recommendation by the Director of the Information School.

C.   PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

The doctoral program is designed to give the student (1) a broad general knowledge of the field of library and information studies, (2) an in-depth knowledge of an area of specialty, and (3) research skills necessary to conduct research in the student's area of special interest.

Information School requirements incorporate the minimum UW Graduate School requirements, which cannot be waived by the Information School.

1. General Requirements

a)   Credit Requirements

The Graduate School requires a minimum of 32 graduate-level credits taken at University of Wisconsin-Madison after admission to the doctoral program before achieving dissertator status. The minimum credit requirement for a Information School Ph.D. degree is a total of 51 credits including 999s and 990s. Up to 10 credits may include approved transfer credits or credits taken before admission to the Ph.D. program; however, the credits may not be more than 10 years old.

b)   Credit Hours for Assistants and Fellows: Regular Semesters

For complete rules surrounding minimum credit hours for appointment as a teaching assistant, project assistant, research assistant, instructor, or fellow, please see the Graduate School's website (Enrollment Requirements section).

c)   Course Distributions

Course work, as a whole must contribute to a rationally unified program of study and research. In addition to work in Information Studies at the iSchool, PhD students must also complete a minor.

(1)   Information Studies (see LIS Subject Area Knowledge below)

(2)   The Minor

The minor broadens the conceptual base for the student. If the minor is in a single department (Option A), the requirements of that department must be met. If divided among two or more departments (Option B), it must consist of at least twelve credits selected to build a unified minor. Option B can be appropriate to the library and information studies doctoral program since library and information theory builds on research and principles in a diversity of other academic disciplines and professional fields. Further, library and information studies research frequently involves not only the theory and technique of library and information studies but also the substantive materials in the diverse fields of knowledge and the greatly varied community and institutional contexts (school, research institute, general community) within which library and other information services are provided. The intent of the minor is not met with basic courses taken to meet the Research skills requirement.

d)   Policy on Library and Information Science Minor for Doctoral Students in Other Fields

An Information School faculty member, serving as minor field adviser, shall determine the adequacy of the library and information science preparation. Using as a guideline the completion of a minimum of twelve (12) credits in library and information science, the adviser judges that the courses compose a unified program which will equip the student appropriately. Throughout the student's progress, the student must keep the iSchool faculty member informed by appropriate means, such as early consultation, notification of dissertation topic proposal, and service as a member of the reading committee for the dissertation.

e)   Good Academic Standing

To remain in good academic standing within the iSchool PhD program, a student must maintain a 3.5 overall GPA, not carry any incomplete grades in courses (other than 999s) for more than 1 semester, and they must pass all mastery demonstration papers by appointed deadlines.

A student who fails to meet any of the above criteria will receive a letter of warning from the PhD program director placing them on probationary status. They will have one additional semester (not including summer) to change their status. If they do not successfully change their status, then they will be asked to leave the program.

If the student does not expect to successfully change their status within the probationary semester, they can request that the PhD committee grant a probation extension; however, an extension will only be granted if the student can prove likelihood of success in the upcoming semester.   The student should send a letter asking for an extension and providing evidence of likelihood of success to the PhD program director.

2. Content Areas Requiring Demonstration of Mastery

In order to be admitted into PhD candidacy, students would need to prove mastery in three main areas through the use of a portfolio and obtain approval for three scholarly "mastery demonstration" papers by a jury of faculty.   This section describes the three areas of mastery:

Mastery Area A: LIS Subject Area Knowledge
Mastery Area B: Research Methods
Mastery Area C: Theoretical Approaches

a)   LIS Subject Area Knowledge

Students are expected to gain:
1)   a broad background in library and information studies (LIS) research/scholarship
2)   In-depth knowledge in an area of specialty.

Students show development of a broad background knowledge of the field by completing coursework from across three out of the four content areas: Use, Users and Context; Information Organization and Access; Cultural Philosophies, Histories and Debates; Information Policy, Management and Institutions. Information School PhD seminars are preferred; however if no PhD Information School seminar is available, an alternative Information School course may be recommended by the PhD program director and the student's advisor.

The student's specialty area shall be a subdivision or mix of any of these broad areas. Students demonstrate in-depth knowledge of a

specialty area through a combination of more coursework, topics of MD papers, independent studies, etc.

The content of these areas is detailed below.

(1)   Use, Users and Context

This area explores the information needs and information behavior of people in various roles, situations, environments, and contexts that go beyond traditional places like libraries. It explores the factors that influence the user's needs and behavior.

The content area may include, but is not limited to: 1) critical evaluation of a number of paradigms for studying information behavior; 2) critical evaluation of the theoretical frameworks, models and research methods used to study information behavior; 3) critical evaluation and use of findings from information user and behavior studies for the improvement, provision and design of information systems, products and services; 4) explanation and/or prediction of the information behavior patterns of specific user groups in a context, and 5) systematic evaluation of information systems, products and services designed for specific user groups.

Competences in this content area may be demonstrated through works in areas, such as: User-centered design of systems/services, the reference interview, bibliographic instruction, community needs assessment, information behavior of a specific user group, etc.

(2)   Information Organization and Access Systems

In this concentration students examine sociotechnical systems through which individuals and groups arrange information (in all its cultural forms) and enable or enact its transfer and retrieval. It highlights the fact that the organization, retrieval and use of information takes place in different places and times with different people or groups of people and that each place, time or group of people experience real-world advantages and constraints. Sociotechnical systems may encompass computer and network hardware and software, heuristics, ontologies, particular divisions of labor, and distributions of power. The concentration consists of three inter-related perspectives: 1) information organization; 2) information transfer; and 3) information retrieval.

The "organization" or arrangement of information refers to the cognitive, ethical and cultural processes by which people create rules for the arrangement of things, the application of those rules to information, people, places and things, and the social and cultural implications of that application.

Information "transfer" examines the movement of information from one person, place or time to another. The "retrieval" of information refers both to the informal and the formal acquisition of information from a system (as defined above) and includes the cognitive, social, historical and philosophical influences on acquisition, advantages and constraints for acquisition, and the social or ethical implications of the acquisition.

The concentration area includes, but is not limited to, LIS research topics such as classification theory and social construction of classification schemes, index relationships and XML, information retrieval and data mining, digital libraries, metadata, human computer interaction, knowledge management, community networks and computer mediated communications.

(3)   Cultural Histories, Philosophies and Debates

Research topics in this area may include both US-centric and global studies of:

1) the historical roles of individuals, events, places, social and intellectual movements, and economic conditions in the development of libraries and information agencies of all types;

2) the philosophical underpinnings of librarianship and information studies, including the key debates over the definition (and value) of "information" itself and the proper relationship between "information" and "society" ;

3) intellectual freedom and the rights guaranteed by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, including implications for social, political and economic relationships

4) social justice in terms of differential access to the means of information consumption and production (including skills, tools, and sites) based on various group and individual characteristics such as income, gender, age, occupation, family status, geography, nationality, education, race/ethnicity, language, sexual orientation, religious/philosophical beliefs, political/organizational affiliation and the like.

The area of "cultural histories, philosophies and debates" begins with the historical and philosophical foundations of the field of LIS, especially within the US, as it has been transformed over time from a strong tradition of librarianship, rooted in print, in place, and in public institutions, to a broader notion of information studies. Information studies involve many different kinds of media, at various spatial and temporal scales, within a variety of different public and private institutions.

Second, since history and philosophy may be descriptive and normative, careful attention to political and cultural debates within this long and ongoing period of change is crucial. Social processes involving information-based technologies, occupations, places, institutions, laws, users, and uses inevitably involve personal and legal judgments about both the purpose of information in the proper functioning of society, and the proper structure of society to enable it to effectively maintain, disseminate, and increase its information capital. Indeed, the very definition of "information" (as distinct from either "data" or "knowledge") involves an important normative judgment.

Finally, since societies inevitably differ across time and space, the various histories, philosophies and debates of LIS must always be contextualized within a broader cultural framework. Students will recognize cultural diversity in choices concerning information production and consumption, and understand cultural divides in access to skills, tools, and sites of information production and consumption.

(4)　　　*Information Policy, Management and Institutions*

The area of Information Policy, Management and Institutions includes three components that provide structure and context for LIS theory and practice:

(1) "Policy" incorporates federal, state, and local policy and other legal precedents pertaining to information management and use. This highlights the uneven legal and political geographies over which information-based institutions, such as libraries, museums, etc., must act in order to serve their multiple users in a rapidly evolving world of structural global, economic and policy demands that are often in tension with contingent local economies.

(2) "Management" encompasses an institution's mission within a changing and competitive external environment of technology and labor, as well as financial, political, social, and information resources. This includes internal organizational policies as they relate to informational, financial and human resources. These organizations include, but are not limited to libraries.

(3) "Institutions" focuses on that information and those information processes that are mediated by a diverse mix of organizations and that are affected by institutional governance, purpose, funding and size.

The content area may include, but is not limited to:
Information policy formulation, implementation, analysis, and evaluation, including public policy vis-à-vis information and communication issues. Relationships between organizational mission and information resources management, including the role of systems analysis, information and knowledge management audits, IT infrastructure design, development, implementation and evaluation. Organizational patterns in all types of institutions that impact the creation, organization, utility, evaluation and dissemination of information that may exist in a variety of cultural forms, including human and non-human resources and systems.

Students specializing in this area would be able to explain organizational theories, policy formulation approaches, and be able to view and evaluate information resources and services through a public policy lens.

b)　　　**Research Methods**

In order to meet the goals of the program to provide broad general knowledge, in-depth knowledge in a special area, and research skills required to complete a dissertation, each student is required to demonstrate knowledge of at both quantitative and qualitative research approaches and methods. The purpose of this requirement is to support critical reading of research literature as well as to permit, if appropriate, the design and conduct of dissertation research that uses qualitative and/or statistical data analysis.

To show mastery, students should at a minimum take the following courses:

- LIS 603: Research and Evaluation Methods for Library and Information Studies (or approved equivalent)
- LIS 910: Seminar in Research Design and Methodology for Library and Information Studies
- 2 semesters statistics through ANOVA
- 1 semester qualitative data collection & analysis

Completing comparable graduate courses at a peer institution may demonstrate research knowledge. Statistics knowledge attained should be at the level of multivariate analysis, including the ANOVA (analysis of variance).

c)   **Theoretical Approaches**

Students would need to show expertise in two of the following theoretical approaches. Students should develop expertise in the theoretical frameworks they select for their dissertation as approved by the advisor:

- Socio-political theories: Political science, sociology, policy, economics, ethics, jurisprudence
- Psychology theories: Cognitive psychology, social psychology, developmental psychology, perception, etc.
- Paradigms: Different traditions within philosophy of science (e.g., pragmatism, positivism, post-positivism), epistemology, ontology
- Critical theory: Gender, race, culture, able-ness, power, public spheres
- Organizational theories: Theories of organizational change, leadership, management, work practices, professions
- Historiography and geography: Social construction & production of time and space, temporal/spatial processes, theories of place, politics of canon formation, public history

Knowledge about theoretical approaches will be obtained through LIS 910 and other coursework both inside and outside the Information School.

3. **Major Program Passage Points and Requirements**

The following sections outline key milestones in student progress toward the PhD. Students will provide documentation of their progress through the program and other academic activities by completing the "Ph.D. Student Progress Form" by 5pm on the **first Friday of Spring semester** each year.

a)   Progress Evaluation

The purpose of the progress evaluation is to provide an early point of feedback and counseling for the student. To this end, a formal review of the student's progress is conducted at the end of the first three semesters of full-time or part-time study.

As a part of this review, the student submits (at least 2 weeks prior to the progress evaluation) the first of three mastery demonstration papers for evaluation by the PhD Committee. The student selects the paper from among those written during the period of study under review, usually as part of a course requirement. The paper should, at a minimum, demonstrate the student's ability to investigate, synthesize, and interpret the literature of some part of library and information studies. It is reviewed in terms of the evaluation criteria outlined for MD papers in the Appendix.

At the meeting, the student will speak to the work reflected in the first MD paper with the PhD Committee. In addition, the discussion can cover the student's general progress, the student's thoughts about a minor field, the student's schedule for completion of the degree, and other topics relevant to the student's performance and progress. The Committee's role is to assess whether the student has the potential to complete the requirements for the degree, and whether the program is capable of offering the resources needed by the student. Therefore, it is not intended to be a public occasion. On the basis of the discussion, the Committee develops observations and recommendations for the student, and the chair of the Committee reports these to the student and notifies the Director (or designee) of the completion of the process. Evaluation may result a recommendation that the student not continue with the iSchool PhD program.

b)   Teaching and Research Experience

(1)   Teaching Practicum

Each student is required to fulfill at least one teaching practicum. The purpose of the teaching practicum is to ensure that each advanced studies student has basic experience in LIS teaching including the skills of course planning, materials development, presentation of materials, leading discussions and evaluating student work. Practicum outputs also provide evidence of teaching ability. The practicum may be taken for credit, or may be taken for no credit. The maximum number of teaching practicum that may be taken for credit is 1; any additional teaching practicum may not be taken for credit.

To fulfill a practicum requirement, the PhD Committee recommends that students approach the faculty who teaches a course with which they would like to gain experience. The student and faculty will prepare a "contract" (see Appendix D) describing the student's obligations. Because the purpose of the practicum is to gain LIS teaching experience, the teaching practicum should be taken with a iSchool faculty member. Students may fulfill their practicum requirement by working as a TA for a iSchool class, but they must provide evidence that their TA experience fulfilled all the practicum requirements (see practicum evidence below). Students who have taught LIS courses at other institutions may petition the PhD Committee to allow their previous experience to fulfill their teaching practicum requirement. This petition should also be accompanied by evidence of teaching as outlined below. Students cannot fulfill their practicum requirement by doing presentations in a class they are currently taking, or by giving presentations at colloquia.

The teaching practicum should be equivalent to 1 week's worth of teaching work for a course or approximately 45 hours worth of effort. It must include the following elements: course planning, preparation of materials such as readings, handouts or slides, lecture or presentation, leading discussion and evaluating student comprehension of material.

Evidence showing fulfillment of practicum requirements may include (but is not limited to):
- description of the goals of the practicum and how the material covered helped students meet broader course objectives
- a reading list
- examples of the classroom students' work or completed assignments
- outline of lecture
- contract signed by faculty sponsor at the end of the practicum to indicate completion of agreed upon responsibilities. This signed contract is proof that the student has completed the practicum
- A half page of written feedback provided by the faculty sponsor including elements of classroom student evaluation of the advanced studies student's teaching

All evidence should be maintained in the student's portfolio. A copy of the contract signed by the faculty sponsor is a proof document and should also be maintained in the portfolio. A copy of the proof document should be given to the Ph.D. program coordinator (Assistant to the iSchool Director). Faculty who agree to sponsor a practicum are responsible for providing a half-page of written feedback – thus a practicum should only be conducted when the faculty sponsor is available to observe and provide feedback.

(2)   Pedagogy Course

In addition, students are required to take LIS639: Pedagogical theory & practices for information professionals (or equivalent) to improve their teaching skills.

(3)   Research Practicum

Each student is required to fulfill at least two different research practica. The purpose of the research practicum is to ensure that each advanced studies student has basic experience in several areas of research (e.g., literature review, study design, data collection, data analysis, report writing), to familiarize students with faculty research, and promote collaboration between advanced studies students and faculty. Each practicum may be taken for credit, or may be taken for no credit. If the practicum is taken for credit, then the student should register for 2 separate 1 credit practicum. Each practicum must include at least 45 hours worth of work. The maximum number of research practicum that may be taken for credit is two.

To fulfill a practicum requirement, the PhD Committee recommends that students approach a faculty whose research area interests the student. Further, faculty are encouraged to periodically announce practicum opportunities to make students aware of research possibilities. Students are encouraged to do their practica with two different faculty in order to gain experience with different research areas. Students are also encouraged to design each of the two practica to focus on a different research skill. For example, the first practicum could focus on creating a literature review, while the second practicum could involve data collection. Each practicum may also involve more than one skill.

A practicum may be taken with faculty outside of iSchool as long as the outside faculty ensures that the practicum meets the iSchool research practicum requirements and provides the feedback required on the iSchool practicum form.

A research practicum cannot be fulfilled as part of a course, but a course project could be extended into a research practicum if the student can find a faculty sponsor. A practicum can be extended into an independent study, but it cannot constitute the whole of an independent study.

Student and faculty sponsor should prepare a research practicum contract (see Appendix E). This defines the tasks, priorities,

deliverables, due dates, and number of hours to spend on each task. As part of the contract, the faculty sponsor must write a brief explanation of how the student's work contributes to the overall research and the student's personal research interests.

At the end of the practicum the faculty sponsor signs the contract indicating that all tasks have been satisfactorily completed. This contract should be maintained in the student's portfolio and is proof that the student has fulfilled the practicum requirement. A copy should be given to the Ph.D. program coordinator (Assistant to the iSchool Director). Students may also wish to maintain samples of research practicum outputs in their portfolio as evidence of experience in or mastery of particular research methods or particular theoretical areas.

c)   Mastery Demonstration Papers

Doctoral students will demonstrate mastery of the required subject areas and research skills through three mastery demonstration (MD) papers and a research portfolio (see appendices).

The first of these MD papers will be presented at the *end of the first three semesters of study* (usually in December). This requirement will be a critical aspect of the student's Progress Evaluation conducted by the members of the PhD Committee.

The second MD paper must be submitted by the end of the student's 5th semester, or the completion of 36 credit hours of the PhD program.

The third (and final) MD paper must be submitted by the end of the student's 7th semester. The final MD paper must be completed prior to the portfolio and defense meeting.

A student may seek an appeal of the 3rd MD submission date to avoid not being in good academic standings. An example of grounds for such an appeal would be difficulties getting IRB approval that are beyond the student's control. Such appeal will consist of a letter to the PhD Committee outlining and documenting the reasons for the delay, a description of work completed on the project to date, a proposed date of submission, and a letter of support from the student's academic advisor.

IRB approval is required for all studies written up as MD papers, unless the MD paper does not involve human subjects. Regardless of whether an MD paper requires IRB approval, each student must successfully complete the Human Subjects tutorial by the time she or he submits the first MD paper.

The three papers should ideally address the students' research focus. Students may revise papers prepared for classes and submit them for the MD requirement. Before submission, students must get feedback on the paper from one tenured or tenure-track faculty, either as part of a course for which the paper was written, or independently thereof, and the paper should be revised on the basis of that feedback. The revision may be done in the context of a particular journal in which the paper may appear.

At least 2 of the student's papers should be submitted to a refereed journal, conference, or book chapter prior to the portfolio defense.

The professor who has taught the course in which the paper was originally presented will usually serve as a "gatekeeper" throughout the MD paper requirement process. The student may elect any willing member of the faculty to serve as the gatekeeper for an MD paper prepared in a course. In the event that the paper was presented outside of a course, the student will be required to find a faculty member willing to approve the paper as a MD submission, as well as serve as the "gatekeeper." A jury of three faculty members (one of which will be the "gatekeeper") selected by the student will evaluate two of the MD papers. (The first would have been evaluated by the PhD Committee.) A list of evaluation criteria for use by the jury can be found in Appendix C. The evaluation criteria will include a required literature review component, as well as making a novel contribution to relevant scholarly conversations. MD papers may be turned in at any time, excluding summers.

(1)   MD Paper Outcomes

The MD papers may receive three scores: accept, accept with revisions and fail. All three papers must be submitted and evaluated as "accepted" before the student can petition for the Portfolio Presentation and Defense meeting.
Accept: This judgment means a paper is fully accepted in its present form although judges may still have suggestions for improvement prior to submission for publication.
Accept with Revisions: This judgment means that the judges find a paper promising, but flawed, and that they are willing to accept a paper conditional on defined improvements. If this option is chosen, the judges should create a list of required revisions and set a date for completion of the revision (typically one or two months). At least one judge should ensure that the student has completed the required revisions.
Fail: Judges may fail a paper that does not meet publishable standards and would require substantial and profound work to make it

acceptable.   If the paper fails, the student is put on iSchool academic probation and must resubmit the paper to the judges following the same guidelines used in the original submission by a date set by the judges (usually one or two months).   Only one such failure and resubmission is allowed during a doctoral career. After two such failures, a student will be asked to leave the PhD program.

See the jury evaluation instruction sheet in the appendixes (Appendix B & C) for more information on evaluation criteria.

d)   Program Portfolio/Statement of Intent Defense

Students are eligible to present and defend a Program Portfolio and Statement of Intent when they have satisfied the research skills requirement, removed any deficiencies, completed all required course work, cleared their records of all incomplete grades, acquired the required graduate credits and completed all teaching and research practicum. After a successful presentation and defense of the Program Portfolio and Statement of Intent, the Graduate School Office issues a warrant authorizing the Information School to receive the student's Program Portfolio. The warrant constitutes a formal acceptance into candidacy for the Ph.D. degree.

Students must submit their program portfolio and statement of intent by the end of their 8th semester in the program. A student may seek an appeal of the portfolio/statement of intent submission date to avoid not being in good academic standings. An example of grounds for such an appeal would be difficulties getting IRB approval that are beyond the student's control. Such appeal will consist of a letter to the PhD Committee outlining and documenting the reasons for the delay, a description of work completed on the project to date, a proposed date of submission, and a letter of support from the student's academic advisor.

The student will first petition the faculty of the school to present and defend the Program Portfolio and Statement of Intent giving the faculty a two week review period. The evaluation criteria will focus on the degree of alignment between the contents of the portfolio, including the quality of the practica, and the student's intended research topic. In the event that two or more faculty fail to approve the petition, the case will be referred to the PhD Committee for resolution. After the petition is approved, the student can schedule with his or her dissertation committee the presentation and defense of the Program Portfolio (see Appendix F).

(1)   Portfolio Contents

The Program Portfolio should consist of a well-organized and easy to read binder maintained by the student during the duration of her/his doctoral career. It should include the materials listed in Appendix F. The student should make the Program Portfolio available at least two weeks prior to the Program Portfolio presentation and defense meeting. A copy of the Program Portfolio will be filed with the Director's office and placed in the iSchool conference room.

The portfolio is a way for students to demonstrate that they have met all program requirements and that they have obtained the expertise necessary to undertake the dissertation project described in their Statement of Intent.

(2)   Statement of Intent Contents

The Statement of Intent for the general area of the dissertation shall be brief (6 to 10 pages long):
- Statement of the problem/identification of the parameters of the area of investigation
- Delineation of the potential contributions of such an investigation
- Description of the scope and nature of the related literature
- Estimate of the feasibility (conceptual, methodological, financial, evidential) of conducting such a study
- Assessment of resources available on campus
- Discussion of the potential and expected methodologies
- Description of planned theoretical framework(s).
- Description of the research skills required to conduct such an investigation with a demonstration of knowledge of or a plan for acquiring the needed skills.

(3)   Portfolio Defense Protocol and Timeline

Four weeks prior to Program Portfolio Defense, the student should meet with the iSchool Student Records Coordinator to review coursework and request preliminary warrant.

In the Program Portfolio presentation and defense meeting, the student will present two sets of materials. First, the student will present her/his Program Portfolio that demonstrates how the student has fulfilled all the program requirements and in which areas of subject matter, theory and research methodology she/he has specialized. The majority of the meeting should be taken up with student presentation of the Statement of Intent document (see below), referring back to the materials in the student's Program Portfolio to discuss how the student has obtained the skills and knowledge necessary to undertake the proposed dissertation topic. The Statement of Intent (second part of the meeting) is a brief document (6 to 10 pages) presented to the student's in-house doctoral committee

(dissertation committee). In the event that the student is deficient in demonstrating appropriate mastery of research skills, theory or subject area knowledge, the committee will recommend additional requirements that may include, but not be limited to additional course work and readings. The chair, in consultation with the committee, will determine when the student should fulfill these additional requirements.

A successful presentation and defense of the Program Portfolio results in the signed warrant and entrance to candidacy. This milestone can only be reached upon completion of 32 required credits, completion of all practicum requirements and completion of the MD paper requirement. A generic outline of the Program Portfolio, together with a suggested timeline is provided in the Appendix F.

4. The Dissertation Process

a)   Dissertation Proposal

The doctoral dissertation proposal is a formal document that the student prepares and that the student's doctoral committee evaluates and approves. The faculty should approve and file the dissertation proposal before the student collects substantive data for the dissertation. The proposal shall contain at a minimum the following sections:

- Statement of the problem, including an indication of the relevance of the topic to library and information studies, a review of related research and an indication of the theoretical and conceptual framework within which the problem fits;

- Specific research question or hypothesis, including an indication of the variables to be related or phenomena to be analyzed, assumptions underlying the study and definitions of major terms in the question or hypothesis;

- Data collection, including an indication of the nature of the data, the probable sources of the data, general description of any instruments to be used to collect and record data and procedures to be followed in data collection;

- Analysis and interpretation, including an indication of the method to be used in interpreting data, statistical tests (if any) to be used, method for grouping or interpreting non-quantitative data.

The student must demonstrate the ability for independent investigation in dissertation. The Graduate School sets the maximum time for completion as five years from the date of admission to doctoral candidacy.
The student's doctoral committee (dissertation committee) shall supervise the dissertation, with the major professor serving as chair. Each student shall arrange with his or her committee the procedures for consultation and advice during the period of research and writing.

b)   Dissertation Defense

When the student completes the dissertation and meets all other requirements, the student's doctoral committee will hold a final oral examination/defense open to all. While all faculty may participate in the oral examination, the decision on acceptance of the research rests with the student's doctoral committee. In order to participate in the university's May commencement exercises the oral examination must be successfully completed by March. Students who have a scheduled oral examination and plan to complete all requirements for the degree by December may participate in the iSchool graduation ceremony in May of that year.

The dissertation must conform to the requirements of the Graduate School. One copy of the dissertation must be deposited in the Information School, in addition to those that the Graduate School requires.

II. PHD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES

A. KEY ACTORS

PhD Committee. – The Director (or designee) has overall responsibility for the administering the doctoral program. The faculty delegates primary responsibility for policy development to the PhD Committee of the Information School.
Progress Evaluation Committee. – The PhD Committee serves as the Progress Evaluation Committee for doctoral students.

Major Professor/Advisor. – Upon admission, the PhD program director serves as the default advisor for all students. At any point, the student may switch to a major professor/advisor based on similarities in research interests. Students are encouraged to do so as early as they feel comfortable doing so. The student should formally ask a current faculty member to serve as their major advisor. The student should find a major advisor by the time they defend their statement of intent.

The advisor advises the student on selecting courses, developing a minor and preparing the dissertation proposal. When the student finishes coursework, the major professor, after consulting the student, will submit to the Director (or designee) the names of four other faculty members who agree to serve on the student's doctoral committee. If the student subsequently changes the focus of the dissertation research, a change of major professor or a reconstitution of the committee may be requested of the Director (or designee).

Student's Doctoral Committee. – The student's doctoral committee shall include five members of the graduate faculty; no fewer than three are to be from the iSchool faculty and at least one shall be from outside the School. Within the guidelines developed by the iSchool faculty, the committee shall approve the dissertation proposal, evaluate and accept the dissertation, and conduct the final oral examination/defense.

B. PHD PROGRAM PROCESS & RESPONSIBILTIES OF KEY ACTORS

Admissions Phase

- Applicant folders kept in main office.
- Initial request for application received; materials sent. (Faculty Secretary)
- Application received. (Admissions Adviser and Records Manager)
- List of applicants, with status, maintained. (Records Manager)
- Completed file, with blank evaluation sheets, given to Admissions Adviser. (Records Manager)
- Summary sheet created. (Admissions Adviser)
- PhD Committee notified when application complete. (Admissions Adviser)
- Review of application file; evaluation sheets returned to Admissions Adviser. (PhD Committee)
- Interview scheduled or applicant informed of non-admittance. (Admissions Adviser)
- Program Planning Guide sent to applicants invited for interview. (Admissions Adviser)
- Interview and admit/non-admit decision. (PhD Committee)
- Admissions Adviser informed of decision using form attached to applicant's file. (Chair of PhD Committee)
- Examiner's Report signed. (Admissions Adviser in consultation with the Director)
- Admission/non-admit letter sent. (Records Manager, in consultation with Admissions Adviser.)

Doctoral Study Period
Student folders live in office of iSchool Student Records Manager

iSchool Student Records Administrator assumes responsibility for:
- Records
- Issuing warrants

iSchool Administrator assumes responsibility for:
- Funding/payroll/scholarships
- Benefits coordination
- VISAs for international students

Role of iSchool Director or Designee:
- Overall responsibility for administering the doctoral program.

- Monitoring student progress and writing letters alerting students who are not making satisfactory progress
- Updating "Program Planning Guide"
- Liaison with doctoral advisers and PhD Committee
- Ad hoc member of PhD Committee

PhD Committee Chair: (PhD Program Director) serves as initial adviser. Upon the successful completion of the first MD paper, students may change the advisor to a faculty member whose research interest closely matches with the student's and who is willing to serve as the advisor for the student.

PhD Committee:
- Considering policies, issues and curriculum, with recommendations to faculty
- Recruiting applicants, providing initial contact with strong applicants or assigning this responsibility to faculty members with the most similar interests
- Evaluating applicant files
- Interviewing qualified applicants
- Recommending candidates for fellowships
- Reviewing MD papers
- Funding decisions (with iSchool Director): TAs, PAs, RAs, and fellowships

C. SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS FOR PHD STUDENTS

Supplementary funds for PhD students are available through the generous supporters of the Margaret Monroe Fund at the UW-Foundation. In order to provide equity of access to these funds, distribution decisions will be made using the following priorities:

Highest Priority: Purposes related to completion of the dissertation.

Secondary Priority: Presenting a paper or poster or participating in a panel at scholarly/research conference. Travel to non-scholarly/research conferences do not fall under this priority unless the travel will directly support a student's research (e.g., interview participants at the conference)

Third Priority: Data collection activities related to completion of master demonstration papers.

Students must apply to the Director for funds. The Director will distribute the funds based upon the above priorities and the date of the request.

III. APPENDICES

A. APPENDIX : CHECKLIST OF DOCTORAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Credits: 51 credits minimum. 32 credits must be UW graduate credits.
Subject Areas: Take seminar in at least three of the following four areas:
____ Cultural History, Policies and Debates
____ Information Organization & Access
____ Information Policy, Management & Institutions
____ Users, Uses & Contexts

Research methods:
____ LIS 603: Introduction to research (or equivalent)
____ LIS 910: Research Design and Methodologies
____ Statistics 1 (e.g., Educational Psychology 760)
____ Statistics 2 through ANOVA (e.g., Educational Psychology 761)
____ Qualitative Research Methods (e.g. ethnography, grounded theory, etc.)
____ Digital data collection or analysis research method experience (e.g. Digital Humanities Analytics)

Pedagogy:
____ LIS 639: Pedagogical theory & practice (or equivalent)

Minor: 12 credits minimum (option A or B)
____ 3 credits   ____ 3 credits
____ 3 credits   ____ 3 credits

Practica (45 hours, credit optional – maximum 1 credit each)**:**
Research practicum I
Research practicum II
Teaching practicum

Mastery Demonstration Papers
____ MD paper 1 (reviewed by PhD committee – due end of the 3rd semester)
____ MD paper 2 (jury review – due end of the 5th semester)
____ MD paper 3 (jury review – due end of 7th semester)

Portfolio
Proposal
Defense

End of Program Steps
____ Meet with iSchool Student Records Coordinator **4 weeks prior** to arrange prelim warrant request
____ Portfolio submitted for admission to candidacy/defense
____ Dissertation proposal/defense
____ Meet with iSchool Student Records Coordinator **4 weeks** prior to arrange for final warrant request
____ Dissertation/defense

B.   APPENDIX : FORMS FOR MASTERY DEMONSTRATION (MD) PAPERS: INSTRUCTIONS FOR STUDENTS, JURY MEMBERS & GATEKEEPERS

Purpose: The MD paper represents scholarly work conducted by the student as part of a UW-Madison course, project, or independent study. The purpose of the MD paper requirement is to ensure that iSchool PhD students have the skills required to conduct and report on independent scholarly research. It is hoped that all iSchool PhD students will publish their MD papers at conferences or journals.

As outlined on 3(c), judges of MD papers may assign one of three possible scores: accept, accept with revisions and fail.
Accept: This judgment means a paper is fully accepted in its present form although judges may still have suggestions for improvement prior to submission for publication.
Accept with Revisions: This judgment means that the judges find a paper promising, but flawed, and that they are willing to accept a paper conditional on defined improvements. If this option is chosen, the judges should create a list of required revisions and set a date for completion of the revision (typically one or two months). At least one judge should ensure that the student has completed the required revisions.
Fail: Judges may fail a paper does not meet publishable standards and would require substantial and profound work to make it acceptable.   If the paper fails, the student is put on iSchool academic probation and must resubmit the paper to the judges following the same guidelines used in the original submission.

Evaluation Expectations: Evaluation expectations increase from the 1st to the 3rd paper. The first paper should be at least suitable for a conference poster session or modest conference presentation. Reviewers should also have lower expectations for quantity of data included and sophistication of research question for the first paper. The paper should however present a compelling question or problem, begin or propose a reasonable exploration of that problem, present a logical research design to produce data that inform the research question, and meet all the style and format expectations for a scholarly paper. Expectations should rise for the second paper – it should be of the same quality as a peer reviewed conference presentation. The third paper should be of publishable quality in a respectable peer review journal. See the paper evaluation form (Appendix C) for exact evaluation criteria.

■ First MD Paper Instructions:
The first MD paper should be submitted to the PhD Committee two weeks prior to the student's first performance evaluation, normally scheduled after the student completes the first three semesters of study in the program.
The first MD paper is reviewed by all PhD Committee members and the outcome is transmitted to the student by the committee chair. If revisions are required, a due date is set and the revisions are reviewed for completeness.

■ Second & Third MD Paper Instructions:

The second MD paper must be submitted at the end of the 5th semester of study or at the completion of 36 credit hours of PhD coursework. The third MD paper
Gatekeeper: The student should choose a gatekeeper & provide the gatekeeper with a copy of these instructions (Appendix B), the review form (Appendix C) and a copy of the paper. The gatekeeper should ensure the paper is of adequate quality and require fixes to any obvious flaws prior to allowing the student to distribute the paper for jury review.

The Jury: The student is responsible for inviting two other faculty members to participate in the jury review of the second and the third MD papers. Faculty members outside iSchool can be invited to serve as the jurors. The student may consult the gatekeepers of the MD papers about the selection of jurors.
The gatekeeper of the paper should inform the selected jurors by email or in writing of his/her approval of the submission and forward a copy to the student. By so doing, the gatekeeper indicates the paper is suitable for further review. The student should keep a copy of the message for his/her documentation.
The student should provide the following to the jury members: a paper copy of the MD paper, this instruction sheet (Appendix B) and the form "Jury Evaluation of Mastery Demonstration Papers" (Appendix C). The student should instruct the jury members to return comments to the gatekeeper.
The juror should evaluate the student's performance based the criteria listed of the evaluation form and indicate their

decision on the paper.

Resubmission guidelines: If a paper receives two or more "fail" votes, then the student must resubmit the paper by the date set by the jury; however, a "fail" vote usually indicates that the jury finds the paper largely unworkable. Therefore students receiving a reject vote should consider focusing efforts on a different paper.

When the gatekeeper receives the comments from the juror, the gatekeeper will inform the student of the outcome and forward copies of all comments to the student (Note: the gatekeeper needs to keep a copy of all paper review forms or emailed comments until the end of the process.

If the vote on the paper requires revisions, the gatekeeper should negotiate with the jurors to decide the priority of the revisions and their due date. The gatekeeper will provide a memo/email to the student outlining exactly which revisions are required in order for the paper to be considered acceptable. If the vote on the paper is split, the gatekeeper, in consultation with the jurors, will negotiate required changes and provide a memo outlining those changes to the student.

The gatekeeper is responsible for ensuring that the student has made the required changes to the paper and therefore the student must provide the gatekeeper with a revised copy of the paper and a cover memo outlining how the student has accommodated the required changes (with references to specific areas of text).

When the process is complete, the gatekeeper should advise the departmental administrator that the MD paper has been accepted. The gatekeeper should also provide the 3 review forms to the administrator so they can be stored in the student's file.

C. APPENDIX : MASTERY DEMONSTRATION (MD) PAPERS: JURY EVALUATION FORM

Dear _____,

The iSchool PhD student named _____ has asked that you review the following paper for his/her 2nd   3rd (circle one) mastery demonstration paper review. This copy of the paper is yours to mark up.   Please finish the review and return this form to the gatekeeper_____ (insert gatekeeper name and email) by the following date: _____.

The MD review is similar to peer review of a conference or journal submission. Please fill out the following form and, on the next side, prepare brief comments that (a) assess the paper as an example of independent scholarly inquiry, and (b) provide constructive feedback to improve the paper. **A copy of this form will be made available to the student for review.**

Please note that evaluation expectations for MD paper increase from the 1st to the 3rd paper. For example, for the first paper, jurors should expect a paper acceptable as a conference poster with a coherent research question, logical model of inquiry, and some data/analysis. For the second paper jurors should expect paper quality similar to a full conference paper including a significant research question, a full methodology, and more data/analysis. For the third paper, jurors should expect the paper to be of publishable quality in a peer reviewed journal. Standards among different modes of inquiry (e.g., historical research vs. experiments) may vary.

Indicate the overall performance of the following aspects: (1=Poor;3=Fair;5=Excellent)

Review Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
Social or practical importance of questions or issues: To what extent does the paper affect the behavior or thinking of information professionals or other action-oriented personnel as opposed to being primarily reflective comments for other researchers only?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relevance to the field: To what subsidiary/associative discipline does the paper address, and to what extent would readers see the problem or issue addressed as central to their field as opposed to peripheral?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Validity of claims: To what extent are the arguments and evidence offered in support of claims compelling, measured against the rigorous standards of research, as opposed to tenuous or questionable? Are the research methods appropriate? Are there flaws in the methods, arguments, or data analyses? Are the conclusions justified by the results of the analyses?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Originality of ideas or methods: To what extent does the paper represent fresh, imaginative, innovative, possibly trail-blazing approach that is new, as opposed to being more routine or noncreative contribution? Does the paper address a significant problem, topic, or idea?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Significance of research: To what extent do the discoveries, insights, conclusions, or accomplishments reported shed light on other important issues of central concern to the field? Do the findings confirm, expand, revise, or challenge conventional knowledge of professional consensus?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Readability of the paper as integral work of research literature: To what extent is it a well-organized integral work, outstanding for its clarity or persuasiveness and enjoyable to read, as opposed to boring, confused, dense?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scholarship: To what extent are intellectual debts acknowledged and all assertions appropriately documented? Does the author demonstrate a command of the relevant literature?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Written comments:
Social or practical importance of questions or issues:

Relevance to the field:

Validity of claims:

Originality of ideas or methods:

Significance of research:

Readability of the paper as integral work of research literature:

Scholarship:

Other comments:

RECOMMENDATION

☐ Accept (including accept with minor revisions or editing)
☐ Accept conditional on completion of significant revisions.
Suggested due date for revisions _____
☐ Reject

Juror's Signature: Date:

Gatekeeper instructions: See Appendix B of the PhD program planning guide for instructions. Also, please provide a copy of all forms to the departmental administrator for the students' file.

D. APPENDIX : TEACHING PRACTICUM CONTRACT

Teaching Practicum Contract (copy to be kept by both Student and Faculty Sponsor)
Title:

Faculty Sponsor:

Student Participant:

Contribution:

Key Tasks (listed in priority order)	Hours to complete	Outputs	Due Dates
	Total hours must not exceed 45		

For Credit? yes / no (circle one)   If yes, semester of credit registration _____

Signatures Indicating Agreement with Contract Terms:

_____   _____   _____   _____
Faculty Sponsor   Date   Student   Date

Signatures Indicating Completion of Work:

_____   _____   _____   _____
Faculty Sponsor   Date   Student   Date

Suggested Areas for Improvement/Feedback:

E.   APPENDIX : RESEARCH PRACTICUM CONTRACT

Research Practicum Contract (copy to be kept by both Student and Faculty Sponsor)
Title:

Faculty Sponsor:

Student Participant:

Contribution:

Key Tasks (listed in priority order)	Hours to complete	Outputs	Due Dates
	Total hours must not exceed 45		

For Credit? yes / no (circle one)   If yes, semester of credit registration _____

Signatures Indicating Agreement with Contract Terms:

_____   _____   _____   _____
Faculty Sponsor   Date   Student   Date

Signatures Indicating Completion of Work:

_____   _____   _____   _____
Faculty Sponsor   Date   Student   Date

Suggested Areas for Improvement/Feedback:

F. APPENDIX : CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PROGRAM PORTFOLIO

After completing all doctoral program requirements (see Appendix A), the student will petition the faculty of the school to present and defend their Program Portfolio. Once the faculty sign off on the Program Portfolio (A copy will be made available to the iSchool faculty), the student will prepare for the presentation and defense of the Program Portfolio to his/her in-house dissertation committee (attendance of the out-side member(s) is optional and left up to the student) according to the following guidelines :

1.   The student will prepare a Program Portfolio and make a copy available to the iSchool community. Students are encouraged to create a carefully organized and well thought out presentation of the portfolio to facilitate the reviewers' assessment. The student is also encouraged to make the portfolio accessible on the Web, but this is not mandatory.

Through the Program Portfolio students are expected to demonstrate mastery of at least three subject areas and research methodologies. The Program Portfolio should consist of a well-organized and easy to read binder maintained by the student during the duration of her/his doctoral career. It should include the following materials:

1) Curriculum Vitae
2) Current transcript
3) Summary of fulfillment of iSchool requirements
    a. Chart with course numbers, titles, and dates completed
        i. Include information about courses transferred in from other institutions
    b. One page describing content area focus/specialized knowledge and description of how the specialization was achieved: extra coursework, special projects, etc.
    c. One page describing research methods focus/specialized knowledge and description of how the specialization was achieved: extra coursework, special projects, etc.
    d. One page describing theoretical approaches focus/specialized knowledge and description of how the specialization was achieved: extra coursework, special projects, etc.
    e. One page describing digital data collection or analysis research method experience, and description of how the experience was achieved: extra coursework, special projects, etc. (The experience should be cutting edge, i.e., beyond long-standing statistical and qualitative coding software)
    f. Summary descriptive paragraph for each of teaching and research practica
    g. Completed teaching and research practicum forms (2 research, 1 teaching)
4) Three Mastery Demonstration Papers
5) Letters/emails of acceptance of MD papers 2 and 3 by jury.
6) Proof of submission for publication/conferences of at least 2 papers
7) Copies of any publications or papers presented at conferences
8) Teaching evaluations if applicable
9) Other materials (teaching, research, contributions, awards, recommendations)
10) Statement of intent (6-10 pages)

2.   The student will make a 15 minute presentation of the Statement of Intent to be followed by another 15 minute presentation demonstrating research skills, course work, previous work and other experiences and competencies that together demonstrate that the student is ready to commence the doctoral topic research and develop a dissertation proposal.

3.   After the successful defense of the Program Portfolio, members of the student's dissertation committee will sign the preliminary warrant. The warrant constitutes a formal application for admission to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree when it is filed with the Dean of the Graduate School. The Graduate School officially admits a student to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree after passing the Comprehensive Preliminary Examination (that is in the form of a successful presentation and defense of the Program Portfolio). Once admitted, a student may apply for a Certificate of Philosophy as recognition of Candidacy.

G. APPENDIX: FACULTY & DOCTORAL RESEARCH INTERESTS

The following statements of their doctoral research interests by members of the School faculty who direct dissertations are intended to help prospective students understand the School's areas of interest and strength.

1. Faculty research interests

Downey, Greg: History and geography of information & communication technology, especially the often hidden labor behind such technology

Eschenfelder, Kristin R.: Digital copyright and intellectual property, digital rights management, telecommunications and information policy, digital publishing, management of electronic government information

Kim, Kyung-Sun: Information-seeking behavior, user-oriented systems design, Web-based learning, digital libraries, metadata

Rubel, Alan: Medical privacy, public health surveillance, information ethics and policy

Senchyne, Jonathan: Print culture, history of information technology, race and gender theory

Smith, Catherine Arnott: Consumers and how they relate to medicine: medical records, medical vocabularies, medical informatics

Whitmire, Ethelene: History of libraries and librarianship, information seeking behavior, academic libraries, reference services, underrepresented students' use of libraries

Willett, Rebekah: Children's media culture, play and learning; information literacy, gender issues

2. Recent PhD Dissertations

Nahyun Kwon (2002) "Community Networks: Needs Assessment and Community Co-orientation."

Chang Suk Kim (2002) "Predicting Information Searching Performance with Measures of Cognitive Diversity."

Susan Davis (2003) "Leadership in the Archival Profession: A Case Study."

Yunkeum Kim (2003) "Measuring and Assessing Internet Service Quality in Public Libraries."

Andrew B. Wertheimer (2003) entitled "Public Libraries Behind Barbed Wire: Japanese American Readers During World War II."

Sook Lim (2004) "Power of Systems Offices in Academic Library Organizations."

Athena Salaba (2004) "Semantic Relationships and Subject Access: Which Subject Relationships are Useful to the User?."

Eun-Young Yoo (2004) "Middle-Aged Women's Health Information Seeking on the Web."

Shen Yi (2006) "Digital Information and Communications Networks and Scientific Research Substance: An Investigation of Meteorology."

Terrance S. Newell (2006) "Rethinking Information Literacy Learning Environments: A Study to Examine the Effectiveness of Two Learning Approaches."

Ming-Hsin "Phoebe" Chiu (2007) "Making Sense of Organizational Socialization: Exploring Information Seeking Behavior of Newcomer Digital Librarians in Academic Libraries."

Lynne C. Chase (2007) "Getting in on the Front End of Information Systems Development: Records Management/Systems Analyst Interactions in State Government Agencies."

Chi-Shiou Lin (2007) "The Conceptualization of Government Publications on the World Wide Web: A Genre Theory Inspired Investigation."

Patricia A. Lawton (2006) "Make New Mistakes: An Analysis of ARL Member Digital Libraries."

Sei-Ching Joanna Sin (2009) "Structural and Individual Influences on Information Behavior: A National Study of Adolescents' Use of Public Libraries."

Xiaohua "Awa" Zhu (2011) "The Access Rights for Digital Legal Information: A Historical Case Study."

Nathan Johnson (2011) "How to Build Infrastructure: Rhetorics of Web Standardization"

Michelle Caswell (2012) "Archiving the Unspeakable: Silence and Voice in Khmer Rouge Mug Shots."

Sharon McQueen (2012) "The Story of the Story of Ferdinand."

Melissa Adler (2012) "For SEXUAL PERVERSION See PARAPHILIAS: Disciplining Sexual Deviance at The Library of Congress."

Brenton Stewart (2012) "Informing the South: On the Print Culture of Antebellum Augusta, Georgia, 1828-1860."

Jom Polparsi (2012) "Global and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Changes in Library and Information Studies (LIS): Information Seeking Behaviors of LIS Faculty Members in Thailand"

Tien-I Tsai (2013)   "Socialization and Information Horizons: Source Use Behavior of First-Generation and Continuing-Generation College Students."

Kyle Jones (2015)   "All the data we can get: a contextual study of learning analytics and student privacy"