



---

The Information School  
University of Wisconsin – Madison  
Doctoral Program Student Handbook

**This version created July 2019**

**Yellow highlights** reflect changes/additions made during 2019-20 academic year.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	PROGRAM OVERVIEW.....	4
	Intention of Handbook	
	Key Actors	
	Responsibilities of Key Actors	
	Program Purpose and Scope	
	Learning Outcomes	
	Program Structure	
	Program/faculty governance committees and descriptions	
	List of program faculty and research interests	
II.	ADVISING.....	7
	Advisor Selection	
	Advisor Roles	
	Change of Advisor	
III.	DOCTORAL DEGREE REQUIREMENTS .....	8
	Program Basics	
	Course Requirements	
	Credit requirements	
	Research methods	
	Pedagogy course	
	Course distributions and content areas	
	Theoretical approaches	
	Doctoral minor (for iSchool students)	
	Additional Program Requirements	
	IRB training	
	Publishing and conference presentation requirements	
	Research practicum	
	Teaching practicum (or equivalent)	
	Program Milestone Requirements and Deadlines	
	Annual progress evaluation	
	Mastery demonstration (MD) papers	
	Program portfolio and statement of intent defense	
	Portfolio contents	
	Statement of intent contents	
	Portfolio defense protocol and timeline	
	Dissertation and Oral Defense	
	Dissertation proposal	
	Dissertation defense	
IV.	DOCTORAL MINOR (TAKEN BY STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE PROGRAM).....	18
V.	SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS .....	18
	Good academic standing	
	Advanced Studies Specialist Program	
	Academic Grievance - iSchool Grade Appeal Procedure	
VI.	SATISFACTORY PROGRESS - CONDUCT EXPECTATIONS .....	18

Diversity Statement  
Academic Misconduct  
Non-Academic Misconduct  
Research Misconduct

VII.	FUNDING AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION .....	19
	Guaranteed funding	
	Finding non-guaranteed funding	
	Graduate Assistantships (TAs, PAs, Lecturer/SA positions)	
	Process for awarding graduate assistantships	
	Responsibilities	
	TA and PA Collective Bargaining	
	Stipend Levels and Paychecks	
	Tuition Remission and Payment of Segregated Fees	
	Health Insurance Benefits	
	Maximum Appointment Levels	
	Enrollment Requirements for Graduate Assistants	
	Fellowships	
	Graduate School Fellowships	
	Departmental/Campus Fellowships	
	External Funding/Fellowships	
	Fellows with Concurrent Appointments	
	Funding for Conference/Research Travel	
VIII.	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PLANNING .....	21
	Local/Program Resources for Professional Development and Career Planning	
	Travel to Meetings and Conferences	
	Campus-wide Resources for Professional Development	
	Individual Development Plans (IDP)	
IX.	APPENDICES.....	23
	A. Information School PhD Annual Progress Evaluation Form	
	B. Checklist of Doctoral Program Requirements	
	C. Mastery Demonstration (MD) Papers: Instructions for Students, Jury Members & Gatekeepers	
	D. Mastery Demonstration (MD) Papers: Jury Evaluation Form	
	E. Teaching Practicum Contract	
	F. Research Practicum Contract	
	G. Criteria for Evaluating Program Portfolio	
	H. MD1 Literature Review Proposal	

# I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

## **Intention of Handbook**

This handbook is intended for doctoral students who are pursuing Doctor of Philosophy degrees. The UW-Madison Graduate School is the ultimate authority for granting graduate degrees at the University. The Information School (iSchool) administers the doctoral program under the authority of the Graduate School. The [Graduate School's Academic Policies and Procedures](#) provide essential information regarding general University requirements. Program authority to set degree requirements beyond the [minimum required by the Graduate School](#) lies with the iSchool program faculty. The policies described in this handbook have been approved by the program faculty as a whole. Degrees and course requirements may change over time. However, students must meet the degree and course requirements in effect when they entered the program. In addition, administrative procedures and processes can change over time. Students are required to follow the procedures and processes listed in the current handbook. The information in this handbook should also be supplemented by individual consultation with your advisor so that individual needs, interests and all degree requirements are met.

## **Key Actors**

iSchool Student Records Administrator  
iSchool Administrator  
iSchool Director  
PhD Program Chair  
PhD Committee

## **Responsibilities of Key Actors**

iSchool Student Records Administrator assumes responsibility for:

- Creation and maintenance of PhD student records
- Requesting and issuing warrants

iSchool Administrator assumes responsibility for:

- Funding/payroll/scholarships
- Benefits coordination

PhD Program Chair:

- Overall responsibility for administering the doctoral program
- Monitoring student progress and writing letters alerting students who are not making satisfactory progress
- Updating PhD student handbook
- Liaison with doctoral advisers and PhD Committee
- Serves as initial advisor for all PhD students
- Funding decisions (with iSchool Director) regarding TAs, PAs, and fellowships
- Liaison with Graduate School

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

## **Program Purpose and Scope**

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 Outcomes**

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
    - ii. By enrolling in an appropriate digital humanities and/or analytics course (e.g. LIS 768)
  - 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 assistantships and placements successfully
    - ii. By giving presentations in conferences or workshops
  - b. Students will be able to demonstrate skills and experience in teaching.
    - i. By completing a pedagogy class successfully
    - ii. By completing a teaching assistantship and/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)

## **Program Structure**

*Program/faculty governance committees and descriptions*

iSchool Director and PhD Committee:

The iSchool Director has responsibility for assuring the administration of the doctoral program. The faculty delegates primary responsibility for doctoral program administration and policy development to the PhD Committee Chair and members of the PhD Committee of the iSchool.

Progress Evaluation Committee:

The PhD Committee serves as the Progress Evaluation Committee for doctoral students.

Student's Doctoral Committee:

The student's doctoral committee shall include **four** 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 iSchool. Within the guidelines developed by the iSchool faculty, the student's doctoral committee shall approve the dissertation proposal, evaluate and accept the dissertation and conduct the final oral examination/defense.

*List of program faculty and research interests:*

Eschenfelder, Kristin R.:

*Research fields:* Scholarly communications, information/data policy, science and technology studies

*Methods and methodologies:* Content analysis, interviews, focus groups, surveys

*Theories:* socio-technical theories, organizational and field level theories

*Areas of interest:* Information policy, scholarly communications, data sharing and data governance, social aspects of ICYs, government information

Kim, Kyung-Sun:

*Research fields:* information behavior, information users, user-centered systems/services

*Methods and methodologies:* experiments, focus group, interviews, surveys

*Theories:* psychological, sociocultural theories, interactionism

*Areas of interest:* Selection and use of resources, social media use, information literacy, information equity, diversity

Royston, Reginold:

*Methods and methodologies:* Digital humanities, ethnography

*Theories:* Critical theory (race, class, gender)

*Areas of interest:* New media, African diaspora, Internet and technology in developing world contexts

Rubel, Alan:

*Research fields:* Information ethics, policy and law

*Areas of interest:* Information privacy and security, surveillance, algorithmic decision-making, bioethics

Senchyne, Jonathan:

*Research fields:* Book history and print culture, American literary history, African American print culture, digital humanities, American Studies

*Methods and methodologies:* Archival and special collections research, close reading, historicism

*Theories:* Literacy and cultural theory, critical race theory, public sphere theory, materialisms

*Areas of interest:* Material cultures of books and print, material texts, paper typography and composition, early and nineteenth-century American literature and culture, African American thought, library history

Smith, Catherine Arnott:

*Research fields:* Consumer health informatics, history of medicine (American Progressive Era)

*Methods and methodologies:* Interviews, focus groups, qualitative analysis, content analysis, propositional analysis, knowledge representation and taxonomy development

*Theories:* Personal health information management (PHIM; biomedical engineering)

*Areas of interest:* Clinical information systems (particularly consumer- and patient-facing), consumer health vocabulary, personal health information management by college students living with disabilities, health information provision in public libraries, archives and other nonclinical spaces

Whitmire, Ethelene:

*Research fields:* History, Scandinavian studies, African American studies (African American, 20th century)

*Methods and methodologies:* Archival research

*Theories:* Black feminist theory

*Areas of interest:* African American history, transnational experiences of African Americans

Willett, Rebekah:

*Research fields:* Childhood studies, Media and Cultural Studies, Education, Girlhood Studies

*Methods and methodologies:* Discourse analysis, ethnography, qualitative methods

*Theories:* Sociocultural theories, domestication theory, boundary theory, feminist post-structuralism

*Areas of interest:* Children's media cultures, new literacies, digital cultures, play, public library makerspaces

## II. ADVISING

### Advisor Selection

Upon admission, the PhD program director serves as the default advisor for all students. At any point, the student may switch to an advisor based on similarities in research interests. Students are encouraged to select an advisor 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 should be a faculty member whose expertise and project/research interests match closely with those that the student intends to acquire. Students are encouraged to gather information from courses, faculty and student seminars, the program website and publications to help identify faculty with matching interests. While no faculty member is obliged to accept a student's request to serve as advisor, invitations are usually accepted except in cases where the faculty member judges that a different advisor would serve the student's needs better.

### Advisor Roles

The advisor serves a dual role: first, to assist the student in acquiring the highest level of knowledge and competence in the field; and second, to chair the student's Doctoral Committee that will determine whether the student has performed acceptably at each of their degree milestones. Additionally, the advisor will communicate with the student regarding their progress toward degree completion, assist with course selection, discuss academic and professional goals and help students in academic and professional planning.

The advisor advises the student on selecting courses, deciding upon and developing a minor and preparing the dissertation proposal. When the student finishes coursework, the major professor, after consulting the student, will submit to the iSchool Director the names of **three** other faculty members who agree to serve on the student's doctoral committee, including one member from outside the iSchool. 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.

### **Change of Advisor**

A student who later decides that a different faculty advisor would be preferable should discuss this with the current advisor and then seek to change. Selection of an advisor, or a change of advisor, should be based on the faculty member's ability to guide the student expertly into the chosen area of interest.

## **III. DOCTORAL DEGREE REQUIREMENTS**

### **Program Basics**

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.

### **Course Requirements**

#### *Credit requirements*

The Graduate School requires a minimum of 32 graduate-level credits taken at the University of Wisconsin – Madison after admission to the doctoral program before achieving dissertator status. The minimum credit requirement for an Information School PhD degree is a total of 51 credits including 990s (Research and Thesis) and 999s (Independent Reading and Research). Up to 10 credits may include approved transfer credits or credits taken before admission to the PhD program; however, the credits may not be more than 10 years old. See Appendices A and B for assistance in planning coursework.

#### *Research methods*

In order to meet the goals of the program to provide broad general knowledge, in-depth knowledge in a particular content area and to acquire the skills required to complete a dissertation, each student is required to demonstrate knowledge of 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 quantitative and/or qualitative data analysis. To fulfill the research methods requirements, students should take, at a minimum, 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
- Two semesters of statistics (including ANOVA)
- One semester of qualitative data collection and analysis
- One semester of new digital data collection and analysis methodologies (e.g. digital humanities and/or analytics course such as LIS 768)

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).

### *Pedagogy course*

To assist PhD students in preparation for teaching and to improve their instruction skills, students are required to take LIS 639: Pedagogical Theory and Practice for Information Professionals (or equivalent).

### *Professional Writing and Reading (PWR) seminar*

Students must take this 1 credit seminar six times before becoming a dissertator. The seminar meets every other week and provides foundational knowledge for becoming a researcher.

### *Course distributions and content areas*

Coursework, as a whole, must contribute to a rationally unified program of study and research. In addition to work in the iSchool, PhD students must also complete a minor. Through coursework, PhD students are expected to gain (1) a broad background in library and information studies (LIS) research and scholarship and (2) develop an in-depth knowledge in an area of specialty.

Students show development of a broad background knowledge of the field through completion of content area coursework. The iSchool offers departmental seminars in four content areas: Use, Users and Context; Information Organization and Access: Cultural Philosophies, Histories and Debates; and Information Policy, Management and Institutions. Students are required to complete coursework in three out of the four content areas. iSchool PhD seminars are preferred; however, if no PhD iSchool seminar is available, an alternative iSchool 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 these broad areas. Students develop an in-depth knowledge of a specialty area through a combination of additional coursework, independent studies, research practica, and mastery demonstration papers.

Details of the iSchool content areas are presented below:

#### Use, Users and Context

This area explores the information needs and information behavior of people in various roles, situations, environments and contexts that extend beyond traditional library spaces. It explores the factors that influence users' needs and behaviors. The content of this area may include (but is not limited to):

1. Critical evaluation of paradigms for studying information behavior
2. Critical evaluation of theoretical frameworks, models and research methods used to study information behavior
3. Critical evaluation and use of findings from 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 user groups in context
5. Systematic evaluation of information systems, products and services designed for specific groups

#### Information Organization and Access

In this area, students examine sociotechnical systems through which individuals and groups arrange information (in all its cultural forms) and enable or enact its transfer and retrieval. Students examine the dynamic ways in which information organization, retrieval and use differ over time, place and space, and that people in each of these instances experience real-world advantages and constraints. Sociotechnical systems may encompass computer and network hardware and software, heuristics, ontologies, divisions of labor and distributions of power. This area consists of three interrelated perspectives: information organization, information transfer and information retrieval.

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 formal acquisition of information from a system (described above) and includes the cognitive, social, historical and philosophical influences on acquisition, advantages and constraints for acquisition and the social or ethical implications for the acquisition.

This 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.

### Cultural Histories, Philosophies and Debates

Research topics in this area include both U.S.-centric and global studies of:

1. The historical roles of individuals, events, places, social movements and economic conditions in the development of libraries and information agencies
2. The philosophical underpinnings of librarianship and information studies, including 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 based on various group and individual characteristics (e.g. gender, age, income, race, sexual orientation, education, religious affiliation etc.)

This area begins with historical and philosophical foundations of the LIS field, particularly within the U.S. context, as it has been transformed over time from a tradition of librarianship, rooted in print, in place and in public institutions, to a broader notion of information studies, which involve various kinds of media, at various spatial and temporal scales, within a variety of public and private institutions.

Because 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 process involving information technologies, occupations, places, institutions, laws, users and uses inevitably involve personal and legal judgements about 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; the very definition of “information” (as distinct from “data” or “knowledge” involves an important normative judgement.

Finally, because societies differ across time and space, the various histories, philosophies and debates of LIS must be contextualized within a broader cultural framework. Through coursework in this area, students will recognize cultural diversity in choices concerning information production and consumption, as well as gain an understanding of cultural divides in access to skills, tools and sites of information production and consumption.

### Information Policy, Management and Institutions

This area 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 and policy formulation approaches, as well as be able to view and evaluate information resources and services through a public policy lens.

### *Theoretical Approaches*

Students need to demonstrate expertise in two of the following theoretical approaches. Students should develop expertise in the theoretical frameworks they select for their dissertation as approved by their 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 and production of time and space, temporal/spatial processes, theories of place, politics of canon formation, public history

Knowledge of theoretical approaches will be obtained through LIS 910 and other coursework, both inside and outside the iSchool.

### *Doctoral minor (for iSchool PhD students)*

All iSchool students are required to complete a minor in another department. The doctoral minor broadens the conceptual base for the student. PhD students have two options for completing the required minor: if the minor is located within a single department (Option A), the requirements of that department must be met. The distributed minor, a minor in which courses are selected from among two or more departments (Option B), must consist of at least 12 credits. Option B can be appropriate for iSchool PhD students

because library and information theories build upon research and principles from a diversity of other academic disciplines and professional fields. Additionally, library and information studies research frequently involves not only the theories and techniques of library and information studies, but also the substantive materials in diverse fields of knowledge and the greatly varied community and institutional contexts (e.g. 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.

### **Additional Program Requirements**

#### *IRB training*

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.

#### *Publishing and conference presentation requirements*

Prior to the PhD student's portfolio defense, at least two of the student's MD papers should be submitted to a refereed journal, conference, or book chapter.

#### *Research practicum*

Each student is required to fulfill one 80-hour research practicum. The purpose of the research practicum is to ensure that each PhD student has experience working on a research project (other than their own), to be exposed to other forms of data gathering and analysis, to familiarize students with faculty research, and to promote collaboration between PhD students and faculty. Students are encouraged to complete the research practicum later in their iSchool career (third or 4<sup>th</sup> year) in order to be in the best position to contribute research skills to a project. The practicum may be taken for credit or may be taken for no credit. If the practicum is taken for credit, the student should register for a 2-credit practicum. Students may only take one research practicum for credit. [Note: students joining the program before 2020 have the choice of doing two 40-hour or one 80-hour practicum.]

To fulfill a practicum requirement, the PhD Committee recommends that students approach a faculty whose research area interests the student. Faculty are encouraged to periodically announce practicum opportunities to make students aware of research practicum possibilities.

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

A research practicum cannot be fulfilled as part of a course; however, 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.

The student and faculty sponsor should prepare a research practicum contract (see Appendix F). This contract 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. Students may also wish to maintain samples of research

practicum outputs in their portfolio as evidence of experience or mastery of particular research methods or particular theoretical areas.

### **Program Milestone Requirements and Deadlines**

The following sections outline key milestones in student progress toward the PhD.

#### *Annual progress evaluation*

Students will provide documentation of their progress through the program and other academic activities by completing the “PhD Student Progress Form” (See Appendix A).

The purpose of the annual progress evaluation is to provide an early point of feedback and counseling for the student. A formal review of the student's progress is conducted at the end of the first three semesters of study. As a part of this review, the student submits (at least 2 weeks prior to the progress evaluation) the first Mastery Demonstration paper for evaluation by the PhD Committee. [See *Master Demonstration Papers* section below for further description.]

At the meeting, the student will speak to the work reflected in the first MD paper with the PhD Committee. Addition, the discussion can cover the student's general progress, their thoughts about a minor field, their 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. The meeting is not intended to be a public occasion. On the basis of the discussion, the Committee develops observations and recommendations for the student. 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.

#### *Mastery demonstration (MD) papers*

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

The first MD paper must be submitted near the end of the student's 3rd semester (usually in late November). This requirement is a critical aspect of the student's Annual Progress Evaluation conducted by the members of the PhD Committee. The first MD paper is a literature review relevant to the student's field and specific area of interest. The literature review is more than a summary of related studies in the field. It is a piece of writing that expresses critical engagement with existing research and theories in the chosen topic area. The PhD Committee is looking for a paper that describes a well-defined area of research, that makes a clear point, and that explains how a substantial and representative amount literature relates to the area of research. The review should efficiently and accurately convey key elements of the literature, and should provide critical comments on and extensions to that literature. The rubric for grading MD papers is used (see Appendix D), however, the Committee selects ‘not applicable’ for two categories: ‘Social or practical importance of questions or issues’ and ‘Originality of ideas or methods’. **There is a required proposal process for MD1 – see Appendix H ‘MD1 Literature Review Proposal’.**

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 appeal for an extension of an MD submission date to avoid not being in good academic standing. 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 Chair outlining and documenting the reasons for the delay, a description of work completed on the project to date, and a detailed plan for completion including a proposed date of submission. The extension cannot exceed four months from the date originally due, and a second extension to this or to subsequent MD papers will normally result in the student being placed on academic probation. This does not change deadlines for subsequent MD papers. The PhD Chair will consult with the student's advisor and present the case to the PhD Committee. The Committee will vote on whether or not to grant the extension.

The three MD papers should ideally address a student's 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.

The professor who 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 D. 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.

### MD Paper Scoring

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. See Appendix D for information on evaluation criteria.

**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 resubmission is allowed; if the second resubmission fails, then the student will not be able to complete the PhD program. Further, only one MD failure with successful resubmission is allowed during a doctoral career. After two such failures, a student will be asked to leave the PhD program. Students may pursue an Advanced Studies Specialist Program

Certificate while on academic probation (see description and requirements of the Certificate in Section V below).

#### *Program portfolio and 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 the 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 PhD degree. See also Graduate School '[Complete your preliminary examinations.](#)'

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 practicum, 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 G).

#### *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 G. 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.

#### *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

### *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 the research practicum requirement, and completion of the MD paper requirement. A generic outline of the program portfolio, together with a suggested timeline is provided in the Appendix G.

## **Dissertation and Oral Defense**

### *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
  - review of the literature and related research
  - an indication of the theoretical and conceptual framework within which the problem fits
- Specific research question(s) 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(s) 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
  - 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 applicable) 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.

#### *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 who 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.

## **IV. DOCTORAL MINOR (TAKEN BY STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE PROGRAM)**

The doctoral minor in Library and Information Studies is a flexible and interdisciplinary program functioning under the University of Wisconsin–Madison Graduate School's [Option A rules](#) (minimum 9 credits). Students will need to fill out a [PhD minor registration form](#) and a [PhD Minor Completion form](#). Both are available from the Information School website. As part of the process of completing the forms, they will need to identify, and obtain the signature of, a minor advisor from the iSchool faculty who will serve to assist with course selection and other issues. To begin the process of enrolling in the Library and Information Studies Option A minor, please contact an iSchool faculty member via email. Only Option A minors are given preferred enrollment status. Students may select courses from both the master's and PhD level from within iSchool for their doctoral minor.

## **V. SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS**

### **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 one 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. The student will have one additional semester (excluding summer) to change their status. If they do not successfully change their status, the student 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. An extension will only be granted if the student can prove the likelihood of success in the upcoming semester. The student should send a letter asking for an extension and providing likelihood of success to the PhD program director.

Continuation in the Graduate School is at the discretion of the Graduate School, the iSchool and the PhD program director.

### **Advanced Studies Specialist Program**

The Advanced Studies Specialist Program is a degree option for students who have done at least 24 credits of graduate coursework as enrolled PhD students in the UW-Madison iSchool, but who decide not to pursue the complete PhD degree.

*Requirements:* The Advanced Studies Specialist Program requires

- 24 graduate credits, half of which may be from outside of the iSchool. 999s are acceptable.
- Completion of a major project (topic approved by advisor), including a paper and an oral presentation. Typically an MD paper defense will fulfill major project requirements.
  - The paper must represent a well-organized inquiry employing appropriate methods and complying with expectations for academic writing and presentation.
  - The oral presentation must be made to a committee of at least 3 UW faculty, at least two of which must be from the iSchool.

*Completion:* Completion of the Advanced Studies Specialist Program results in the issuance of a UW-Madison Certificate of Specialist in Library and Information Studies with the student's particular area of specialization designated. The certificate appears on the official UW transcript. Past Advanced Studies Specialist Program certificate holders have specialized in topics such as library assessment, library history, metadata applications and data management. Note: students cannot simultaneously pursue a PhD and an Advanced Studies Specialist Program certificate – credits count toward one program or the other.

### **Academic Grievance - iSchool Grade Appeal Procedure**

The assignment of a course grade is a judgment for which the instructor in the course is solely responsible, and appeal of this judgment is a serious matter. A student who feels that a grade assigned for a course is an inaccurate or unjust reflection of his or her work and learning in the course and wishes to appeal it will embark on the following process:

1. The student must first discuss the matter with the instructor who assigned the grade that is being appealed. This should be done no later than the end of the first two weeks of the semester following the one in which the grade was awarded (Spring semester for Fall grades; Fall semester for Spring and Summer grades).
2. If, after this discussion, the student wishes to appeal the matter further, he or she should submit an appeal in writing to the Associate Director. This should be done within two weeks of the student's discussion with the instructor.
3. The written appeal will be considered by a committee consisting of Associate Director and two other faculty members selected by the Associate Director, at least one being a member of the iSchool Executive Committee. The instructor will be informed that such an appeal has been submitted. The committee will gather such information and documentation as it deems appropriate.

4. If the committee finds adequate basis for doing so, it will ask the instructor to reconsider the grade and to report the results of the reconsideration to the student and to the Director. Alternatively, the committee may decide that the appeal lacks sufficient basis for action. In either case, the student will be notified of the committee's decision and of the student's right to appeal to the Graduate School, using the Graduate School's appeal procedures.

## VI. SATISFACTORY PROGRESS - CONDUCT EXPECTATIONS

### Diversity Statement

We are committed to the ideas reflected in the UW's statement on diversity: "Diversity is a source of strength, creativity, and innovation for UW-Madison. We value the contributions of each person and respect the profound ways their identity, culture, background, experience, status, abilities, and opinion enrich the university community. We commit ourselves to the pursuit of excellence in teaching, research, outreach, and diversity as inextricably linked goals. The University of Wisconsin-Madison fulfills its public mission by creating a welcoming and inclusive community for people from every background – people who as students, faculty, and staff serve Wisconsin and the world."

### Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is an act in which a student (UWS 14.03(1)):

1. seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation;
2. uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise;
3. forges or falsifies academic documents or records;
4. intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others;
5. engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance; or
6. assists other students in any of these acts.

### Non-Academic Misconduct

The university may discipline a student in non-academic matters in the following situations:

1. for conduct which constitutes a serious danger to the personal safety of a member of the university community or guest;
2. for stalking or harassment;
3. for conduct that seriously damages or destroys university property or attempts to damage or destroy university property, or the property of a member of the university community or guest;
4. for conduct that obstructs or seriously impairs university-run or university-authorized activities, or that interferes with or impedes the ability of a member of the university community, or guest, to participate in university-run or university-authorized activities;
5. for unauthorized possession of university property or property of another member of the university community or guest;
6. for acts which violate the provisions of UWS 18, Conduct on University Lands;
7. for knowingly making a false statement to any university employee or agent on a university-related matter, or for refusing to identify oneself to such employee or agent;
8. for violating a standard of conduct, or other requirement or restriction imposed in connection with disciplinary action.

### Research Misconduct

Much of graduate education is carried out not in classrooms, but in laboratories and other research venues, often supported by federal or other external funding sources. Indeed, it is often difficult to distinguish

between academic misconduct and cases of research misconduct. Graduate students are held to the same standards of responsible conduct of research as faculty and staff. The Graduate School is responsible for investigating allegations of research misconduct. This is often done in consultation with the Division of Student Life as well as with federal and state agencies to monitor, investigate, determine sanctions, and train about the responsible conduct of research. For more information, contact the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research Policy, 333 Bascom Hall, (608) 262-1044.

## **VII. FUNDING AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION**

### **Guaranteed funding**

Upon admission into the PhD program, all students are guaranteed funding for the first three years. Funding most commonly takes the form of a departmental TA or PA position.

### **Finding non-guaranteed funding**

While all PhD students are guaranteed funding for the first three years, additional, non-guaranteed funding may be available in the form of departmental TA, PA, lecturer or instructor positions. If you are looking for funding to support your graduate studies, the Graduate School provides a list of steps to follow, at [grad.wisc.edu/studentfunding/steps](http://grad.wisc.edu/studentfunding/steps)

### **Graduate Assistantships (TAs, PAs and Lecturer positions)**

#### *Stipend levels and paychecks*

Stipend rates for graduate assistantships are set by the University. Current rates for TAs, PAs, and LSAs can be found on the website for the Office of Human Resources.

Graduate assistants are paid on a monthly basis and stipends are usually deposited directly into student's bank accounts. You can authorize direct deposit by filling out the Authorization for Direct Deposit of Payroll form and returning it to the Graduate Coordinator.

#### *Tuition remission and payment of segregated fees*

TAs, PAs, and Lecturers (Students Assistants) with appointments of 33.3% or higher (approximately 13 hrs/week) receive remission of their full tuition (in- and out-of-state, as applicable). Students with these appointments are still responsible for paying segregated fees.

#### *Health insurance benefits*

TAs, PAs, and Lecturers (Student Assistants) with appointments of 33.3% or higher (approximately 13 hrs/week) for at least the length of a semester are eligible to enroll in a health insurance program.

#### *Maximum appointment levels*

The Graduate School sets the maximum levels of graduate assistantship appointments. International students should be especially aware of maximum levels of employment.

### **Fellowships**

There are many different kinds of fellowships on campus. Some are awarded by the program, some are awarded by the school/college and others are awarded by the Graduate School. In addition, a number of students have applied for and won fellowships from federal agencies, professional organizations and private foundations. The terms and conditions of fellowships across campus vary widely. If you have a fellowship, make sure you understand the obligations and benefits of that fellowship, including stipend, health insurance eligibility, eligibility for tuition remission, pay schedule, etc.

### *Graduate School fellowships*

The Graduate School administers a number of different fellowships on campus, including: University Fellowships, Chancellor's Fellowships, Mellon-Wisconsin Fellowships, the Dickie Fellowships and a variety of external fellowships.

### *External fellowships*

We encourage all students to seek out and apply for funding from sources external to the university (e.g., federal agencies, professional organizations, private foundations). The Graduate School supports selected federal/private fellowships through the provision of tuition support and health insurance.

The Graduate School also provides remission of the non-resident portion of students' tuition (if applicable) to students who win external fellowships that are payrolled through the university and provide an academic year (9-month) or an annual year (12-month) stipend.

Students should be aware that fellowships and awards from external sources will each have unique terms and conditions that you should take time to understand.

### **Funding for Conference/Research Travel**

iSchool PhD students wishing to apply for departmental funding to support conference and/or research travel should apply via the following Google form: <https://goo.gl/forms/427I3SXyu0OOKzIs2>

In addition to iSchool funding, the Graduate School provides a limited amount of funding for dissertators and final year MFA students whose research has been accepted for presentation at a conference. For more information about this funding, visit the [Student Research Grants Competition website](#).

In addition, the Graduate School runs the Travel Research Grants competition, which provides funds to support travel related to your dissertation/thesis research. Students must be dissertators or final-year MFA students. For more information about this funding, visit the [Student Research Grants Competition website](#).

## **VIII. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PLANNING**

### **Local Resources for Professional Development and Career Planning**

Tanya Hendricks Cobb: Student and Alumni Services Coordinator

[tcobb@wisc.edu](mailto:tcobb@wisc.edu)

(608) 263-2909

### **Campus-wide Resources for Professional Development**

In addition to opportunities at the local level, the Graduate School Office of Professional Development provides direct programming in the areas of career development and skill building, and also serves as a clearing house for professional development resources across campus. Be sure to keep a pulse on programs offered by the following campus services as well:

- Writing Center [writing.wisc.edu/](http://writing.wisc.edu/)
- Grants Information Collection [grants.library.wisc.edu/](http://grants.library.wisc.edu/)
- Delta Program [delta.wisc.edu](http://delta.wisc.edu)
- UW Center for the Humanities [humanities.wisc.edu](http://humanities.wisc.edu)

## **Individual Development Plans (IDP)**

The Graduate School webpage offers a collection of IDP resources (<https://grad.wisc.edu/professional-development/individual-development-plan/>) to support graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, mentors, PIs, grants administrators, and graduate program coordinators.

As you begin your Graduate School career, an IDP is an essential tool to help you:

- 1) Assess your current skills and strengths
- 2) Make a plan for developing skills that will help you meet your academic and professional goals
- 3) Communicate with your advisors and mentors about your evolving goals and related skills.

The IDP you create is a document you will want to revisit again and again, to update and refine as your goals change and/or come into focus, and to record your progress and accomplishments. It also serves to start – and maintain – the conversation with your faculty advisor about your career goals and professional development needs.

The onus to engage in the IDP process is on you, although your advisor may encourage and support you in doing so. The IDP itself remains private to you, and you choose which parts to share. Through the IDP process, you may decide to identify various mentors to whom you can go for expertise and advice.

## IX. APPENDICES

### A. APPENDIX: INFORMATION SCHOOL PHD ANNUAL PROGRESS EVALUATION FORM

**Review date** –

**Name** –

**Semester started** –

*This form is used to track work you have completed during your studies at the Information School. You should revise this form each semester as you work toward your portfolio. You must submit this on Canvas each year on Dec 1<sup>st</sup>. Indicate work you are currently doing (courses, papers, etc.) as ‘in progress’.*

#### **Course Work (51 credits minimum)**

<b>Seminars in at least three of the following four areas</b>	<b>Course title</b>	<b>Semester completed</b>
Cultural History, Policies and Debates		
Information Organization & Access		
Information Policy, Management & Institutions		
Users, Uses & Contexts		

<b>Required classes</b>	<b>Semester completed</b>
LIS 603: Introduction to research (or equivalent)	
LIS 910: Research Design and Methodologies	
Statistics 1	
Statistics 2	
Qualitative Research Methods	
Digital data collection or analysis research method experience	
LIS 639: Pedagogical theory & practice (or equivalent)	

<b>Minor (12 credits minimum) - indicate your minor: Course titles</b>	<b>Semester completed</b>

<b>Other classes</b>	<b>Semesters completed</b>
Professional Writing and Research (PWR) seminars (6 credits required for students starting Fall 2020)	

<b>Research Practicum (indicate topic and supervisor)*</b>	<b>Semester completed</b>
--	---------------------------

\*Complete Practicum agreement form and save for your portfolio (see Student Handbook)

**Mastery Demonstration Papers\***

<b>Title of paper</b>	<b>Month and year passed</b>
MD1 (reviewed by PhD committee – due end of the 3rd semester)	
MD2 (jury review – due end of the 5th semester)	
MD3 (jury review – due end of 7 <sup>th</sup> semester)	

\*Keep email and/or paper communication that shows you have passed each MD paper. You will need these for your portfolio.

**Teaching**

<b>Position (e.g. TA, primary instructor, guest lecturer)</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Semester</b>

**Professional activities** (journal articles written/published; conferences attended; conference presentations; please indicate if you have applied to conferences and/or submitted articles to journals; include dates of conference, submissions or presentations)

**Area of research**

*Please write a brief statement (300-400 words) about your focus for your next MD paper and/or dissertation. You must include 1) your current idea for the research topic, and 2) a personal justification for pursuing your chosen topic (for example, course work you have taken, personal experience with the topic).*

## B. 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

\_\_\_\_\_ **Professional Writing and Research (PWR) seminar (6 semesters)**

### 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. LIS 768)

### Pedagogy:

- \_\_\_\_\_ LIS 639: Pedagogical theory & practice (or equivalent)

### Minor: 12 credits minimum (option A or B)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3 credits                      \_\_\_\_\_ 3 credits
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3 credits                      \_\_\_\_\_ 3 credits

**Research practicum** (80 hours, possible 2 credits; students enrolled before Fall 2020 have the option of completing two 40-hour practica) \_\_\_\_\_

### 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 7<sup>th</sup> semester)

\_\_\_\_\_ **Program portfolio defense**

### End of Program Steps – see also Graduate School [‘Defend and Deposit Your Dissertation’](#)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 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 (warrant gets signed by examiners)

## C. APPENDIX: 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.

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 1<sup>st</sup> to the 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 D) 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.

The iSchool PhD Committee strongly encourages students to do a literature review for their first MD paper. The literature review is more than a summary of related studies in the field. It is a piece of writing that expresses critical engagement with existing research and theories in the chosen topic area. The PhD Committee is looking for a paper that describes a well-defined area of research, that makes a clear point, and that explains how a substantial and representative amount literature relates to the area of research. The review should efficiently and accurately convey key elements of the literature, and should provide critical comments on and extensions to that literature. The Review Criteria rubric for grading MD papers is used (see Appendix D), however, the Committee selects 'not applicable' for two categories: 'Social or practical importance of questions or issues' and 'Originality of ideas or methods'. The Committee encourages students to make an appointment with the Writing Center to review their MD papers.

### *Second & Third MD Paper Instructions:*

The second MD paper must be submitted at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> semester of study or at the completion of 36 credit hours of PhD coursework. The third MD paper must be submitted by the end of the student's 7<sup>th</sup> semester. The final MD paper must be completed prior to the portfolio and defense meeting.

**Gatekeeper:** The student should choose a gatekeeper & provide the gatekeeper with a copy of these instructions (Appendix C), the review form (Appendix D) 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 C) and the form "Jury Evaluation of Mastery Demonstration Papers" (Appendix D). 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 review forms and 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; 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 an MD paper has been accepted, the gatekeeper must email or provide written confirmation to the student that the MD paper has passed. Students must save this confirmation for their portfolios.

**When the process is complete, the gatekeeper must advise the iSchool Student Records Administrator of the result. The iSchool Student Records Administrator will download reviews and grades from Canvas.**

D. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> (delete one) Mastery Demonstration paper review. 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 prepare brief comments that (a) assess the paper as an example of independent scholarly inquiry, and (b) provide constructive feedback to improve the paper. **Your completed form will be made available to the student for review.**

First MD papers: The iSchool PhD Committee strongly encourages students to do a literature review for their first MD paper. The literature review is a piece of writing that expresses critical engagement with existing research and theories in the chosen topic area. The PhD Committee is looking for a paper that describes a well-defined area of research, that makes a clear point, and that explains how a substantial and representative amount literature relates to the area of research. The review should efficiently and accurately convey key elements of the literature, and should provide critical comments on and extensions to that literature. **The Review Criteria rubric for grading MD papers is used, however, the Committee selects ‘not applicable’ for two categories: ‘Social or practical importance of questions or issues’ and ‘Originality of ideas or methods’.**

Please note that evaluation expectations for MD paper increase from the 1st to the 3rd paper. For the second paper jurors should expect paper quality similar to a full conference paper including a significant research question, a full methodology, and 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.

Please see MASTERY DEMONSTRATION (MD) PAPERS: INSTRUCTIONS FOR STUDENTS, JURY MEMBERS, & GATEKEEPERS for more detailed instructions (Appendix C in the iSchool PhD Handbook).

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

Review Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
<b>Social or practical importance of questions or issues:</b> 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?						
<b>Relevance to the field:</b> 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?						
<b>Validity of claims:</b> 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?						

<b>Originality of ideas or methods:</b> 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?						
<b>Significance of research:</b> 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?						
<b>Readability of the paper as integral work of research literature:</b> 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?						
<b>Scholarship:</b> 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:

**When the process is complete, the gatekeeper must advise the iSchool Student Records Administrator of the result. The iSchool Student Records Administrator will download reviews and grades from Canvas.**

E. APPENDIX: TEACHING PRACTICUM CONTRACT (optional practicum for students starting Fall 2019)

**Title:**

**Faculty Sponsor:**

**Student Participant:**

**Contribution:**

Key tasks	Hours to complete	Outputs	Due dates

For credit? Yes / No (circle one)      If yes, semester of credit registration: \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures indication 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: RESEARCH PRACTICUM CONTRACT

**Title:**

**Faculty Sponsor:**

**Student Participant:**

**Contribution:**

Key tasks	Hours to complete	Outputs	Due dates

For credit? Yes / No (circle one)      If yes, semester of credit registration: \_\_\_\_\_

Signatures indication agreement with contract terms:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty sponsor                      Date                      Student                      Date

Signatures indicating completion of work:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Faculty sponsor                      Date                      Student                      Date

Suggested areas for improvement/feedback:

## G. 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 all faculty sign off on the Program Portfolio, the student will present and defend the 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 hard copy available to the iSchool community. The student is encouraged to make the portfolio accessible electronically, but this is not mandatory. 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. 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 research practicum
    - g. Completed research practicum form
    - h. Completed Information School PhD annual progress evaluation form
  - 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 PhD degree when it is filed with the Dean of the Graduate School. The Graduate School officially admits a student to candidacy for the PhD 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. See also Graduate School '[Complete your preliminary examinations.](#)'

## H. APPENDIX: MD1 LITERATURE REVIEW PROPOSAL

All students must complete the MD1 proposal process during their first year of the program. Proposals are due at the end of semester 2 (as part of the PWR seminar) and are read by the entire PhD Committee.

Suggested timeline: semester 1 - steps 1&2; semester 2 - steps 3 &4

### Steps to complete:

1. Step-up your training on searching (see Dr Cat Smith, do her power searching course, or complete her 602)
2. Read about literature reviews
  - a. Complete the tutorial here: <https://www.monash.edu/rlo/graduate-research-writing/write-the-thesis/writing-a-literature-review>
  - b. Read at least 3 examples of PhD thesis literature reviews. For example, read Ling Feng, Morgan Meyer, and Tom Webb: <https://studysites.sagepub.com/ridley/reviews.htm>
  - c. Recommended books:
    - i. Hart, Chris *Doing a Literature Review*
    - ii. Ridley, Diana *The Literature Review: A Step-by-Step Guide for Students*
3. Decide your method for finding relevant literature, which may include any or all of the following:
  - Keyword and subject searches on library catalogues and in databases that index the literature of your field, as well as citation databases like Web of Science and Scopus
  - Browse university bookshelves
  - Identify key journals – skim titles and abstracts
  - Use the snowball technique of following up references in bibliographies
  - Identify key authors and search for their publications
4. Write a 1000-word proposal for your literature review that includes
  - a. Brief introduction to the topic
  - b. Purpose of your literature review
  - c. Method and justification for finding relevant literature, including a list of databases you have searched
  - d. Discussion of scope and limitations and adjacent literature.
  - e. Outline of possible themes, theories, and methods from the literature that are emerging in your initial scope. We view this as a tentative outline.