



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

This version created June 2021

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.....	8
	Advisor	
	Advisor Selection	
	Advisor Roles	
	Change of Advisor	
III.	DOCTORAL DEGREE REQUIREMENTS	8
	Program Basics	
	Course Requirements	
	Credit requirements	
	Course distributions and content areas	
	Breadth Courses (12 credits)	
	Specialization (12 credits)	
	Doctoral Minor for iSchool PhD students (12 credits)	
	Core Information Science Courses (15 credits)	
	Additional Program Requirements	
	Theoretical approaches	
	IRB training	
	Publishing and conference presentation requirements	
	Research practicum	
	Teaching experience	
	Program Milestone Requirements and Deadlines	
	Annual progress evaluation	
	Mastery demonstration (MD) papers	
	Advancement to Candidacy (the iSchool preliminary examination)	
	Program portfolio	
	Preliminary proposal	
	Preliminary proposal defense	
	Protocol and timeline	
	Dissertation and Oral Defense	
	Dissertation proposal and oral defense	
	Dissertation defense	
	Time Constraints	

IV.	DOCTORAL MINOR (TAKEN BY STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE PROGRAM).....	19
V.	SATISFACTORY PROGRESS – ACADEMIC EXPECTATIONS	19
	Good academic standing	
	Credits per term allowed	
VI.	SATISFACTORY PROGRESS - CONDUCT EXPECTATIONS	20
	Diversity Statement	
	Academic Misconduct	
	Non-Academic Misconduct	
	Research Misconduct	
	Probation	
VII.	FUNDING AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION	21
	Guaranteed funding	
	Finding non-guaranteed funding	
	Graduate Assistantships (TAs, PAs, RAs, Lecturer/SA positions)	
	Stipend Levels and Paychecks	
	Tuition Remission and Payment of Segregated Fees	
	Health Insurance Benefits	
	Maximum Appointment Levels	
	Fellowships	
	Graduate School Fellowships	
	External Funding/Fellowships	
	Funding for Conference/Research Travel	
VIII.	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND CAREER PLANNING	22
	Local/Program Resources for Professional Development and Career Planning	
	Campus-wide Resources for Professional Development	
	Individual Development Plans (IDP)	

APPENDICES.....23

X. APPENDICES.....25

- A. Information School PhD Annual Progress Evaluation Form
- B. Checklist of Doctoral Program Requirements
- C. Mastery Demonstration (MD) Papers: Instructions
- D. Mastery Demonstration (MD) Papers: Evaluation Forms
- E. Teaching Practicum Contract
- F. Research Practicum Contract
- G. Program Portfolio Checklist
- H. Mastery Demonstration Paper 1 proposal process

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 information 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 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. Add to existing bodies of theory, scholarship, or scientific knowledge through critique, testing or extension in scholarly output.
 1. By having papers accepted at recognized conferences and journals
 2. By passing mastery demonstration (MD) papers
 3. By completing a satisfactory dissertation
 4. By having papers accepted at recognized scholarly journals
2. Demonstrate mastery of statistical, computational, and digital data collection and analysis methodologies.
 1. By including a digital data collection and analysis methodologies statement in the portfolio
 2. By enrolling in an appropriate digital humanities and/or analytics course (e.g. LIS 768)
3. Employ scholarly methodologies and tools appropriate to areas of study to inform research.
 1. By completing breadth requirements
 2. By including a research methods statement in the portfolio
4. Demonstrate scholarly communication skills both orally and in writing.
 1. By having papers accepted at recognized conferences and journals
 2. By passing MD papers
 3. By completing teaching assistant placements
 4. By giving presentations in conferences or workshops
5. Engage in service contributions as appropriate to profession and field of study.
 1. By attending conferences
 2. By participating in university academic activities (e.g. STS, interdisciplinary programs)
6. Demonstrate teaching skills and experience including cultural competency training.
 1. By completing teaching assistant placements
 2. By completing the pedagogy class successfully
 3. By completing a teaching assistantship and/or lectureship successfully
 4. By completing the teaching practicum successfully

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:

Downey, Greg

Areas of interest: History and geography of information and communication technology and labor

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

Hutchins, Ian

Research fields: Scientific Portfolio Analysis, Bibliometrics, Science-of-Science

Methods and methodologies: machine learning, Network Analysis, Natural Language Processing, informatics

Areas of interest: scientific advance, bench-to-bedside translation, science policy

Jackson, Corey

Corey's research bridges human-centered computing, computer-supported cooperative work, and design epistemologies from fields such as organization studies, psychology, and education. His work employs qualitative and quantitative methodologies and is informed by a socio-technical perspective and theories. His research contributes to the design of open collaboration platforms and is directed by two complementary approaches: (1) documenting human experiences online and (2) implementing and evaluating system affordances.

Jiang, Jiepu

Areas of interest: Information retrieval, conversational agents, exploratory text analytics, human-AI interaction

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

Ni, Chaoqun

Areas of interest: Scholarly Communication, Science Policy, Scientometrics, Scholarly Data Analytics

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

Rule, Adam

I am a postdoctoral scholar in Medical Informatics at Oregon Health and Science University working with Michelle Hribar and Michael Chiang. I study technologies that help people document, share, and collaboratively perform data-driven work. I am especially interested in computational notebooks, electronic health records, reproducible research, information visualization, and apple fritters. I will join the Information School at the University of Wisconsin-Madison as an assistant professor in Fall 2021.

I am recruiting PhD students to join my group next Fall. Please apply to the iSchool's PhD program and send me your CV if you are interested in working with me at the intersection of HCI, health informatics, and human-centered data science.

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

Thebault-Spieker, Jacob

Research fields: HCI, social computing

Methods and methodologies: experimental, geographic/statistical analysis, building systems

Areas of interest: understanding and mitigating bias, behavioral analysis, online communities, distributed work

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

The Information School Ph.D. Committee serves as the Progress Evaluation Committee for doctoral students. Upon admission, the Ph.D. committee chair 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.

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 preliminary proposal.

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 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.

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 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.

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 information studies research and scholarship and (2) develop an in-depth knowledge in an area of specialty. This is a summary of the course requirements, which are detailed below:

- Breadth Courses (12 credits)
- Specialization (12 credits)
- Doctoral Minor (12 credits)
- Core Information Science Courses (15 credits)

Breadth Courses (12 credits)

Must take at least one 3-credit course in each of the following four areas: 1) Intro to Research Design, Thinking, Methods; 2) Statistics/Numerical Literacy; 3) Working with Digital Data; and 4) Pedagogy. Suggested and pre-approved lists of courses for each of these areas are available from advisors.

Specialization (12 credits)

Students must complete a minimum 12 credits in their area of specialization. Courses must be relevant to the student's program of study. Courses should be chosen in consultation with their advisor or the PhD program chair.

Doctoral Minor for iSchool PhD students (12 credits)

Students must complete a minimum of 12 credits in their PhD minor. Students may complete a concentrated minor or a distributed minor or a concentrated minor. If the minor is located within a single department (concentrated; Option A), the requirements of that department must be met. The distributed minor (Option B), a minor in which courses are selected from among two or more departments, must consist of at least 12 credits. Option B can be appropriate for iSchool PhD students because information studies theories build upon research and principles from a diversity of other academic disciplines and professional fields. Additionally, information studies research frequently involves not only the theories and techniques from 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 information services are provided. The intent of the minor is not met with basic courses taken to meet the research skills requirement.

Core Information Science Courses (15 credits)

Students show development of a broad background knowledge of the LIS field through completion of content area coursework. All students must take

- LIS 910 Research Design and Methodology for LIS
- 6 credits of LIS 925 a 1-credit departmental seminar course
- Seminars in at least two of the following four areas: 1) Use, Users and Context; 2) Information Organization and Access; 3) Cultural Philosophies, Histories and Debates; and 4) Information Policy, Management and Institutions. 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, program 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.

Additional Program Requirements

Theoretical Approaches

Students should develop expertise in the theoretical frameworks they select for their dissertation as approved by their advisor. Knowledge of theoretical approaches will be obtained through LIS 910 and other coursework, both inside and outside the iSchool.

- 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

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, the student must have completed at least two submissions to a refereed journal, conference, or book chapter.

Research practicum

Each student is required to fulfill one research practicum. The purpose of the research practicum is to ensure that each PhD 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 to promote collaboration between PhD students and iSchool faculty. Each 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 2-credit practicum. The practicum must include at least 80 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. Faculty are encouraged to periodically announce practicum opportunities to make students aware of research practicum possibilities. Students are encouraged to do their practica with two different faculty to gain experience with different research areas. Students are also encouraged to design each practicum to focus on a different research skill (e.g. practicum one could focus on creating a literature review, while the second could involve data collection). Each practicum may also involve more than one skill.

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.

Teaching experience

All students must demonstrate teaching skills and experience including cultural competency training. Students may meet the teaching skills requirement by teaching a course, through a Teaching Assistant position, or through a teaching practicum.

A cultural competency training statement must be included in the portfolio. This statement only needs to indicate the training the student undertook. Cultural competency training is often included in pedagogy courses such as LIS639, or students can take a dedicated cultural competency workshop or seminar. An indicative list of cultural competency training opportunities is available from students' advisors.

Option: Instructors and Teaching Assistants

For students who are instructors or teaching assistants, teaching skills and experience are documented through course evaluations from students. In addition, when PhD students teach a course, a faculty member provides them with an evaluation of their teaching as part of the departmental course evaluation process. These are all optional documents for the teaching section of the portfolio.

Option: Teaching practicum

Students who do not teach a course must satisfactorily complete a teaching practicum under the supervision of a faculty member. The faculty supervisor assesses the practicum experience against student's stated goals using a rubric which is included in the portfolio. The purpose of the teaching practicum is to ensure that each PhD 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 one. Any additional teaching practicum may not be taken for credit.

To fulfill a teaching practicum requirement, the PhD Committee recommends that students approach the faculty who teaches the course with which they would like to gain experience. The student and faculty will prepare a “contract” (see Appendix E) describing the student’s obligations. Because the purpose of the practicum is to gain LIS teaching experience, the teaching practicum should be taken with an iSchool faculty member. Students may fulfill their practicum by working as a TA for an iSchool class, but they must provide evidence that their TA experience fulfilled all the practicum requirements (see 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 presenting in a class they are currently taking, or by giving presentations at colloquia.

The teaching practicum should be equivalent to one 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 (e.g. course readings, handouts, slides, lecture, presentation), leading discussion and evaluation of students’ comprehension of material.

Evidence demonstrating fulfillment of the teaching 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 students’ work or completed assignments
- Lecture outline
- Contract signed by faculty sponsor at the end of the practicum indicating completion of agreed upon responsibilities and obligations (signed contract serves as proof that the student completed the practicum)
- Written feedback provided by the faculty sponsor indicating elements of classroom student evaluation of the PhD student’s teaching

All evidence of practica 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 student’s portfolio. Faculty who agree to sponsor a practicum are responsible for providing a half-page of written feedback; a practicum should only be conducted when the faculty sponsor is available to observe and provide feedback.

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 Annual Progress Evaluation Form” (See Appendix A). The purpose of the annual progress evaluation is to provide feedback and counseling for the student. All pre-dissertation students will submit this form annually via Canvas in April.

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 (MD1) for evaluation by 3 members of the PhD Committee. One member of MD1 Committee will be the student's nominal chair or faculty closely associated with their intended research area, and other members of the MD1 are selected by the PhD Committee chair. Where there is disagreement on the committee (between non-chair members), a 4th person will be called in (appointed by PhD Committee Chair). [See *Master Demonstration Papers* section below for further description.] MD1 is examined by the Committee at a formal defense meeting. At the MD1 defense meeting, the student will be asked questions and speak to the work reflected in the paper. In 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 two 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 progress evaluation conducted by members of the PhD Committee. All students must complete the MD1 proposal process during their first year of the program (see Appendix H). Proposals are due at the end of semester 2 (as part of the 925 seminar) and are read by 3 members of the PhD Committee (student's advisor and 2 other members appointed by PhD Committee Chair). 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. A rubric for grading MD papers is used (see Appendix D). The Committee encourages students to make an appointment with the Writing Center to review their MD papers.

The second MD paper must be submitted by the end of the student's 6th semester. 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 will normally result in the student being placed on academic probation. 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 two 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 the MD2 paper. Students must arrange an MD2 defense meeting for their MD2 paper. This meeting will be similar to the MD1 defense meeting. 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. Both MD 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 Appendix D for more information on evaluation criteria.

Advancement to Candidacy

Students must complete their advancement to candidacy within four years of entering the program (by the end of the 8th semester). Students who miss this deadline will not be in good standing with the Information School and funding will be reconsidered. There are two parts of students' advancement to candidacy: 1) submission of a program portfolio, and 2) presentation and defense of a preliminary proposal.

At this stage, a *preliminary committee* is formed for the purpose of examining the preliminary proposal. This committee should be composed of three iSchool faculty members who likely will be on the student's dissertation committee. A fourth faculty member from outside the iSchool must be added to

the *dissertation committee* to examine the dissertation proposal and dissertation (see [Graduate School requirements for doctoral committees](#)). The student and advisor may decide whether or not to invite the outside faculty member to examine the preliminary proposal. Following the Graduate School requirements, the fourth member and any additional members may be from any of the following categories, as approved by the iSchool's PhD Committee: graduate faculty, faculty from a department without a graduate program, academic staff (including emeritus faculty), visiting faculty, faculty from other institutions, scientists, research associates, and other individuals deemed qualified by the PhD committee.

Program portfolio

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 their dissertation project. Students are eligible to present a program portfolio when they have satisfied the program requirements, including completing all required coursework, clearing their records of all incomplete grades, acquiring the required graduate credits, and completing all teaching and research practica. The program portfolio should consist of a well-organized binder, electronic file, or electronic folder maintained by the student throughout their doctoral career. It must include the materials listed in Appendix G. Portfolios may be submitted at any time, but must be approved before the end of the 8th semester.

The student's portfolio will be submitted to the advisor for approval and made available in print or digital format for a period of optional review and feedback by other faculty members for 30 days. After this time period, the portfolio will be submitted to the PhD committee for final approval. The portfolio is evaluated using a checklist (see Appendix G). After the portfolio is submitted, the student can schedule the presentation and defense of the preliminary proposal with their preliminary committee.

Preliminary proposal

The preliminary proposal is a forward-looking plan for the student's doctoral research. The proposal should be 8-10 pages (not including references). Students should work with the advisor to decide the content areas of the proposal, as this will vary according to discipline. The proposal might cover the following areas:

- 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
- 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

Preliminary proposal defense

There will be an oral defense of the preliminary proposal. In the defense meeting, the student will give a 20-minute presentation of the proposal. Content will vary – the following is a suggested format for the presentation:

Slide 1 – motivating questions, proposed research questions, why the student is the right person to do this dissertation

Slide 2 – literature being drawn from, indication of coursework that prepared the student

Slide 3 – theories being drawn on, indication of coursework that prepared the student

- Slide 4 – proposed methodologies for data collection and analysis, indication of coursework that prepared the student
- Slide 5 – anticipated issues related to access to data
- Slide 6 – contribution of this proposed study, impact, importance to research or practice

Following the presentation, the preliminary committee will ask the student questions and discuss potential suggestions for the student’s dissertation research. 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 primary advisor, in consultation with the committee, will determine when the student should fulfill these additional requirements.

Protocol and timeline

Students must submit their program portfolio and preliminary proposal by the end of their 8th semester in the program. A student may seek an appeal of the portfolio and preliminary proposal 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.

Four weeks prior to the preliminary proposal defense, the student should meet with the iSchool Student Records Coordinator to review coursework and request a preliminary warrant. After a successful submission of the portfolio and defense of the preliminary proposal, the Graduate School Office issues a warrant authorizing the Information School to receive the student’s program portfolio and preliminary proposal. The warrant constitutes a formal acceptance into candidacy for the PhD degree.

Dissertation and Oral Defense

Dissertation proposal and oral defense

The doctoral dissertation proposal is a formal document that the student prepares and that the student's doctoral committee evaluates and approves. The committee should approve the dissertation proposal before the student collects substantive data for the dissertation. For many students, the dissertation proposal is the first three chapters of the dissertation: introductory chapter, literature review, and methods. In any case, the proposal must contain at a minimum the following sections:

- Statement of the problem including:
 - an indication of the relevance of the topic to 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 discussion, 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 discussion, 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

In the dissertation proposal, the student must demonstrate the ability for independent investigation. The dissertation proposal evaluation process involves an oral defense. The student's doctoral committee (dissertation committee) shall supervise the dissertation, with the major professor serving as chair. Students shall arrange with their 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.

Time Constraints

A candidate for a doctoral degree who fails to take the final oral examination and deposit the dissertation within five years after passing their program portfolio and preliminary proposal may be required to take additional coursework, redefend their program portfolio and preliminary proposal, and to be admitted to candidacy a second time.

Doctoral degree students who have been absent for ten or more consecutive years lose all credits that they have earned before their absence. Individual programs may count the coursework students completed prior to their absence for meeting program requirements; that coursework may not count toward Graduate School credit requirements.

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

The doctoral minor in Information 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 Information minor (Option A), 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 both 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.

Credits per Term Allowed

Eight to 12 credits in a regular semester is considered full time at the graduate level. Course load maximums are 12 credits in a regular semester, 8 credits in the summer term and 3 credits in the intersession.

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.

Probation

Students who fail to meet any of the assessment criteria as described in the Doctoral Program Student Handbook will receive a letter of warning from the Ph.D. 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, they will be asked to leave the program. If students do not expect to successfully change their status within the probationary semester, they can request that the Ph.D. committee grant a probation extension; however, an extension will be granted only 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 Ph.D. program director.

VII. FUNDING AND FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Guaranteed funding

Upon admission into the PhD program, all students are guaranteed funding for the first five years at 50% FTE. Funding most commonly takes the form of a departmental TA, PA or RA position.

Finding non-guaranteed funding

While all PhD students are guaranteed funding for the first five years, additional, non-guaranteed funding may be available in the form of departmental TA, PA, RA, 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

Graduate Assistantships (TAs, PAs, RAs and Lecturer positions)

Stipend levels and paychecks

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

Graduate assistants are paid on a bi-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, RAs and Lecturers (Student 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, RAs 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/42713SXyu0OOKzIs2>

NOTE: after you have filled in the form, send an email to the iSchool Director indicating that you have done so.

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

(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/
- Grants Information Collection grants.library.wisc.edu/
- Delta Program delta.wisc.edu
- UW Center for the Humanities 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. GRIEVANCES AND APPEALS

These resources may be helpful in addressing your concerns:

- [Bias or Hate Reporting](#)
- [Graduate Assistantship Policies and Procedures](#)
- [Hostile and Intimidating Behavior Policies and Procedures](#)
 - [Office of the Provost for Faculty and Staff Affairs](#)
- [Dean of Students Office](#) (for all students to seek grievance assistance and support)
- [Employee Assistance](#) (for personal counseling and workplace consultation around communication and conflict involving graduate assistants and other employees, post-doctoral students, faculty and staff)
- [Employee Disability Resource Office](#) (for qualified employees or applicants with disabilities to have equal employment opportunities)
- [Graduate School](#) (for informal advice at any level of review and for official appeals of program/departmental or school/college grievance decisions)
- [Office of Compliance](#) (for class harassment and discrimination, including sexual harassment and sexual violence)
- [Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards](#) (for conflicts involving students)
- [Ombuds Office for Faculty and Staff](#) (for employed graduate students and post-docs, as well as faculty and staff)
- [Title IX](#) (for concerns about discrimination)

Students should contact the department chair or program director with questions about grievances.

APPENDICES

A. APPENDIX

INFORMATION SCHOOL PHD STUDENT 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 will be revising this form each year as you work toward your portfolio. Indicate work you are currently doing (courses, papers, etc.) as ‘in progress’.

Course Work (51 credits minimum)

Core Information Science Courses (15 credits)		
Course	Course title	Semester completed
LIS 910	Research Design and Methodology for LIS	
LIS 925	PWR Seminar (1-credit, take 6 times)	
Seminars in at least two of the following four areas		
LIS 931	Information Policy, Management & Institutions	
LIS 940	Users, Uses & Contexts	
LIS 950	Cultural History, Policies and Debates	
LIS 975	Information Organization & Access	

Breadth Courses (12 credits)		
Must take at least one 3-credit course in each of the following four areas		
Course	Course title	Semester completed
Intro to Research Design, Thinking, Methods		
Statistics/Numerical Literacy		
Working with Digital Data		
Pedagogy		

Specialization (12 credits)		
Course	Course title	Semester completed

Minor (12 credits)		
Indicate your minor:		
Course	Course title	Semester completed

Other Courses		Semester completed

Practica (indicate topic and supervisor)*	Semester completed
Research practicum	
Teaching practicum (if applicable)	

*Complete Practica agreement forms and save them for your portfolio (see Student Handbook)

Mastery Demonstration Papers*

Title of paper	Month and year passed
MD1 (proposal due end of 2 nd semester, paper due end of 3rd semester)	
MD2 (due end of the 6th semester)	

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

Teaching

Position (e.g. TA, primary instructor, guest lecturer)	Class	Semester

Additional Research

Position (e.g. RA, PA, 999)	Topic	Semester

Professional activities (journal articles written/published; conferences attended; conference presentations, and service; 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.

COURSE WORK

Core Information Science Courses:

_____ LIS 910: Research Design and Methodologies

_____ LIS 925: PWR Seminar (6 total credits)

Take seminar in at least two of the following four areas:

_____ LIS 931: Information Policy, Management & Institutions

_____ LIS 940: Users, Uses & Contexts

_____ LIS 950: Cultural History, Policies and Debates

_____ LIS 975: Information Organization & Access

Breadth Courses (15 credits):

_____ Intro to Research Design, Thinking, Methods

_____ Statistics/Numerical Literacy

_____ Digital data collection or analysis research method experience

_____ Pedagogy

Specialization (12 credits)

Minor (12 credits minimum - option A or B)

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Practica (credit optional – research: 2-credits max and teaching 1-credit max)

Research practicum (80 hours)

Teaching practicum (45 hours – required unless you are an instructor or TA)

Mastery Demonstration Papers

_____ MD paper 1/defense (proposal due end of 2nd semester, paper due end of the 3rd semester)

_____ MD paper 2/defense (due end of the 6th semester)

Portfolio and preliminary examination steps (for admission to candidacy)

1. Meet with iSchool Student Records Coordinator **4 weeks** prior to arrange prelim warrant request
2. Portfolio submitted for admission to candidacy (due at end of 8th semester)
3. Portfolio presentation and oral defense (at least 2 weeks after deadline for faculty review of portfolio)

Dissertation Steps

1. Dissertation proposal and oral defense
2. Meet with iSchool Student Records Coordinator **4 weeks** prior to arrange for final warrant request
3. Dissertation submission
4. Dissertation presentation and defense (due within 5 years of admission to candidacy)

See also the Graduate School's [Steps to Completing the Degree](#).

C. APPENDIX: MASTERY DEMONSTRATION (MD) PAPERS: INSTRUCTIONS

MD papers are submitted and assessed via Canvas: <https://canvas.wisc.edu/courses/221853>

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. Both papers require an oral defense for the purpose of gaining skills in articulating ideas verbally and having a dialogue with faculty members about ideas in the papers.

Evaluation Process: The process for evaluating MD1 and MD2 is largely the same except that MD1 requires a proposal (see Appendix H), and the criteria are different for MD1 and MD2 (see Appendix D). Both papers are evaluated by 3 faculty members, and both papers involve an oral defense. One of the MD2 faculty reviewers may be from outside the department.

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 2nd 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 2nd paper should be of publishable quality in a respectable peer reviewed journal. See the assessment rubrics (Appendix D) for exact evaluation criteria.

Submission and feedback process: The PhD Committee Chair is responsible for creating the ‘module’ and ‘assignments’ on Canvas for the all submissions. Students submit MD1 and MD2 on Canvas to each individual reviewer (each reviewer will have their own ‘assignment’). Before the oral defense, reviewers create a DRAFT assessment using the rubric. Reviewers do not put this draft on Canvas. For the defense, reviewers ask questions to help finalize their draft assessment. After the defense, reviewers put their finalized assessment form and comments on Canvas.

Revisions: If revisions are required, a due date is set, and the revisions are reviewed by one or all reviewers. The outcome is communicated to the student by the student’s advisor. The advisor 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 advisor, in consultation with the reviewers, will negotiate required changes and provide a memo outlining those changes to the student. The student must submit on Canvas 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).

If a paper receives two or more “fail” votes, then the student must resubmit the paper by the date set by the reviewers; however, a “fail” vote usually indicates that the reviewers find the paper largely unworkable. Therefore, students receiving a “fail” vote should consider focusing efforts on a different paper.

MD1 PAPER INSTRUCTIONS

All students must complete the MD1 proposal process during their first year of the program (see Appendix H). Proposals are due at the end of semester 2 (as part of the 925 seminar) and are read by 3 members of the PhD Committee (student’s advisor and 2 other members appointed by PhD Committee Chair). Proposals are submitted on Canvas.

The completed MD1 paper must be submitted by mid-November in the student’s 3rd semester. The MD1 paper is submitted on Canvas and discussed at the student’s oral defense in December (student’s 3rd semester).

The MD1 proposal and paper are evaluated by 3 members of the PhD Committee. One member of MD1 committee will be the student’s nominal chair or faculty closely associated with their intended research area, and other members of the MD1 are selected by the PhD Committee chair. Where there is disagreement on the committee (between non-chair members), a 4th person will be called in (appointed by PhD Committee Chair).

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 assessment rubric for grading MD papers is used (see Appendix D). The Committee encourages students to make an appointment with the Writing Center to review their MD papers.

MD2 PAPER INSTRUCTIONS

The second MD paper must be submitted at the end of the 6th semester of study. The student’s advisor should ensure the MD2 paper is of adequate quality and require fixes to any obvious flaws prior to allowing the student to submit the paper for review. The MD2 paper is evaluated by 3 faculty members, one of whom may be outside the department. One member of MD2 committee will be the student’s nominal chair or faculty closely associated with their intended research area. The student is responsible for inviting two other faculty members to participate in the review of the MD2 paper. Faculty members should be close to the student’s field of study. Where there is disagreement on the committee (between non-chair members), a 4th person will be called in (appointed by PhD Committee Chair).

D. APPENDIX: MASTERY DEMONSTRATION (MD) PAPERS: EVALUATION FORMS

iSchool Mastery Demonstration Paper 1 Assessment Rubric

Rather than having strict criteria or scores to indicate success or failure, the iSchool takes a holistic approach to assessing PhD student papers. When a student passes an MD paper, the assessors are indicating that the student is performing at a level acceptable for this stage in his/her career, and the paper is indicative that the student has developed abilities sufficient to complete a doctoral dissertation.

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Before the defense, reviewers create a DRAFT assessment using the rubric: assign one rating per criteria, address the two criteria questions in comments, and indicate overall recommendation. Reviewers do not put this draft on Canvas!
2. For the Defense, reviewers ask questions to help finalize their draft assessment.
3. After the Defense, reviewers put their finalized assessment form on Canvas.

Student Name:

Paper title:

Assessor Name:

Date:

<p>CRITERIA FOR LITERATURE REVIEWS (MD1)</p>	<p>Ratings 5= Excellent - acceptable, few or no revisions needed 4= Good - acceptable, could use minor revisions 3= Fair - requires some improvement to make the paper acceptable 2= Poor - unacceptable, needs major improvement 1= Very poor - unacceptable, unclear if author is able to complete this component assignment successfully</p>
<p>Command of the literature How well does the review cover key relevant bodies of literature, debate, and/or theoretical positions related to the research topic? How well does the review frame the research topic, problem or question within the larger field of study?</p>	
<p><i>Command of the literature Rating (1-5)</i></p>	
<p>Synthesis of the literature To what extent does the review provide analytical and critical discussions rather than summative and descriptive overviews of the literature?</p>	

<p>How well does the review put works into conversation with each other by presenting relationships between different studies in the field including intersections and diversions?</p>	
<p><i>Synthesis of the literature rating (1-5)</i></p>	
<p>Written communication skills To what extent is the writing organized, coherent, concise, and clear?</p> <p>Is the paper well-presented in terms of format, punctuation, and grammar including complete in-text citations (or discipline specific reference style) and citations in the reference list?</p>	
<p><i>Written communication skills rating (1-5)</i></p>	
<p>RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>Ratings (highlight one) <i>Accept</i> (including accept with minor revisions or editing)</p> <p><i>Accept conditional on completion of major revisions.</i> (Reviewers - please indicate suggested due date for revisions and whether or not you would like to see the revised version)</p> <p><i>Reject</i></p>

Further comments (optional)

iSchool Mastery Demonstration Paper 2 Assessment Rubric

NOTES FOR REVIEWERS:

Rather than having strict criteria or scores to indicate success or failure, the iSchool takes a holistic approach to assessing PhD student papers. When a student passes an MD paper, the assessors are indicating that the student is performing at a level acceptable for this stage in his/her career, and the paper is indicative that the student has developed abilities sufficient to complete a doctoral dissertation.

The MD2 review is similar to peer review of a conference or journal submission. Please use the assessment rubric on Canvas 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. Please note that evaluation expectations for MD paper increase from the 1st to the 2nd paper. For the second paper reviewers should expect paper quality similar to a full conference paper including a significant research question, a full methodology, and data/analysis. Reviewers should expect the paper to be of publishable quality in a peer reviewed journal. Modes of inquiry (e.g., historical research vs. experiments) may vary.

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

1. Before the defense, reviewers create a DRAFT assessment using the rubric: assign one rating per criteria, address the criteria questions in comments, and indicate overall recommendation. Reviewers do not put this draft on Canvas OR they keep the draft assessment hidden on Canvas.
2. For the Defense, reviewers ask questions to help finalize their assessment.
3. After the Defense, reviewers revise their assessment if necessary and release their finalized assessment on Canvas.

MD 2 Assessment Rubric					
Criteria	Ratings				
<p>Background literature Does the author demonstrate a command of the relevant literature?</p>	5=Excellent	4=good	3=fair	2=poor	1=very poor
<p>Validity of claims, methods, and conclusions Does the paper offer rigorous arguments with supporting evidence, as opposed to tenuous or questionable claims?</p> <p>If relevant: Are the research methods appropriate? If relevant: Is the data analysis rigorous and systematic?</p> <p>Are the conclusions justified by the results of the analyses?</p>	5=excellent	4=good	3=fair	2=poor	1=very poor
<p>Potential contribution to the field Does the paper have potential to make a contribution to the field of study?</p>	5=excellent	4=good	3=fair	2=poor	1=very poor

MD 2 Assessment Rubric

Criteria	Ratings				
<p>Written communication skills To what extent is the writing organized, coherent, concise, and clear?</p> <p>Is the paper well-presented in terms of format, punctuation, and grammar including complete in-text citations (or discipline specific reference style) and citations in the reference list?</p>	5=excellent	4=good	3=fair	2=poor	1=very poor
RECOMMENDATION	<p>Accept (including accept with minor revisions or editing)</p>		<p>Accept conditional on completion of significant revisions. Include suggested due date for revisions.</p>		<p>Reject</p>

E. APPENDIX: TEACHING 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:

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: CHECKLIST FOR PROGRAM PORTFOLIO

1. Curriculum Vitae
2. Current transcript
3. Summary of fulfillment of iSchool requirements
 1. Completed Information School PhD Annual Progress Evaluation Form
 2. Completed research practicum form
 3. Summary of teaching training/experience
 - i. skills and experience: submit either a teaching philosophy statement and list of courses taught OR teaching practicum documents
 - ii. cultural competency training: submit a description of cultural competency course/workshops or cultural competency component of a course related specifically to teaching
4. Two Mastery Demonstration Papers
5. Proof of submission to journal or conference of at least 2 peer reviewed research products (posters, short papers, conference presentations, etc)
6. Copies of any publications or papers presented at conferences (if applicable)
7. Teaching evaluations - student and faculty evaluations (if applicable)
8. Other materials (teaching, research, contributions, awards, recommendations)

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 925 seminar) and are read by 3 members of the PhD Committee (student's advisor and 2 other members appointed by PhD Committee Chair).

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

Steps to complete:

1. If necessary, 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.