MEMORANDUM

TO: COE Faculty and Staff

FROM: Edward J. Kame’enui, Associate Dean

DATE: December 3, 2007 (Revised January 10, 2008)

RE: COE Doctoral Methodological & Statistical Course Sequence and Requirements

There are two purposes for this memorandum. The first purpose is to document and represent the processes and procedures employed and the decisions made that resulted in the current COE policy to require doctoral candidates (i.e., those beginning their Ph. D. course work in the fall, 2007) to enroll in a six-course sequence in two of the three following research traditions: quantitative, qualitative, or single subject research. The second purpose is to clarify, re-state, and formally propose the adoption of two policies designed to guide COE Ph. D. candidates’ course requirements in research methodology and traditions.

Historical Record of Policy Development

A formal COE document does not currently exist that describes and ostensibly represents the current and “sanctioned” COE policy on the course requirements in research methodology and traditions for Ph.D. candidates in the College. After extensive discussion at the Department Heads’ Council meeting on November 27, 2007, coupled with an independent search of documents in the Assistant Dean for Academic Programs and Student Services Office, and individual meetings and consultations with faculty, it appears that formal documentation of the current COE policy is best gained from multiple sources.

The best sources of documentation include at least two recent communications from Dr. David Chard, former Associate Dean for Curriculum and Academic Program in the COE: (a) an email that Dr. Chard sent to the “Academic Secretaries” on August 15, 2007; (b) an undated document entitled, “Transition Issues for the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Academic Programs,” that Dr. Chard prepared and shared with me (see Attachments #1, 2), and (c) a meeting with Dr. Chard on August 6, 2007. For purposes of COE policy documentation, I recommend that we anoint these two sources as the primary basis for developing a current, formal COE policy on the course requirements in research methodology and traditions for Ph. D. candidates in the COE.

In addition to the organic sources for the development of a policy on the course requirements for Ph. D. students, it is important to understand and clarify the process that was employed to gain faculty approval for this policy. For the record, Dr. Chard recruited and appointed a “College Curriculum Design Committee” composed of a representative group of faculty from across the college to develop this policy. This committee developed the policy and recommended it for approval to the Department Heads’ Council (DHC)
during the 2005-2006 academic year. As such, the Committee appointment, the process it employed, and its recommendation to the DHC is arguably representative of the governance privilege extended to faculty at the UO on curriculum matters. According to various faculty members who participated in this approval process, it appears that members of the COE Department Head’s Council voted sometime in 2006 to adopt the policy represented in the August 15, 2007 memorandum from David Chard to the Academic Secretaries. A vote on this issue was taken predicated on the assumption that the Department Head’s appropriately represented the faculty on these curriculum matters, and thus, exercised the faculty’s wishes in executing the vote. It is also a matter of record that these new policies were presented and discussed with the faculty at general COE faculty meetings on at least three occasions in the last two years. Finally, it is also reported that Dr. Chard reviewed and reaffirmed the new policies at the last COE faculty meeting in spring, 2007.

**COE Policy Documentation and Development**

For purposes of formal policy documentation, critical elements of the COE policy specific to the new research methodology requirements are best derived from the email that Dr. Chard sent to the “Academic Secretaries” on August 15, 2007 (Attachment 1). The pertinent parts of that email follow:

**“1. All first year Ph.D. students must enroll in and complete TED 610: Philosophies of Research being offered winter 2008.**

**2. All entering Ph.D. students must complete a research methodology sequence such that they take courses in at least two methodological traditions (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, or single subject) with at least 4 courses in one tradition and 2 in another. With advisor consent, a student may plan to complete 5 in one and 1 in a second tradition. Note: program evaluation is no longer accepted as a research tradition that will fulfill this requirement for Ph.D. students. Additionally, this is a minimum COE requirement. Advisors should encourage their students to do more if it fits their schedules and goals. A sequence of courses for the quantitative courses is attached. As similar sequences are created for single subject and qualitative traditions, they will be forwarded to you.”**

Based on this email documentation, I have drafted the following policy on COE Ph. D. candidates’ course requirements for educational research methodology and traditions. It is my recommendation that the COE faculty adopt this policy and begin its implementation this school year (2007-08). Attachment #1 presents this policy.

I also recommend that the COE adopt the policy on advancement to candidacy referenced in the August 15, 2007 email from David Chard but attached as a separate document (See Attachment #2) and dated August 4, 2006. The memorandum is entitled, “Technical Guidance for Advancement to Candidacy Changes for fall 2007.” Attachment #2 presents the specific language that we “voted on and approved” (Chard, August 4, 2006).
ATTACHMENT #1: Proposed COE Policy for Adoption

COE Policy on Ph. D. Candidates’ Course Requirements for Educational Research Methodology and Traditions

“Beginning in the fall of the 2007-2008 academic year, all newly admitted Ph. D. students are required to enroll in a minimum of six (6) courses in educational research methodology. In selecting the courses, students are required to enroll in courses from two of three following traditions of research methodology—quantitative, qualitative, and single subject research. Moreover, of the 6 required courses, students must enroll in a 4+2 combination in which at least 4 courses represent one tradition and two courses represent another tradition. For example, the 4+2 combination of courses could include 4 courses that represent the quantitative research tradition and 2 courses that represent the qualitative research tradition. Another combination could include 4 courses in qualitative research and 2 course in single subject research, or 4 courses in single subject research and 2 courses in quantitative, and so forth. Students may also complete a 5+1 combination of courses that would be similar in structure (5 courses in quantitative research and 1 course in qualitative research tradition, etc.) to the 4+2 combination. However, a 5+1 combination of courses across two of the three research traditions (quantitative, qualitative, single subject) requires advisor approval.”

“In addition, beginning in the winter term, 2008 (January 7, 2008), all newly admitted Ph. D. students are required to enroll in the course, TED 610, Philosophy of Research, 4 credits.\textsuperscript{1} The required sequence and combination of six courses (5+1 or 4+2 in two of the three areas of research methodology—quantitative, qualitative or single subject) and the required Philosophy of Research course for Ph. D. students in the COE will apply to all Ph. D. students admitted during and after the 2007-2008 academic year.”

\textsuperscript{1} Dr. Jerry Rosiek will teach this course in winter 2008. An EDUC prefix will eventually replace the TED prefix, which currently designates Dr. Rosiek’s home department, Teacher Education.
ATTACHMENT #2: Proposed COE Policy for Adoption

Technical Guidance for Advancement to Candidacy COE Policy

Common Purpose:
The college-wide purpose of advancement to candidacy includes:
1. Providing Ph.D. students with an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and expertise in specific areas of study.
2. Setting the occasion for Ph.D. students to integrate their knowledge and skills in professional activities related to their scholarship and teaching.
3. Evaluating Ph.D. students’ competence in their general and professional knowledge and their capacity to successfully conduct and defend a dissertation.

Common Domains Evaluated:
Each Ph.D. program handbook must clearly specify components required for advancement to candidacy that address the following domains: (a) Professional standards; (b) Scholarly communication; and (c) Educational inquiry

Common Procedures
Each Ph.D. program must specify a set of procedures to be approved by the Graduate School. These procedures will be included in all Ph.D. handbooks and will include but are not limited to timelines, remediation guidelines, and evaluation criteria.