

# **EDP Research Portfolio Guidelines**

## **Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology**

### **Overview and Purpose**

Students in the PhD programs in the Department of Educational, School, and Counseling Psychology (EDP) are required to submit a research portfolio, as outlined below, *before* they may proceed to the qualifying examination. The purpose of this requirement is to *permit the students to demonstrate their competence in (1) conducting empirical research and (2) submitting their work for presentation or publication to a professional audience*. This research portfolio requirement serves as a *preliminary examination* in that students must successfully complete the three components described below to be permitted to continue in their doctoral program of study:

- Component 1: Empirical Research Project Manuscript
- Component 2: Summary Question Responses
- Component 3: Conference Research Proposal Submission **OR** Manuscript Submission

### **Component 1: Empirical Research Project Manuscript**

The student will make a **substantial contribution as the first student author** to an empirical research project under the supervision of a faculty member. This substantial contribution must be an authorship-level contribution and one that involves writing portions of the manuscript. All decisions about student authorship on published work must be based on APA publication guidelines. Regarding authorship, “a student should, in a cumulative sense, make a professional contribution that is creative and intellectual in nature, that is integral to completion of the paper, and that requires an overarching perspective of the project” (Fine & Kurdek, 1993, p. 1143). The project may involve research that is conducted independently, within a larger research project or team, as part of secondary data analysis, or as part of a master’s thesis. The research conducted must be empirical (i.e., based on data gathered) and must have the potential to contribute to the literature. A systematic review or narrative content analysis of published literature does not meet the requirements; however, a wide range of methodologies are acceptable (e.g., experimental, Monte Carlo, survey-based, qualitative, evaluation, meta-analysis). The empirical research project must result in an empirical, APA-style manuscript, a copy of which is submitted to fulfill Component 1. This manuscript should include a literature review, method, results, discussion, and references.

### **Component 2: Summary Question Responses**

Students will craft detailed responses to the following questions about the empirical research project submitted as Component 1 of the portfolio. **Students must be the sole author of these responses**, though they are welcome to consult their major professor for clarification on the summary questions. Students should respond to the group of questions below that is appropriate for their study type (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods) by rewriting each numbered question followed by a response written in paragraph form. Page length will vary according to study particulars. Please first consult the appropriate [Journal Article Reporting Standards \(JARS\)](#) for the project type that matches your own: [Quant](#), [Qual](#), [Mixed](#).

### **Summary Questions for Quantitative Projects**

1. Provide a detailed statement of your unique contribution to the empirical research study and of the relative contribution of all collaborators (1 page).
2. Summarize the study's research purpose and questions/hypotheses.
3. Describe your subjectivities (i.e., social positionalities, social locations) in relation to this specific study and how these informed your topic choice, methods, and/or analyses.
4. Describe the study's design (e.g., experiment, survey).
5. List the variables in the study. Describe the analytical function of each variable (e.g., dependent variable). If variables from original data were changed (e.g., re-coded or reversed), indicate rationale. Discuss the type of dependent variable(s) (e.g., categorical or continuous) and the statistical methods appropriate to work with this type of dependent variable(s). Discuss the type of independent variable(s) (e.g., categorical or continuous) and how each was prepared for data analysis (e.g., dummy coding). State whether and how any variables were used to control extraneous sources of variation either through the design of the study and/or analysis of the data. Discuss how well statistical assumptions of chosen statistical methods were met.
6. Explain at least one strength of the design used with respect to each of the following: internal, external, construct, and statistical conclusion validity. Please define (with citation) each form of validity evidence as a part of your response.
7. Explain at least one weakness of the design used with respect to each of the following: internal, external, construct, and statistical conclusion validity.
8. Beyond the broad ethical considerations that were addressed in your IRB application (e.g., confidentiality, informed consent), what additional/unique ethical considerations were pertinent to the responsible conduct of this particular study and how did you address them?

### **Summary Questions for Qualitative Projects**

1. Provide a detailed statement of your unique contribution to the empirical research study and of the relative contribution of all collaborators (1 page).
2. What approach to inquiry informed your study (include ontology, epistemology, axiology, rhetorical structure, and methodology)?
3. How is the study design consistent with your chosen approach to inquiry?
4. Describe your subjectivities (i.e., social positionalities, social locations) in relation to this specific study and how these informed your topic choice, methods, and/or analyses.
5. How did you determine when data collection could conclude?
6. According to your approach to inquiry, how did you determine this study had methodological integrity (e.g., fidelity, utility in achieving research goals, trustworthiness)?
7. Explain one strength and one weakness of the design used.
8. Beyond the broad ethical considerations that were addressed in your IRB application (e.g., confidentiality, informed consent), what additional/unique ethical considerations were pertinent to the responsible conduct of this particular study and how did you address them?

### **Summary Questions for Mixed Method Projects**

1. Provide a detailed statement of your unique contribution to the empirical research

- study and of the relative contribution of all collaborators (1 page).
2. Summarize the study's research purpose and questions/hypotheses.
  3. Describe your subjectivities (i.e., social positionalities, social locations) in relation to this specific study and how these informed your topic choice, methods, and/or analyses.
  4. Describe the study's design.
  5. Provide a rationale or justification for the need to collect both qualitative and quantitative data and the added value of integrating the results (findings) from the two databases.
  6. According to your approach to inquiry, how did you determine this study had methodological integrity (e.g., validity, fidelity, utility in achieving research goals, trustworthiness)?
  7. Explain one strength and one weakness of the design used.
  8. Beyond the broad ethical considerations that were addressed in your IRB application (e.g., confidentiality, informed consent), what additional/unique ethical considerations were pertinent to the responsible conduct of this particular study and how did you address them?

### **Component 3: Conference Research Proposal OR Manuscript Submission**

Component 3 need **not** be related to the study that is the focus of Components 1 and 2. Students may satisfy the requirements of Component 3 in one of two ways: Option 3A OR Option 3B.

#### **Option 3A: Conference Research Proposal Submission**

Students will write and submit a research proposal to be peer-reviewed for presentation at a state, regional, national, or international conference. The student **must be the first author of the proposal**, regardless of the authorship order of a manuscript associated with the project. Only peer reviewed proposals are eligible. These three items will be submitted to fulfill Component 3:

1. A "Conference Proposal Cover Sheet," which includes:
  - a. A complete APA-style citation for the presentation (formatted as it would be on the student's CV if the proposal was accepted and then presented)
  - b. The name of the conference, society, division, and special interest group (as applicable) to which the proposal was submitted
  - c. A detailed statement of the student's unique contribution to the proposal and of the relative contribution of all collaborators
2. A copy of the conference research proposal. Proposal length will vary according to conference submission guidelines.
3. Documentation of successful *submission* of the research proposal (e.g., email notification, PDF copy of submission portal webpage confirmation message).

#### **Option 3B: Manuscript Submission**

Students will write and submit an empirical manuscript to a peer-reviewed academic journal. The student **must be the first author of the manuscript**. These three items will be submitted to fulfill Component 3:

1. A "Manuscript Submission Cover Sheet," which includes:
  - a. A complete APA-style citation for the submission (formatted as it would be on the student's CV)

- b. The name of the journal to which the proposal was submitted
  - c. A detailed statement of the student's unique contribution to the manuscript and of the relative contribution of all collaborators
2. Documentation of successful submission of the manuscript (e.g., email notification, PDF copy of submission portal webpage confirmation message).

### **Presentation and Submission**

All three components should be submitted as Microsoft Word documents to allow for feedback via the comment function. All portfolio components should be typed in 12-point Times New Roman font and double-spaced. All components should conform to the highest standards of writing as outlined in the current *Publication Manual* of the American Psychological Association. The research portfolio should include the following content in this order: (a) research portfolio title page with the student's name, initial submission date, and the dates of subsequent submissions when submitting a revision, (b) the empirical research project manuscript, (c) summary question responses, (d) Conference Proposal Cover Sheet -or- Manuscript Submission Cover Sheet, (e) a copy of the conference proposal (if using Option 3A), (f) documentation of successful submission of the research proposal or manuscript, and (g) a Microsoft Word document copy of the one-page Evaluation Form described below (a standalone one-page Evaluation Form can be downloaded from the program Handbooks and Forms webpage). The student will ask each evaluator in advance whether they wish to receive a printed or electronic copy of the proposal and will provide the desired copy by the submission deadline. As with all professional work, presentation (i.e., quality and organization of the portfolio) is a criterion in evaluation.

### **Evaluation of Research Portfolio**

The student's Advisory Committee should be finalized and on file within the department (EDP) and with the Graduate School prior to the submission of the research portfolio. Each member of the student's Advisory Committee who is a current member of EDP will evaluate the research portfolio (i.e., will serve as a "reviewer"). Non-EDP advisory committee members may evaluate the portfolio if they so choose. Students will consult their major advisor regarding the decision to invite the non-EDP advisory committee member(s) to review the research portfolio. Each evaluator will use the Evaluation Form to note whether each portfolio component does not meet or meets expectations, and each will then email the completed Evaluation Form to the student, carbon copying the Committee Chair.

### **Revising and Resubmitting**

The student will review the Evaluation Forms and any comments provided by the reviewers to revise the portfolio and resubmit. This process is intended to give students practice in the academic skill of revising and re-submitting a manuscript. Each comment or piece of feedback provided by each reviewer should be restated and responded to in a "**Response to Reviewers**" Microsoft Word document that will be submitted to all reviewers alongside the revised Research Portfolio Microsoft Word document and a blank Microsoft Word document copy of the one-page Evaluation Form. This "Response to Reviewers" document will follow the format provided in the example on the last page of this EDP Research Portfolio Guidelines document. In addition, all revisions to the Research Portfolio Microsoft Word document should be done with the "**track changes**" functionality enabled, to make it easy for reviewers to see what has been

revised.

These materials will be resubmitted by the deadline set by the Committee Chair. The student should check with reviewers to see if they prefer an electronic submission or a hard copy submission. As with the initial submission, for this *first revision submission*, each reviewer will use the Evaluation Form to note whether each portfolio component meets or does not meet expectations, and each will then email the completed Evaluation Form to the student, carbon copying the Committee Chair. If all reviewers indicate that all components meet expectations, then the Research Portfolio is accepted, and the Committee Chair will store the Research Portfolio Evaluation Forms in that student's records. If further revisions are requested by at least one reviewer, then the student will repeat the revise and resubmit process articulated for their *second revision submission*. If all components of this second revision submission do not meet expectations for all reviewers, the Research Portfolio is denied further review (fail).

### **Timeline**

Students are advised to plan ahead and to inform committee members of their anticipated *initial submission* date. The *initial submission* will be submitted no later than November 1 of the fall semester or March 1 of the spring semester. The portfolio may not be submitted in the summer. The reviewers will complete the evaluation of the portfolio within 21 days of the date submitted. This 21-day evaluation window applies for initial submission and any revision submissions. *Students assume full responsibility for program delays associated with any required revisions.*

Please see next pages for Evaluation Form document and Response to Reviewers document.

**Research Portfolio Evaluation Form**

**Student's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date submitted:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Evaluator's Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date evaluated:** \_\_\_\_\_

**The evaluated portfolio is the:** \_\_\_\_\_ Initial Submission \_\_\_\_\_ First Revision \_\_\_\_\_ Second Revision

This research portfolio element . . .	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations
<b>Component 1: Empirical Research Project Manuscript</b>		
Manuscript is complete.		
Paper is formatted according to APA publication guidelines.		
<b>Component 2: Summary Question Responses</b>		
Summary Question #1 Response		
Summary Question #2 Response		
Summary Question #3 Response		
Summary Question #4 Response		
Summary Question #5 Response		
Summary Question #6 Response		
Summary Question #7 Response		
Summary Question #8 Response		
<b>Component 3 (evaluate one)</b>		
<b>3A: Conference Proposal or 3B: Manuscript Submission</b>		
<b>Option 3A: Conference Research Proposal</b>		
Conference Proposal Cover Sheet		
Copy of the conference proposal		
Documentation of successful submission for peer review		
<b>Option 3B: Manuscript Submission</b>		
Manuscript Submission Cover Sheet		
Documentation of successful submission for peer review		
<b>Presentation of Materials</b>		
Contents are presented in professional and organized manner.		
All content was carefully edited and proofread.		
Portfolio was submitted on time.		

*Note.* If any element of the portfolio does not meet expectations, the student must revise.

**The student's research portfolio should be** \_\_\_\_\_ **accepted** (i.e., portfolio meets all expectations).  
 \_\_\_\_\_ **revised and resubmitted by** \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ **denied further review (fail)** \_\_\_\_\_ (date)

Comments:

## Recommended Format for Response to Reviewers

Dear Drs. X and Y,

I am pleased to have the opportunity to revise and resubmit my Research Portfolio. I appreciate the work you have put into reviewing the portfolio. Below is a list of the suggestions made to the portfolio and how I have responded. All textual revisions to Research Portfolio are also indicated via track changes.

### **Reviewer #1: Dr. X**

First request from Dr. X restated here.

**RESPONSE:** Student's response to first request stated here.

Second request from Dr. X restated here.

**RESPONSE:** Student's response to second request stated here.

Etc.

### **Reviewer #2: Dr. Y**

First request from Dr. Y restated here.

**RESPONSE:** Student's response to first request stated here.

Second request from Dr. Y restated here.

**RESPONSE:** Student's response to second request stated here.

Etc.

Thank you,  
NAME