# Appendix G: PhD in HPE Dissertation Proposal

*Email* *chpe@usuhs.edu* *for a copy of Appendix G.*

PhD Dissertation Proposal Completion Process:

1. Student, in collaboration with Research Advisors, completes this proposal form.
2. The Research Advisors approve of the submission by (a) signing the completed proposal form and (b) forwarding it on to Director and Deputy Director for approval.
3. The Director and Deputy Director review the proposal and either (a) offer feedback (if applicable) and approve the proposal by signing it and returning it to the student and the Research Advisors OR (b) offer feedback and request revisions by the student and Research Advisors. If routed via (b), the student and Research Advisors re-work the proposal and start the routing process again at step 1.

*CHPE uses learner’s research proposals, Theses and Dissertations for internal purposes (e.g., as samples for current learners). If you would prefer for your materials not to be used for these purposes, please email chpe@usuhs.edu.*

**Registration Information**

**1a. Applicant Information**

Name, title(s):

Telephone:

E-mail:

**1b. Title of Proposed Dissertation Research**

**1C. Proposed Name of Research Advisors (note that the director of CHPE will make final decisions on supervision)**

1.

2.

3.

**1D. Proposed Name(s) of Dissertation Committee Members (note that the director of CHPE will make final decisions)**

1.

2.

3.

**Description of Research Proposal**

**2a. Background/Introduction, Theoretical Framework(s), and Study Purpose(s)**

*Include description of area of inquiry, applicable theoretical frameworks, and specific research question(s)*

*Max 2 pages*

**2b. Methodology(ies) and Methods**

*Describe the series of experiments and/or phases of the study to be undertaken*

*Max 2 pages*

**2c. Literature References**

*Max. 35 references*

**2d. Timeline**

**2e. Societal & Scientific Relevance (about 500 words)**

**2f. military relevance (about 500 words)**

**2g. Expected Scientific Output and Thesis of Results** *Describe dissemination of findings plan, including thesis, papers, and presentations.*

**Approval Signatures**

Directions: Signatures can be submitted via hard copy wet signatures, CAC signatures or Adobe PDF signatures.

**Learner**

Name (Print): Date:

Signature:

**Research Advisor**

Name (Print): Date:

Signature:

**Research Advisor**

Name (Print): Date:

Signature:

**Deputy Director, CHPE**

Name (Print): Date:

Signature:

**Director, CHPE**

Name (Print): Date:

Signature:

**PHD Dissertation Proposal – Assessment Guide for Reviewers**

|  |
| --- |
| **SCIENTIFIC CRITERIA****A. Importance**1. In what way and to what extent is the proposed research of theoretical, practical, methodological, or descriptive importance?
2. Will the proposed research solve a scientific problem or does it shed new light on a problem such that it brings the community a step closer to the solution of a problem?
3. Does the proposed research present interesting scientific perspectives, such that it generates new problems or hypotheses, introduces new connections or relationships, or sheds interesting light on the concerned problem area?
4. Are the indication of and the connection to existing knowledge concerning the problem area adequate?

**B. Problem definition:**1. Are the problems and research questions elucidated in the research proposal clearly defined in relation to:
	1. The isolated project;
	2. The relevant theoretical frameworks; and
	3. The existing research relevant to the area of focus?
2. Are the problems as stated in the research proposal feasible? That is, can the problem be tackled from a methodological perspective?
3. Is the topic adequately well-defined / delineated and is this delineation well thought out?
4. Are the research questions researchable both methodologically and technically?

 **C. Originality:** 1. Can the choice of the problem and the method of research be considered original and contributing to existing work in the area?
2. Does the proposed research project attempt to inform and/or potentially revise the theory?
3. Are new methods of research proposed, developed or tried out or are existing methods used in novel ways?
4. Are existing insights applied in original ways?

**D. Design and methodology:** 1. Are the proposed methods and techniques appropriate to answer the research questions posed?
2. Are the methods and techniques that are proposed adequately motivated?
3. Are the sources referred to and the data necessary available / accessible and are they appropriate to answer the questions posed?

**E. Feasibility:** 1. Is the research design consistent and is it both sound and adequately explicit?
2. Is the working plan well thought out? Is the phasing of the research adequate?
3. Are both the staffing and the institutional environment such that you have confidence in the successful completion of the research, in line with the planning?
4. Is the proposed staffing qualified to carry out the research?

**F. Estimate of staff and material budget:** 1. Is the estimation of staff and material budgets reasonable?
2. Is the estimation of the total length of the project reasonable?
3. Is the estimation of the different phases of the research project (data-acquisition, literature research, analysis, reporting, et cetera) reasonable?
 |
| **RELEVANCE****Strategic importance:** 1. What is, in the long term, the possible impact of the results of the research on education or educational policy?
2. Is the contribution that the research makes desired from an educational, educational policy or societal viewpoint?
3. Is the intended result of the research applicable and can it be implemented in education or educational research?

**Practical importance:**1. Are the expected results of practical importance? If so, what is that importance?
 |