



The University of Vermont

COLLEGE OF NURSING
AND HEALTH SCIENCES

DOCTORAL PROGRAM OF STUDY
IN HUMAN FUNCTIONING AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

Doctoral students are required to prepare a formal research article based on their research rotation. The student is required to give an oral presentation of the research to be reported in the article at the formal research seminar hosted by CNHS as part of the Ziegler Research Forum during May in year 2 or 3 in the program. The student must incorporate the feedback received at the seminar in a peer-reviewed journal article format for submission to the Doctoral Program Committee. They must also submit and present their research at a peer-reviewed scientific conference.

The article must be written at a level of scholarship suitable for submission to a specified peer-reviewed journal. For information on how to identify and locate peer-reviewed journals:

- California State University has published an online tool that may be helpful, <http://lib.calpoly.edu/research/guides/peer.html>
- A comprehensive list of science journals can also be accessed through the Thompson Reuters website at <http://science.thomsonreuters.com/mjl>.
- When choosing a journal for article submission, it can be important to be aware of the journal's impact factor. The **impact factor**, often abbreviated **IF**, is a measure reflecting the average number of [citations](#) to articles published in [science and social science journals](#) in a specified time frame. It is frequently used as a [proxy](#) for the relative importance of a journal within its field, with journals with higher impact factors deemed to be more important than those with lower ones.
- To explore the impact factor of journals you are considering, visit http://thomsonreuters.com/products_services/science/free/essays/impact_factor.

Overview:

The student's research article must conform to the format and bibliographic style of the selected journal. Once the student has received email notification from the Doctoral Program Committee chair approving the manuscript as it is written, the article must then be submitted to the specified journal identified by the student. Confirmation of receipt of the article by the journal must be sent to the Doctoral Program Committee chair before the student will be granted a "pass" for the research practicum. At that point, the timing of submission to an external journal is under the purview of the dissertation committee, but it still must occur as soon as the student's dissertation committee grants approval to submit the

paper for publication and prior to graduation.

Requirements:

1. The student must have successfully completed all the research courses and the research rotations, and presented his or her research paper at the Zeigler Forum prior to submitting the article.
2. An oral presentation based on the student's research must be presented orally in the Annual CNHS Ziegler Research Forum, at which members of the Doctoral Program Committee serve as judges (passed or not passed).
3. The student will use the presentation for the Ziegler Research Forum as the basis for a presentation to be submitted to a peer-reviewed scientific conference and an article to be submitted to the Doctoral Program Committee, who will decide when it is ready for submission to a peer-reviewed journal.
4. The student should select, in consultation with their academic advisor (and the instructor of HFRS 450, if writing the article during that course), a peer-reviewed academic journal to which to submit the article.
5. The article must be:
 - Formatted to conform to all the selected journal's specifications and incorporate feedback received from the student's advisor and at the research seminar forum.
 - Submitted electronically to the chair of the Doctoral Program Committee along with an electronic copy of a sample article from the targeted journal.
 - Revised as requested by the Doctoral Program committee, with substantial improvements made at each point in the revision process, and with explanation of responses to reviewers' comments outlined in cover letters/emails and track changes as requested by the committee, until it meets the committee's standards, as communicated by the committee chair. Substantial improvement is defined by improving at least to the next level in the following ranking listed below under Assessment.
6. The version of the article approved by the Doctoral Program committee chair on behalf of the committee must be:
 - Submitted to the selected journal editor for publication, but *only after* the student has received the written **Released for Submission/Pass** email from the committee chair indicating that the article is ready to be submitted. When official notification of receipt by the journal is received, the student must then forward the official notification to the Chair, who then will provide an email confirming that the requirements have been met.
 - Acceptance of the article for publication is *not* a requirement of the examination. If the article is not accepted by the journal editor (and few articles are the first time around), the student is strongly encouraged to respond to reviewers' comments and to resubmit the article to the same journal, if given that option, or to a different journal if not. Revision and resubmission of the article are *not* requirements of the examination but they are expected as good scholarly practice.

Assessment of Oral Presentation

The oral presentation at the Zeigler Forum is reviewed by the Doctoral Program Committee members and judged as 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory' in meeting the criteria summarized below. It may then be submitted for presentation at a peer-reviewed scientific conference. If the oral presentation is judged unsatisfactory, the student will receive within approximately 30 days a written description of:

1. The deficiencies and recommendations for improvements;

2. Plans for scheduling a second presentation.

The student may repeat the oral presentation once. If the second presentation also is assessed as unsatisfactory, the student's name will be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee with a recommendation that the student be dismissed from the program.

Assessment of Research Article

The research article may not be submitted to the committee chair until the student has passed the oral presentation of the examination. All articles first submitted by the end of the month will be reviewed by the committee during the following month. The research article will be reviewed by the Doctoral Program Committee members and judged as 'satisfactory' or 'unsatisfactory' (i.e., in need of revision) in meeting the criteria summarized below. If the Research Article is judged to be in need of revision, the student will receive within approximately 30 days a written description of:

1. The deficiencies and recommendations for improvements;
2. Suggested date for resubmission (generally within 30 days from receipt of the email notification from the chair of the examination committee).

Once a student submits a research article¹, it will be reviewed by the examination committee in the same manner as by an editor and reviewers of a peer reviewed journal. Similar to the peer-reviewed editing process, articles will be reviewed using the following quality indicators:

1. Reject (*student will still resubmit as long as first time submitted*)
2. Revise and resubmit with major revisions
3. Revise and resubmit with revisions
4. Revise and resubmit with minor revisions
5. Conditional Pass
6. Pass

Resubmitted materials must be sent to the Chair of the Doctoral Program Committee using track changes throughout the document, with a cover memo explaining how the revised materials are responsive to the Committee's major recommendations. If the student fails to move up at least one level (as indicated by the quality indicator sequence) in response to the recommended revisions upon resubmission, the student's name will be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee with a recommendation that the student be dismissed from the program. The student must make all recommended revisions as defined by the examination committee before the article can be **released for submission** to the peer-reviewed journal or the student's doctoral dissertation committee.

No article may be submitted to any person or organization outside the program until it has received a grade of "satisfactory" (which includes, at a minimum, a level of accept with minor to no revisions with evidence of completing any minor revisions that were required) AND the student is in receipt of an email from the examination committee chair indicating the paper is ready for submission to a journal (or to the dissertation committee in lieu of the journal).

Confirmation of the receipt of the article by the journal editor must be sent to the committee chair before the student will be granted a "pass" for this component of the Qualifying Examination.



The University of Vermont

COLLEGE OF NURSING
AND HEALTH SCIENCES

DOCTORAL PROGRAM OF STUDY

IN HUMAN FUNCTIONING AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES

Criteria for Assessment of Research Presentation

Failure to achieve a “Satisfactory” rating for *any* Essential Component may result in an unsatisfactory grade for the Research Presentation.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	Organization Completeness and organization.	Presentation content is sufficiently complete, well-organized.	Presentation is disorganized, unfocused, or essential components are not addressed or are not of sufficient depth.
2.	Rationale Demonstration of rationale for research.	Rationale for research concisely outlines a research need or gap.	Rationale for research is fully or partially omitted or does not support a research need.
3.	Research Questions Inclusion of clearly-stated research question(s) appropriate for the study	Research question(s) are appropriate to the study and precisely stated.	Research question(s) are omitted or unclear or insufficiently developed or inappropriate to the study.
4.	Method Clarity and validity of methods.	Methods are described clearly and are valid for the study.	Methods are inaccurately or cursorily described or lack validity for the study.
5.	Results Results directly responsive to research questions and methods used.	Results are directly responsive to research questions and methods used.	Results are fully or partially omitted or not responsive to research questions and methods used.
6.	Discussion Inclusion of interpretation of findings.	Findings are critically analyzed and interpreted.	Findings are fully or partially omitted or insufficiently or inaccurately analyzed and interpreted.
7.	Strengths and Limitations Identification of strengths and limitations.	Research strengths and limitations are clearly identified and itemized.	Research strengths and limitations are fully or partially omitted or inappropriate for the study.
8.	Conclusion Data-supported study conclusions.	Conclusions are clear and well supported by study data.	Conclusions are fully or partially omitted or not completely supported by study.
9.	Future Research Inclusion of implications for future research.	Implications for future research are outlined.	Implications for future research fully or partially omitted or inappropriate.
10.	Visual Aids Quality and clarity of visual aids.	Visual aids are of high quality, i.e., clearly portray information, are visible to the whole audience, use complementary colors, and a background that does not conflict with the text/figures.	Visual aids are of poor quality, or information is confusing, or is not clearly visible to the whole audience, uses conflicting colors, or a distracting background.

Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Health Sciences

11.	Delivery Quality of delivery	Delivery is clear, audible and delivered at an appropriate rate. Presenter maintains eye contact with all members of the audience, has no distracting mannerisms, and has a professional appearance.	Delivery is sometimes inaudible or delivered at an inappropriate rate. Presenter does not maintain eye contact with the audience, has distracting mannerisms, or does not have a professional appearance.
12.	Questions Ability to answer challenging questions.	Presenter answers challenging questions knowledgeably, clearly, accurately, concisely, and honestly.	Presenter does not answer questions knowledgeably, clearly, accurately, concisely or honestly.
13.	Timing Appropriate pacing and length.	Pacing of presentation is appropriate and formal part of the oral presentation does not exceed 15 minutes.	Pacing of formal oral presentation is markedly uneven or exceeds the 15 minute time limit.
14.	Effectiveness Overall effectiveness of presentation in communicating with intended audience.	Presenter efficiently and effectively communicates the essential meaning of the presentation to the intended audience.	Presentation does not communicate the essential meanings of the research efficiently or effectively with the intended audience.



The University of Vermont
**COLLEGE OF NURSING
 AND HEALTH SCIENCES**

**DOCTORAL PROGRAM OF STUDY
 IN HUMAN FUNCTIONING AND REHABILITATION SCIENCES**

Criteria for Assessment of Research Article

The exact format will be determined by the selected journal’s requirements; however, the article is expected to include the following **Essential Components**, each of which will be reviewed for quality as well as format. Papers will be reviewed as they would when sent to a peer-reviewed journal; the following serves as a guide for expectations of such articles.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1.	Abstract Includes the sections listed below (Intro through conclusions) within the word limitation provided by the journal.	Abstract is clearly and concisely written and includes purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.	Abstract is missing or does not include purpose, methods, results or conclusions or is written in an unfocused, unclear manner or exceeds a specified word limit.
2.	Introduction/Background Rationale for study, and literature review and critique.	Introduction/background section that includes well-written description and critique of pertinent literature, rationale for study, and research question(s).	Introduction/background section is missing or is incomplete or lacks critical analysis
3.	Methods Research design and rationale, population studied, sampling method, data collection, data analysis.	Methods section that includes concise, clear and appropriate description of population studied, research design, sampling method, data collection technique and data analysis.	Methods section demonstrates insufficient knowledge of the scientific method, or summarizes the pertinent details in an imprecise or inaccurate manner.
4.	Results Related to research question(s) and methods used.	Results section that includes pertinent tables or graphs and that are responsive to research questions(s) and methods used.	Results section does not include pertinent tables or graphs or is incomplete or not appropriate for the research questions(s) and methods used.
5.	Discussion Critical analysis and interpretation of findings, including consideration of strengths and limitations of research design and methods.	Discussion section includes a critical, insightful, well-reasoned and thorough review of findings, interpretation of principal findings in relation to prior research, discussion of methodological weaknesses and limitations of the study, as well as strengths, and significance of study.	Discussion section demonstrates inadequate critical reasoning and interpretation or lacks sufficient depth; methodological weaknesses and limitations and significance of study omitted or insufficiently described or inaccurate.

Ph.D. in Interdisciplinary Health Sciences

6.	Conclusions Justified by the findings of the research.	Conclusions (either as separate section or merged with Discussion section as appropriate for the specified journal) are supported by data and include recommendations for future research.	Conclusions (either as separate section or merged with Discussion section) and recommendations for future research are not supported by data or are missing.
7.	References Includes only references cited in article.	References are sufficient in breadth and depth for topic and consistent and correct in format according to journal specifications.	Not all references are cited or references not cited in the article are included, or are not appropriate or selection is superficial, or citation format is inconsistent or does not follow prescribed format.

	ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
8.	Overall Quality of Presentation Presentation and organization, including correct grammar, spelling, and no proof-reading errors.	The manuscript is well-organized, attractively presented with grammar and spelling that is consistently correct.	Presentation is of poor quality and disorganized, or grammar and spelling errors present.
9.	Adherence to all Journal Specifications Including but not limited to: font size, line spacing, margins, length, treatment of tables and figures, and reference style.	The manuscript adheres to all journal specifications including margins, font, treatment of figures and tables, article length.	Article does not fulfill all the specified journal's requirements.
10.	Administrative Steps The student completes all administrative steps and submits the article to the approved journal in the required time-frame.	The student completes all administrative steps and submits the article to the approved journal in the required time-frame. The exam requirement is not met until the Examination Committee receives proof of submission.	The student fails to complete all administrative steps or does not submit the article to the approved journal in the required time-frame.