

**NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
GRADUATE PROGRAM POLICIES & PROCEDURES  
AY 2018-2019**

**Director**

Anthony A. Braga, Ph.D.

**Associate Director**

Amy Farrell, Ph.D.

[am.farrell@northeastern.edu](mailto:am.farrell@northeastern.edu)

**Graduate Program Director**

Gregory M. Zimmerman, Ph.D.

[g.zimmerman@northeastern.edu](mailto:g.zimmerman@northeastern.edu)

**Graduate Program Administrator**

Jennifer Smith

[jenn.smith@northeastern.edu](mailto:jenn.smith@northeastern.edu)

**DATE OF VERSION: 6.6.2018**

## Contents

<b>NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY CORE VALUES .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (SCCJ) MISSION STATEMENT .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>THEMATIC AREAS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>LEARNING OUTCOMES .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Doctoral Program in Criminology and Justice Policy .....	7
Master’s Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice (MSCJ).....	8
<b>CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION (CCJGSA)..</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>SCCJ POLICIES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
University Graduate Studies Policies .....	9
Parental Leave Policy .....	9
Student Employment Policies.....	9
SCCJ Forms .....	10
<b>SCCJ ACADEMIC POLICIES &amp; PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Grading System .....	10
Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements .....	11
University GPA Academic Probation Guidelines .....	11
SCCJ GPA Academic Probation Guidelines .....	11
Transfer Credit .....	12
Incomplete Coursework .....	12
Academic Advisor.....	13
Registration.....	13
Part-time vs. Full-time Status .....	13
Inactive Status .....	13
Credits and Course Load .....	13
Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy .....	14
Academic Appeals Process.....	14
<b>REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDACY FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE.....</b>	<b>15</b>
Master of Science Two Semester Degree Program.....	15
Credits and Course Load.....	15
Master of Science Two Semester Sample Programs of Study (32 SH).....	15
Master of Science 18-Month Experiential Opportunities Degree Program.....	16

Credits and Course Load.....	16
Master of Science Experiential Opportunities Sample Programs of Study (34 SH).....	16
Required Core Courses .....	17
Elective Courses.....	17
Directed Study .....	17
<b>REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDACY FOR THE PH.D. DEGREE.....</b>	<b>19</b>
Doctor of Philosophy – Students entering with a Bachelor’s Degree .....	19
Credits and Course Load.....	19
Sample Doctoral Program of Study.....	19
Doctor of Philosophy – Advanced Standing (Students Entering with a Master's Degree in Criminology or Criminal Justice).....	20
Credits and Course Load.....	20
Sample Doctoral Program of Study.....	20
Required Core Courses .....	21
Elective Courses.....	21
Directed Study .....	21
Registration after the Completion of Coursework .....	22
<b>DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY PROGRESS EXPECTATIONS, ACADEMIC PROBATION, AND QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS.....</b>	<b>22</b>
General Progress Expectations and General Probation Guidelines.....	22
Required Coursework .....	24
First Qualifying Examination: Foundations Exam.....	24
Foundations Examination Eligibility.....	25
Foundations Examination Progress Expectations and Probation Guidelines.....	26
Second Qualifying Examination: Area Exam and Publishable Paper.....	26
Part 1: Area Exam.....	26
Part 2: Publishable Paper .....	27
Due Dates .....	27
Process and Roles of Students, Chairs, and Readers .....	28
Progress Expectations and Probation Guidelines .....	32
Third Qualifying Examination: Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	33
Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Format.....	33

Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Pre-Proposal and Recruitment of the Committee .....	33
Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Committee .....	34
Preparing for the Proposal: IRB Approval.....	34
Preparing the Traditional Dissertation Proposal.....	34
Preparing the Multiple-Paper Model Dissertation Proposal.....	36
Communication with and Feedback from Committee .....	37
Scheduling the Third Examination.....	38
The Dissertation Proposal Defense.....	39
Third Qualifying Examination Progress Expectation .....	40
Repeat Probation .....	40
Appeal of Failing Grades .....	41
Ph.D. Candidacy .....	41
<b>DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION .....</b>	<b>41</b>
The Dissertation Defense.....	42
Dissertation Defense Timeline .....	42
Doctoral Dissertation – Other Guidelines.....	44
Doctoral Dissertation Progress Expectations.....	44
<b>APPENDIX A: FOUNDATIONS EXAMINATION SAMPLE QUESTION.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: SECOND QUALIFYING “AREA” EXAMINATION SAMPLE QUESTIONS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SGAS AND FACULTY SUPERVISORS .....</b>	<b>47</b>

## **NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY CORE VALUES**

- To educate students for a life of fulfillment and accomplishment.
- To create and translate knowledge to meet global and societal needs.

## **SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (SCCJ) MISSION STATEMENT**

The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice graduate programs help prepare students for research, policy development, administrative, and supervisory positions within the various sectors of the criminal justice field. Conditions and needs in criminal justice are always changing and, therefore, the program acquaints students with the most current perspectives as well as with substantive knowledge, technical skills, and analytic methodologies.

## **THEMATIC AREAS**

### **Law and Justice**

The law and justice theme is focused on the legal, socio-political, and philosophical study of crime and criminal justice. Three primary foci shape the thematic area of law and justice. First, there is a focus on the law as a body of rules and institutions, including the history of criminal law, the basic principles of legal code and processes of lawmaking. Second, the thematic area focuses on the sociology of punishment, considering how rationales, strategies and systems of formal control emerge in the context of broader social organizational relations. Finally, the thematic area is concerned with the meaning of justice, and the philosophical and political underpinnings of varied and often competing conceptions. The law and justice area essentially provides a critical theoretical basis for understanding criminal law, criminal justice systems, and the pursuit of justice in their social and historical context.

### **Global Criminology and Criminal Justice**

The global criminology and criminal justice theme is focused on key dimensions of international issues in crime and justice. The globalization in many spheres - for example, markets, people, capital, culture, information, knowledge, technology, military, biologically relevant substances - is affecting the causes, motives, opportunities and control of misconduct at the local, national and international levels. Global criminology covers a wide range of interconnected issues and focuses on the need to draw from the wisdom and experience of countries other than one's own. Crime-related theory, research and policy are studied through a global lens. A special focus is on international norm creation, enforcement and control, as well as issues of international standards' legitimacy and justice. Emphasis is placed on the patterns, trends and impact of cross-border criminality (including transnational organized crime) and international law violations with the view of

developing preventive and control strategies, mechanisms and measures applicable to traditional and emerging forms of crime.

### **Crime and Public Policy**

The crime and public policy theme is focused on the contributions that criminological theory and research can make to (1) advancing our knowledge and understanding of criminal behavior and (2) developing effective policies of crime prevention and control. Our crime focus involves the study of the nature, distribution, and causes of crime and victimization, with particular attention to measuring crime and testing theories about criminal behavior. Our policy focus includes primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention efforts that target individuals, organizations, institutions, communities, and broad social structural and cultural change. The thematic area of crime and public policy is multi-disciplinary: we improve our understanding of crime and its control by applying insights from the social sciences, the humanities, law, and the natural sciences.

### **Crime Prevention and Security**

Crime prevention is often viewed as actions intended to prevent crime or criminal offending in the first instance, and originating outside of the criminal justice system. What can be done to prevent a young person from coming in conflict with the law or intervene with at-risk people or high risk places before invoking police, courts, or corrections? As an alternative to formal justice processing or a means of informal social control, crime prevention is organized around three main strategies: developmental, situational, and community prevention. Security concerns facing the United States today are broader and more complex than at any time in our history. They range from longstanding concerns arising from crime, intergroup violence and conflict to more recently recognized concerns associated with threats to social and economic systems (e.g. economic, financial, energy, and health systems) along with threats arising from the degradation of natural/environmental systems. Each of these major types of threats to security is often interconnected, and policies to address them require comprehensive and collaborative initiatives. The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, because of its historical focus on global concerns, human rights and social justice, has taken a leadership role in addressing the complex character of threats to security.

### **Fairness and Legitimacy in the Criminal Justice System**

This thematic area is focused broadly on the fairness and legitimacy of criminal justice institutions in their practice and policy. The area focuses on several key questions. The first is whether criminal justice agents and institutions represent and respond to historically marginalized groups *fairly*. The second taps into perceptions of *legitimacy* by asking how institutions are viewed by the public, and particularly by historically marginalized populations. The third involves potential differences in crime among historically marginalized groups, and the connections between this crime and law-making

and enforcing processes. The fourth involves perceptions: the way historically marginalized groups perceive crime and justice and the way they are perceived by others as connected to crime. In all of these questions, we utilize a broad definition of marginalized groups, including those organized along the lines of race, ethnicity, class, immigration status, gender, and sexual orientation, among others. Research and classes in this theme promote the advantages of viewing crime and criminal justice issues from a diversity of perspectives, and encourage critical reflections on our institutions and their policies and practices.

## LEARNING OUTCOMES

### Doctoral Program in Criminology and Justice Policy

The doctoral program in Criminology and Justice Policy is designed to create independent scholars with a distinct area of specialization and the skills necessary to contribute to the intellectual development of their area and the field more generally. The program is research oriented and practice oriented.

The PhD program is strongly committed to producing the next generation of research-productive scholars. Coursework, qualifying examinations, and dissertation structure are geared toward providing students with the theoretical, methodological, quantitative, qualitative, and practical skills needed to obtain top-tier academic positions in the discipline. Additionally, students work with faculty members to individualize their courses of study within existing frameworks to fulfill career aspirations.

In keeping with Northeastern's long-standing, practice-oriented approach to education, the PhD program links students to city, regional, and national agencies. Students gain valuable experience working with practitioners through faculty who collaborate with policy-makers via grant-work. Students are encouraged to apply skills obtained through the PhD program to practice.

Toward these ends, we have identified the following learning outcomes. Over the course of their programs, students in the doctoral program in Criminology and Justice Policy are expected to:

- Apply acquired foundational knowledge in the field of criminology and justice policy to theoretical and policy questions in the realm of criminology and justice policy.
- Critique the knowledge base in a specific domain within the field of criminology and justice policy to demonstrate advanced mastery of theoretical explanations for crime, its causes and consequences.
- Design and carry out original research using methodological tools acquired to develop new theoretical or empirical insights and expand the knowledge base in the field of criminology and justice policy.

The achievement of specific learning outcomes is assessed through a series of qualifying examinations. Each qualifying examination is associated with one of the three specific learning objectives and are described in more detail in relevant sections of this document:

- A “Foundations Examination” (also known as the First Qualifying Examination), graded by a committee, assesses the student’s mastery of foundational knowledge gained through the first-year required courses in the program.
- An “Area Exam” and “Publishable Paper” (known collectively as the Second Qualifying Examination), graded by a committee, assesses the student’s ability to contribute to a specific domain within the field of criminology and justice policy.
- The dissertation proposal defense (also known as the Third Qualifying Exam) and dissertation defense, before a committee, assess the student’s ability to become independent scholars contributing to the ongoing development of knowledge across the field of criminology and justice policy.

### **Master’s Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice (MSCJ)**

The Master’s Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice concentrates both on the problem of crime as a form of deviant behavior, and on the criminal justice and private security systems that deal with it. The program emphasizes a systems approach to criminal justice, stressing policy development and analysis, as well as the impact these policies have on the individuals and organizations charged with delivering justice in a fair and equitable manner. Broad in concept and scope, it encompasses such related disciplines as law, sociology, political science, psychology, criminology, and public administration.

Briefly stated, the Graduate Program in Criminal Justice endeavors to:

- Assist in developing criminal justice and private security leaders capable of assuming responsibility for policy planning and administration;
- Offer students the opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to conduct applied research while assisting them in developing the ability to apply this research in a variety of criminal justice settings; and
- Provide an opportunity for a solid educational foundation for those who wish to pursue more advanced graduate study beyond the Master of Science degree.

Over the course of their programs, students in the Master’s Program in Criminology and Criminal Justice are expected:

- To demonstrate mastery of foundational knowledge in the field of criminology and criminal justice.
- To develop and grow intellectually and ethically, as demonstrated by an ability to be a critical consumer of research and scholarship.
- To develop a keen appreciation for the complexities of crime, criminal behavior, and responses to crime.

- To develop an understanding of, and an ability to contribute to, public and private efforts to make communities safer and to ensure justice.

To demonstrate achievement of these overarching goals, students in the Master's program will be able to:

- Describe the elements of the formal criminal justice system (police, courts, prisons, etc.) and explain the interactions between them.
- Apply existing literature within the field of criminology and criminal justice to compare and/or contrast competing (and often contradictory theories) of crime and criminal behavior.
- Explain how the multiple theories on the causes of crime have evolved and how they interact.
- Assess the merits of criminological research applying acquired methodological and analytical skills.
- Describe the links between criminological theory, criminological research, and criminal justice policy.
- Explain the changing social and political backdrop for, and impediments to, criminal justice policy development and implementation.

### **CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION (CCJGSA)**

All graduate students are encouraged to participate in CCJGSA meetings and events. The CCJGSA seeks to foster a healthy graduate student culture in which students can develop academically as well as professionally while learning and establishing long-lasting relationships with fellow students and faculty.

<http://www.northeastern.edu/cssh/sccj/graduate/student-and-professional-organizations/>

### **SCCJ POLICIES**

#### **University Graduate Studies Policies**

In addition to policies noted here, all graduate students should familiarize themselves with university wide policies for graduate students established by the Provost's Office:

<http://www.northeastern.edu/provost/policies/graduate.html>

#### **Parental Leave Policy**

The Provost's Office has established a parental leave policy for graduate students. The parental leave policy and required forms are available on the Provost's Office website:

<http://www.northeastern.edu/provost/policies/graduate.html>

#### **Student Employment Policies**

Faculty in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice often have (or pursue) funding for research projects. To ensure greater equity for faculty and students, the School has

established the following standard hourly rates that should be used when applying for funding or when hiring students:

- Doctoral: \$24.00/hour\*
- Masters Students: \$18.00/hour
- Undergraduate Students: \$15.00/hour

These rates apply to all hires made on or after September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017.

\* As all full-time doctoral students are funded during the academic year, the hourly rate for doctoral students represents the prevailing rate for *summer research assignments* or for *limited hours* (no more than 6 per week) above the stipend in the academic year (for research activity that enriches the student's development). Faculty members interested in hiring doctoral students for more than 6 hours per week during the academic year will need to budget to cover part (or all) of the student's stipend at the prevailing stipend rate.

## SCCJ Forms

Current versions of all forms referred to in this document are available on our website at [www.northeastern.edu/sccj](http://www.northeastern.edu/sccj).

## SCCJ ACADEMIC POLICIES & PROCEDURES

The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice Graduate Handbook must be used in conjunction with the Northeastern University Graduate Catalog which can be found at: <http://www.northeastern.edu/provost/policies/graduate.html>

## Grading System

A	4.0	This grade is awarded to those students whose performance in the course has been of outstanding graduate caliber
A -	3.667	
B+	3.333	
B	3.0	This grade is awarded to those students whose performance has been at a satisfactory level.
B-	2.667	
C+	2.333	
C	2.0	This grade is awarded to those students whose performance in the course is not at the level expected in graduate work. This grade indicates significant and substantial gaps in the student's understanding of the subject matter and is generally predictive of problems in successfully completing the doctoral program.
C-	1.667	
S	Satisfactory	
U	Unsatisfactory	
I	Incomplete	In accordance with University policy, all incomplete grades must be completed within one academic year. The student must also

		have on file with the Graduate Program Office a signed Incomplete Grade Petition Form.
F	Failure	

### Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements

To remain in good standing, **a minimum overall grade point average of 3.0 (B) is required.** Master's and PhD Students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average or higher across all coursework. Failure to maintain a minimum overall grade point average of 3.0 will result in academic probation, may result in the loss of funding for Student Graduate Assistants (SGAs), and may result in dismissal from the program if not remedied in one academic semester or calendar year, as specified in the "SCCJ GPA Academic Probation Guidelines" section below.

Additionally, **a minimum average GPA of 3.0 (B) across all required courses is required.** Master's and PhD Students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average or higher across all required coursework. Failure to maintain a minimum overall grade point average of 3.0 will result in academic probation, may result in the loss of funding for Student Graduate Assistants (SGAs), and may result in dismissal from the program if not remedied in one academic semester or calendar year, as specified in the "SCCJ GPA Academic Probation Guidelines" section below.

### University GPA Academic Probation Guidelines

Northeastern University requires that all graduate students maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0. When a student's cumulative GPA falls below 3.0, the student is placed on academic probation by the Registrar's Office.

### SCCJ GPA Academic Probation Guidelines

Graduate students are required to maintain an overall grade point average of 3.0 or higher to remain in good standing in the Graduate Program. Students must also maintain a minimum grade point average of 3.0 in required courses to remain in good standing in the Graduate Program.

Graduate students are placed on probation – with potential loss of funding (for SGAs) – as soon as: (1) the overall GPA drops below 3.0; or (2) the GPA across all required courses drops below 3.0.

The student will have one semester immediately following being placed on probation to retake the required course(s) or elective(s) with the lowest grades to bring the overall GPA and/or the GPA across required courses above 3.0.

If the course to be retaken is only offered once per academic year, the student will be placed on probation for two semesters and must retake the course at next offering. If the course to be retaken is an elective that is not offered during the next academic year, the student must

retake a similar substantive course or the course with the next lowest grade based on the discretion of the Graduate Program Director.

Not more than two courses or eight semester hours of credit, whichever is greater, may be repeated. If the student does not fulfill these requirements after the course(s) is retaken one time (after 1–2 semesters), he/she will be dismissed from the program.

Note that retaking a course does not add credits to the student's degree plan nor should it impact the timing of the student's degree plan.

### Transfer Credit

A student may transfer up to nine (9) semester hours of credit from another institution, provided that the credits transferred consist of a grade of B (3.0) or better in graduate-level courses, have been earned at a U.S.-accredited institution, have not been used toward any other degree and have received approval from the Graduate Program Director, Associate Director, and Director of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Courses accepted for transfer credit must have been completed within seven years of the date the request is made to the graduate program and been completed within the seven years prior to the awarding of the student's degree at Northeastern. Grades are not transferred. Upon completion of the course, students should submit a Request for Transfer Credit form to the SCCJ Graduate Office along with an official transcript. Generally, the graduate program does not approve transfer credit for required courses.

### Incomplete Coursework

During the course of the academic year, students may find the need to arrange for an incomplete course grade. Incomplete grades are strongly discouraged and should be incurred in only the direst circumstances. Incomplete grades are awarded to students at the discretion of the individual faculty member/instructor of a particular course. Once a student has received the permission of the course instructor, s/he must complete an Incomplete Grade Petition Form available on the university Registrar's website. The individual student, the faculty member, and the Graduate Program Director must sign this form **prior** to the end of the semester and submission of grade sheets. Students are only permitted to carry 2 incompletes at one time and have no more than 3 incompletes throughout the entire program.

In addition, it is important to note that both the student and the faculty member must establish a date by which all incomplete coursework will be completed. Students who do not file an additional incomplete form or do not complete the required course work by the predefined date will be awarded a final grade based on the coursework completed to date. It is the sole responsibility of the student to ensure that all incomplete coursework is completed by the specified date. **As specified by university policy, all incomplete grades must be completed within one year.**

## Academic Advisor

It is highly recommended that doctoral students have chosen an academic advisor by the end of their first semester. Master's students will be assigned an academic advisor prior to matriculation in the program. The role of the advisor is to assist the student in planning their course of study while at Northeastern and to provide the student with both academic and professional advice.

## Registration

Students must register for courses via the myNEU web portal on [my.northeastern.edu](http://my.northeastern.edu) (procedures to do so are available on the myNEU web portal). Students must register within the dates and times listed on myNEU. Students who fail to register within this time frame will not earn credit or a grade for the course(s) in question and may lose their student health care plan. Late registration may also result in the cancellation of under-enrolled courses and may also have financial aid implications for the student.

To withdraw from a course after the first week of classes, a student must fill out an official course withdrawal form obtained on the University Registrar's website at [www.northeastern.edu/registrar](http://www.northeastern.edu/registrar). Ceasing to attend class does not constitute official withdrawal. Notifying the instructor does not constitute official withdrawal. Please refer to the Registrar's website for additional information and timelines on course withdrawals [www.northeastern.edu/registrar](http://www.northeastern.edu/registrar).

## Part-time vs. Full-time Status

Master's students are expected to complete the program in one academic year (or 18 months if adding an experiential opportunity). In order to complete the program in longer duration (i.e., as a part-time student), the student must petition the SCCJ Graduate Program Director. The Ph.D. program only admits students on a full-time basis and, unless on an approved leave of absence, students must maintain full-time status throughout their program. The SCCJ Graduate Program Director has the sole authority to grant or deny any such requests. It is the responsibility of each student to assure that they remain in the appropriate status.

## Inactive Status

Northeastern University has a policy requiring continuous registration for full-time graduate students. Please refer to the Graduate Catalogue for regulations regarding registration:

<http://www.northeastern.edu/registrar/>

## Credits and Course Load

Please refer to the section particular to each degree for credit and course load requirements, as they differ by degree.

## Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy

Essential to the mission of Northeastern University is the commitment to the principles of intellectual honesty and integrity. Academic integrity is important for two reasons. First, independent and original scholarship ensures that students derive the most from their educational experience and the pursuit of knowledge. Second, academic dishonesty violates the most fundamental values of an intellectual community and depreciates the achievements of the entire university community. Accordingly, Northeastern University views academic dishonesty as one of the most serious offenses that a student can commit while in college. All students should familiarize themselves with Northeastern University's Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy: <http://www.northeastern.edu/osccr/academic-integrity-policy/>.

In addition, the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice has established the policy that any instance of confirmed academic dishonesty in a particular course may result in the failure of the course and dismissal from the program.

## Academic Appeals Process

In accordance with university policy, graduate students are encouraged, whenever possible, to follow the guidelines below to resolve grading disputes during their coursework:

### *Step 1*

Students must attempt to resolve any disputed grade with the individual faculty member assigned to the course. In the event that the situation is not resolved through this mechanism, students must submit a written summary of their concerns to the Graduate Director (if the Graduate Director is also the course instructor, proceed to Step 3).

### *Step 2*

The Graduate Director will review any written request from students regarding the academic dispute and make a recommendation to the individual student and the faculty member involved as to the appropriate outcome measure to be taken. If the student is unsatisfied at this point, the Graduate Director will appoint an Ad Hoc Committee of two faculty members from SCCJ to hear the dispute.

### *Step 3*

The Ad Hoc Committee, if applicable, will review the merits of the student's academic dispute, and report their conclusions and recommendations to the Graduate Committee. The Graduate Committee will convene and make a final decision as to the appropriate outcome measure to be implemented and report their decision to the Graduate Director.

### *Step 4*

The Graduate Director will convene a meeting of both the student and individual faculty member involved to discuss the decision of the Graduate Committee. If the academic dispute is not resolved at this point, the student is welcome to pursue avenues as prescribed by the College's and University's official policies and procedures regarding academic disputes in the University's Graduate Catalogue.

## REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDACY FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE

### Master of Science Two Semester Degree Program

#### Credits and Course Load

To satisfy the requirements for the Master of Science in Criminology and Criminal Justice, students must successfully complete thirty (32) semester hours of coursework in a two-semester sequence. The degree plan for students entering in the Fall and Spring semesters is as follows.

#### Master of Science Two Semester Sample Programs of Study (32 SH)

##### Fall Admission

##### **FALL SEMESTER**

CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **SPRING SEMESTER**

CRIM 7200 Criminology	4 SH
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### Spring Admission

##### **SPRING SEMESTER**

CRIM 7200 Criminology	4 SH
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **FALL SEMESTER**

CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

## Master of Science 18-Month Experiential Opportunities Degree Program

### Credits and Course Load

There is also the opportunity (not required) for an experiential opportunity (e.g., a Graduate Co-op or Research Lab or Center Experience). Students opting for an experiential opportunity will extend the duration of the program by 6 months to 18 months and two credits and will gain informal mentorship through their co-op experience as well as the experiential integration course.

Master's students opting for an experiential opportunity typically enrich their graduate studies with a Graduate Co-op or Research Lab or Center Experience. These experiences entail full-time (or near full-time) employment. Although many co-ops involve paid positions, some are unpaid. Experiential opportunities are scheduled as CRIM 6964: Co-op Work Experience (0 SHs) and engage students in coursework integration through a required CSSH experiential integration course: INSH 6864: Experiential Integration (2 SHs). The degree plan for students entering in the Fall and Spring semesters is as follows.

### Master of Science Experiential Opportunities Sample Programs of Study (34 SH)

#### Fall Admission

##### **FALL SEMESTER**

CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science /	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **SPRING SEMESTER**

CRIM 7200 Criminology	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science /	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **SUMMER/FALL (JULY – DECEMBER)**

CRIM 6964 Co-op Experience	0 SH
INSH 6864 Experiential Integration	2 SH

#### Spring Admission

##### **SPRING SEMESTER**

CRIM 7200 Criminology	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science /	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **FALL SEMESTER**

CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 SH
INSH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
OR	
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science /	
INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	
CRIM elective	4 SH
CRIM elective	4 SH

##### **SPRING/SUMMER (JANUARY – JUNE)**

CRIM 6964 Co-op Experience	0 SH
INSH 6864 Experiential Integration	2 SH

## Required Core Courses

All students entering the program must take sixteen (16) semester hours of required course work as part of the core curriculum. The required core courses are:

Required Courses:	Semester Hours Earned
CRIM 7200 Criminology	4 SH
CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 SH
ISH 6300 Research Methods in the Social Sciences	4 SH
INSH 6404 Computational Social Science OR INSH 6500 Statistical Analysis	4 SH
<b>Total Semester Credit Earned</b>	<b>16 SH</b>

Students adding an experiential option will also be required to enroll in CRIM6964 Co-op Experience (0 SH) and INSH 6864 Experiential Integration (2 SH). These courses will be taken for six months during the co-op experience.

## Elective Courses

Students are expected to take elective courses beyond the required semester hours of core courses. A total of eighteen (16) semester hours of elective credit are needed to complete the degree. Elective courses **generally** meet once a week for 3 hours and 20 minutes on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday in the afternoon or evening. Students should be aware that while the program attempts to accommodate part-time students as much as possible, it is often not feasible to teach all courses in the evening, meaning that students may be required to take some courses in the afternoon. Elective courses are worth three (4) semester hours of credit unless otherwise noted.

The student may also pursue specialized interests by electing courses in other graduate programs at Northeastern. The student is permitted to take up to two courses (8 semester hours) from other graduate programs at Northeastern. A student wanting to take more than 8 credits outside of the school can petition to do so. Such petitions will be considered by the SCCJ Graduate Committee and approved by the school's Graduate Program Director.

## Directed Study

In order to pursue specialized interests not covered by the curriculum, M.S students are allowed to enroll in up to two directed study courses (8 semester hours) during their time in the graduate program. Students may petition to extend the number of directed studies taken. Such petitions must be directed to the Graduate Committee in writing at least 30 days before the start of the new semester and will be considered by the SCCJ Graduate Committee and approved by the school's Graduate Program Director. Such requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

In a directed study, students are able to explore in-depth an area of literature or to conduct a small research project, under the close supervision of a member of the faculty. Whether

one pursues library or original research, the student's work must be reflected in a final product (usually a paper) from the course. Directed Study Approval Forms may be obtained from the Registrar's website [northeastern.edu/registrar](http://northeastern.edu/registrar). Directed Study Approval Forms must include: (1) a course description; (2) a course syllabus; (3) a description of how the course will be graded; and (4) signatures by the faculty member with whom the student wishes to work and the Graduate Director prior to enrolling in the course. This approval form does not automatically register the student for the course. Upon approval of the Directed Study Form by the faculty member, the Graduate Director, and the CSSH Graduate Office of Admissions and Student Services, the SCCJ Graduate Program Coordinator will then register the student for the course. Finally, directed studies that duplicate existing course offerings will not be approved.

## REQUIREMENTS FOR CANDIDACY FOR THE PH.D. DEGREE

### Doctor of Philosophy – Students entering with a Bachelor’s Degree

#### Credits and Course Load

To satisfy the requirements for candidacy for Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology and Justice Policy, students entering the program with a Bachelor’s degree are required to complete fifty-four (54) semester hours of coursework as well as pass three qualifying examinations. Please see the sample program below for students entering the Ph.D. program with a Bachelor’s Degree.

#### Sample Doctoral Program of Study

##### Fall Semester Year 1

CRIM 7710 Criminology & Public Policy 1	4sh
CRIM 7715 Multivariate Analysis 1	4sh
CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4sh
<i>Total 12sh</i>	

##### Spring Semester Year 1

CRIM 7711 Criminology & Public Policy 2	4sh
CRIM 7716 Multivariate Analysis 2	4sh
CRIM 7713 Adv Research & Eval Methods	4sh
<i>Total 12sh</i>	

##### Summer Semester Year 1

*Completion of 1<sup>st</sup> Qualifying Examination  
(Foundations Exam)*

##### Fall Semester Year 2

CRIM Elective	4sh
CRIM Elective	4sh
CRIM Elective	4sh
<i>Total 12sh</i>	

##### Spring Semester Year 2

CRIM Elective	4sh
<i>Total 16sh</i>	

##### Summer Semester Year 2

*Completion of Part 1 of 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination  
(Area Exam)*

##### Fall Semester Year 3

CRIM 8960 Qualifying Exam Preparation	0sh
---------------------------------------	-----

##### Spring Semester Year 3

CRIM 7706 Prac in Writing & Publishing	2sh
<i>Total 2sh</i>	

##### Summer Semester Year 3

*Completion of Part 2 of 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination  
(Publishable Paper)*

##### Fall and Spring Semesters Year 4

CRIM 8986 Research	0sh
--------------------	-----

##### Summer Semester Year 4

CRIM 7700 Practicum in Teaching	0sh
<i>Completion of 3<sup>rd</sup> Qualifying Examination (Dissertation Proposal Defense)</i>	

##### Fall and Spring Semesters Year 5

CRIM 9990 Dissertation	0sh
------------------------	-----

## Doctor of Philosophy – Advanced Standing (Students Entering with a Master's Degree in Criminology or Criminal Justice)

### Credits and Course Load

To satisfy the requirements for candidacy for Doctor of Philosophy in Criminology and Public Policy, students entering the program with a Master's degree in Criminology or Criminal Justice are required to complete forty-two (42) semester hours of coursework and must pass three qualifying examinations. Students entering the program with a Master's degree in a related field may petition the Graduate Committee and Graduate Program Director to enter with Advanced Standing. Please see the sample program below for students entering the Ph.D. program with a Master's Degree.

### Sample Doctoral Program of Study

#### Fall Semester Year 1

CRIM 7710 Criminology & Public Policy 1	4sh
CRIM 7715 Multivariate Analysis 1	4sh
CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4sh
<i>Total 12sh</i>	

#### Spring Semester Year 1

CRIM 7711 Criminology & Public Policy 2	4sh
CRIM 7716 Multivariate Analysis 2	4sh
CRIM 7713 Adv Research & Eval Methods	4sh
<i>Total 12sh</i>	

#### Summer Year 1

*Completion of 1st Qualifying Examination (Foundations Exam)*

#### Fall Semester Year 2

CRIM 8960 Qualifying Exam Preparation	0sh
CRIM Elective Course	4sh
CRIM Elective Course	4sh
<i>Total 8sh</i>	

#### Spring Semester Year 2

CRIM 7706 Prac in Writing & Publishing	2sh
CRIM Elective Course	4sh
CRIM Elective Course	4sh
<i>Total 10sh</i>	

#### Summer Year 2

*Completion of 2nd Qualifying Examination (Area Exam and Publishable Paper)*

#### Fall and Spring Semesters Year 3

CRIM 8986 Research	0sh
--------------------	-----

#### Summer Year 3

CRIM 7700 Practicum in Teaching	0sh
<i>Completion of 3rd Qualifying Examination (Dissertation Proposal Defense)</i>	

#### Fall and Spring Semesters Year 4

CRIM 9990 Dissertation	0sh
------------------------	-----

#### Fall and Spring Semesters Year 5

CRIM 9996 Dissertation Continuation	0sh
-------------------------------------	-----

## Required Core Courses

All students entering the program must take twenty-six (26) semester hours of required course work as part of the core curriculum. The required core courses are:

Required Courses:	Semester Hours Earned
CRIM 7202 The Criminal Justice Process	4 sh
CRIM 7710 Criminology & Public Policy 1	4 sh
CRIM 7711 Criminology & Public Policy 2	4 sh
CRIM 7713 Advanced Research & Evaluation Methods	4 sh
CRIM 7715 Multivariate Analysis 1	4 sh
CRIM 7716 Multivariate Analysis 2	4 sh
CRIM 7706 Practicum in Writing and Publishing	2 sh
CRIM 7700: Practicum in Teaching*	0 sh
<b>Total Semester Credit Earned</b>	<b>26 sh</b>

\* The 0-credit Practicum in Teaching is recommended for all doctoral students and *required* of all students who plan to teach for the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Students should take this course in the semester before they begin teaching.

## Elective Courses

Beyond the twenty-six (26) semester hours of required course work in the core curriculum, the Ph.D. student is expected to take elective courses to fulfill the requirements for candidacy.

- For students entering the program with a Bachelor's degree, a total of twenty-eight (28) semester hours of elective credit (7 electives) is needed in order to complete this requirement.
- For students entering the program with Advanced Standing, a total of sixteen (16) semester hours of elective credit (4 electives) is needed.

Elective courses generally meet once a week for 3 hours and 20 minutes on a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday in the afternoon or evening.

The student may also pursue specialized interests by electing courses in other graduate programs at Northeastern. The student is permitted to take up to two courses (8 semester hours) from other graduate programs at Northeastern. A student wanting to take more than 8 credits outside of the school can petition to do so. Such petitions will be considered by the SCCJ Graduate Committee and approved by the school's Graduate Program Director.

## Directed Study

In order to pursue specialized interests not covered by the curriculum, Ph.D. students are allowed to enroll in up to two directed study courses (8 semester hours) during their time in the graduate program. Students may petition to extend the number of directed studies taken. Such petitions will be considered by the SCCJ Graduate Committee and approved by the school's Graduate Program Director. In a directed study, students are able to explore an

in-depth area of literature or to conduct a research project, under the close supervision of a member of the faculty.

### Registration after the Completion of Coursework

Students who have completed coursework, but who have not yet completed the second qualifying area examination, **must** register for **qualifying exam preparation** with their second qualifying exam Chair as the instructor of record.

After completing all coursework and the first two qualifying exams, students must register for **doctoral research** with their Dissertation Committee Chair as instructor of record (as they work toward the proposal defense).

After completing the proposal defense, and achieving doctoral candidacy, students must register for **dissertation** for **two semesters** with their Committee Chair as instructor of record.

After registering for dissertation twice, the student must register for **dissertation continuation** with their Committee Chair.

Each of these courses requires a grade for the student that reflects their progress over any given semester. A grade of “Satisfactory” is assigned when the student is making progress and has met the requirement of communication with all committee members at least once per semester. A grade of “unsatisfactory” is assigned when the student has failed to initiate contact over the course of a semester or appears to have stopped making satisfactory progress. Unsatisfactory progress in doctoral research, dissertation or dissertation continuation courses in any semester will result in academic probation and may result in loss of funding or dismissal from the program as specified in the “Doctor of Philosophy Progress Expectations, Academic Probation, and Qualifying Examinations” section below.

## DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY PROGRESS EXPECTATIONS, ACADEMIC PROBATION, AND QUALIFYING EXAMINATIONS

### General Progress Expectations and General Probation Guidelines

In addition to the above-mentioned coursework and minimum GPA requirements, students in the doctoral program in Criminology and Justice Policy are expected to meet a series of annual progress benchmarks.

Annual benchmarks include: (1) achieving a B- or higher in each and every first-year required course; (2) the successful completion of a Foundations Exam at the end of the first year; (3) the successful completion of an Area Exam (Part 1 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination) by the end of the second year of study; (4) the successful completion of a Publishable Paper (Part 2 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination) by the end of the third year of study; (5) the completion of a proposal defense by the end of the third year (for students entering with Advanced

Standing) or the fourth year (for students not entering with Advanced Standing); and (6) annual progress toward a dissertation defense in each of the years that follow. Failure to meet annual progress benchmarks will result in a series of graduated sanctions within the program.

By March 1<sup>st</sup> of each academic year, all doctoral students are required to complete and submit program plans to the SCCJ graduate office. A full faculty review of doctoral students occurs in May. Prior to the beginning of each academic year (on or before September 1st), all doctoral students will be individually notified in writing of the program's expectations for their progress over the next academic year and whether or not they are in good academic standing (or on probation for the upcoming academic year).

When students have failed to meet progress expectations that have been clearly articulated in either the SCCJ graduate program's policies and procedures manual or in their annual progress expectation letters, they are notified of the deficiency in writing, placed on academic probation, and given a timeline for remedying the deficiency. As funding is predicated on satisfactory progress toward meeting degree requirements, failure to make satisfactory progress may result in loss of funding. In these cases, the Graduate Program Director, with input from the SCCJ Graduate Committee, Associate Director, and Director, will make funding decisions.

The general expectation is that students who have failed to make satisfactory progress as articulated in the annual review letter will: (1) be placed on formal academic probation, (2) potentially lose funding immediately (if applicable), and (3) be given time, as specified above, to remedy the deficiency. When students fulfill the requirements of their probation within one academic semester, they retain good academic standing. Failure to remedy the deficiency by the end of the academic semester on probation will result in possible dismissal of the student. In these cases, the Graduate Program Director, with input from the SCCJ Graduate Committee, Associate Director, and Director, will make dismissal decisions. The expectation is that students who fail to remedy deficiencies as articulated in the academic probation letter will be recommended for dismissal.

All other program goals unrelated to the terms of a specific academic probation must be fulfilled while on probation (e.g., passing the Foundations Exam while being on probation for not maintaining an overall GPA of 3.0).

Additionally, students cannot be placed on probation while already on probation. Failure to remedy the deficiency for which one is on probation prior to being placed on academic probation again for failure to meet an additional programmatic goal will face possible dismissal from the program.

Students cannot be placed on academic probation (and then remedy the deficiency) more than two times during tenure in the program. Students facing a third distinct instance of probation may be dismissed from the program.

Students will be notified of the referral for loss of funding and/or dismissal and will have the right to submit a letter explaining any special or extenuating circumstances that might be relevant to the Graduate Committee's deliberations. The student has 28 days from the time of being notified of the loss of funding and/or dismissal to appeal his or her cases to the Graduate Committee. The student must articulate in writing how any extenuating circumstances have impeded progress toward degree requirements. The Graduate Committee will deliberate and then submit a recommendation to the Graduate Director of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. Students will be notified by the Graduate Director if the school intends to recommend loss of funding and/or dismissal for failure to make academic progress.

### **Required Coursework**

In addition to the requirements set forth in the "Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements" section above, all doctoral students must receive a B- or higher in each and every first-year required course.

If the student receives below a B- in any of the required courses, he or she will be immediately placed on probation with potential loss of funding. The student then has one semester immediately following being placed on probation to retake the required course(s) below B- to increase the grade(s) to at least a B-. If the course to be retaken is only offered once per academic year, the student will be placed on probation for two semesters and must retake the course at next offering. Not more than two courses or eight semester hours of credit (in total, including electives that may need to be repeated to increase the overall GPA), whichever is greater, may be repeated. If the student does not fulfill these requirements after the course(s) is retaken one time (after 1–2 semesters), he/she will be dismissed from the program. Retaking a course does not add credits to the student's degree plan nor should it impact the timing of the student's degree plan.

Students registered for doctoral research, dissertation, and dissertation continuation receive a grade that reflects their progress over any given semester. A grade of "Satisfactory" is assigned when the student is making progress and has met the requirement of communication with all committee members at least once per semester. A grade of "unsatisfactory" is assigned when the student has failed to initiate contact over the course of a semester or appears to have stopped making satisfactory progress. Unsatisfactory progress in doctoral research, dissertation or dissertation continuation courses in any semester will result in academic probation and may result in loss of funding. A second grade of unsatisfactory (whether consecutive or not) will require Graduate Committee review and may result in dismissal from the program.

### **First Qualifying Examination: Foundations Exam**

The required coursework in year one in the doctoral program (comprised of two semesters of criminological theory, two semesters of statistics, one semester of advanced research methods, and one semester of criminal justice process) provides a broad foundational

knowledge in the discipline. To ensure that all students have mastered the foundational material emphasized across the required courses for the Ph.D. program and can successfully integrate theory, research, and policy, all full-time funded Ph.D. students are required to take a “Foundations Examination” at the end of their first year in the doctoral program (or upon successful completion of all required courses in the doctoral program curriculum).

### Foundations Examination Eligibility

Students must meet the following criteria to be considered eligible to take the Foundations Examination:

- Successfully completed the required courses with passing grades, AND;
- Successfully completed a minimum of 24 credit hours in the program, AND;
- Be in good academic standing.

The examination is typically administered on the first Friday in May after all first-year courses are completed, thus aligning with, yet distinct from, the required courses. The Foundations Examination is a take-home, open book, examination that requires students to answer one of two provided questions (the questions are typically distributed electronically on the first Friday in May by 9am and are due on the following Monday morning at 9am). The Foundations Exam questions are designed to test theoretical, methodological, and statistical knowledge, thereby providing the opportunity to assess each student’s knowledge base from the required courses in the first year of study. The examination is graded by a two person “grading team” comprised of a rotating committee of two to four School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (SCCJ) faculty members (the broader “grading committee” who collectively taught the first-year required coursework).

There are **three** potential outcomes for the Foundations Exam. After deliberation, the grading team can vote to Pass, Pass with Revisions, or Fail the Exam. Both members of the grading team need to agree. If there is disagreement, a third member of the broader grading committee will break the tie. A grade of Pass with Revisions is reserved for Exams for which modest revisions would bring the Exam to a grade of Pass. In such cases, the student will have two weeks to submit the revised Exam. A grade of Fail is typically reserved for Exams for which minor revisions would not be appropriate to raise the paper to a Pass.

A foundations exam sample question is provided in the appendix of this SCCJ graduate program policies and procedures manual. The sample question is provided to illustrate the “type” of question that might be appropriate for the Foundations Examination. Each SCCJ grading committee is responsible for drafting two questions for each sitting of the Foundations Exam, so the form and substance of questions will vary from year to year. All foundations exam questions will be designed to elicit a response that demonstrates a student's ability to integrate theory with methods and statistics and to think critically about policy implications of work in criminology and criminal justice.

### **Foundations Examination Progress Expectations and Probation Guidelines**

Funding in the Ph.D. program is predicated on satisfactory academic progress. To maintain satisfactory progress, full-time funded Ph.D. students are expected to have passed the Foundations Exam in May at the end of the first year of study.

Students who do not pass the Foundations Exam in May will be placed on academic probation for failure to make satisfactory progress and may lose funding. The student will be given one additional opportunity to pass the Foundations Exam in August (typically administered on the first Friday in August) prior to the start of the second year of study. Failure to successfully complete the first qualifying exam prior to the start of the second year of study will result in dismissal from the program.

On a student's second attempt, the faculty grading the Exam will not include any of the committee members who graded the first attempt.

### **Second Qualifying Examination: Area Exam and Publishable Paper**

After demonstrating their foundational knowledge in year one, students devote themselves to an area of specialization in years two and three. Students demonstrate this commitment through a second qualifying examination, which consists of two stages: an Area Exam and a Publishable Paper. The two stages of this exam are required and will ideally be related.

During the second semester of the first year in the doctoral program, students will work with the Graduate Program Director to select a faculty mentor appropriate to their area of interest. This faculty mentor will oversee both parts of the second qualifying exam. The Graduate Program Director randomly assigns a second faculty "reader" to form a two-person committee for the second qualifying examination.

While one or both parts of the second qualifying examination could ultimately become part of a dissertation, they are not required to. To facilitate completion of this two-part qualifying examination, students register for qualifying exam preparation with their mentor as needed during their second and third years in the program.

Note that the student passes the Second Qualifying Examination when both the Area Exam and Publishable Paper have been judged as meriting a passing grade by both committee members AND the publishable paper has been submitted to an appropriate publication outlet.

#### **Part 1: Area Exam**

In conjunction with the qualifying examination Chair and the reader, students draft one theoretically-based research question drawn from their substantive area of interest. This question will be answered in a written comprehensive review of the literature and a critical assessment of the chosen perspective. The written Area Exam answer should not exceed 30 pages of double-spaced text (exclusive of references) and must be submitted within 3 months of the approval of the question by the Chair and reader. The Area Exam response is then

evaluated by the Chair and assigned reader. Students pass the first part of the second qualifying exam once both committee members agree that the student has adequately addressed the posed question. Students are required to complete the Area Exam through earning a pass from both committee members by August 31<sup>st</sup> prior to the start of their third year of doctoral study.

Although only a relatively confined portion of the extant literature might be directly cited in the area examination response, it is recommended that students develop and maintain a comprehensive bibliography of relevant classic and contemporary readings in their area.

### **Part 2: Publishable Paper**

Students work to produce a sole-authored paper of publishable quality. The paper should not exceed 25 double-spaced pages of text (exclusive of references, tables, and figures). Students determine whether they will complete the publishable paper in the second or third year of the doctoral program. If the student is completing the paper in the second year, a draft of the paper must be completed and reviewed by the student's committee members before the beginning of the Spring semester of the second year. It is then vetted and revised through the CRIM 7706: Practicum in Writing and Publishing course offered in the Spring semester of the second year of coursework. If the student elects to complete the requirement in the third year, a draft of the paper, which must be completed and reviewed by the student's committee members before the beginning of the Spring semester of the third year, is then vetted and revised through the CRIM 7706: Practicum in Writing and Publishing course offered in the Spring semester of the third year of coursework.

The expectation is that the paper will be submitted to an appropriate academic journal or publication outlet, but acceptance for publication is not required to pass the exam. The student will be deemed to have passed the second part of the examination once both Qualifying Exam committee members agree that the paper is of publishable quality AND the paper has been submitted to a suitable publication outlet.

### **Due Dates**

\*Note that students are encouraged to work ahead of these deadlines, which indicate the latest dates to compete the exam and paper on time

#### **Committee Selection Assignment**

- 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam Committee Selected/Assigned: **Prior to the end of the spring semester during the first year of doctoral study**

#### **Part 1: Area Examination**

- Draft of Area Exam Question Submitted to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam Chair: **No later than December 31<sup>st</sup> of second year of doctoral study**
- Draft of Area Exam Question Submitted to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam Reader: **No later than January 31<sup>st</sup> of second year of doctoral study**

- Area Exam Question Approval Expected: **Within 2 weeks of question being submitted to the area exam committee**
- Work on Area Exam Answer Commences: **Within 2 weeks of approval of question**
- Area Exam Answer Submitted: **Within 3 months of commencement of work on the answer (no later than July 15<sup>th</sup> of second year of doctoral study)**
  - Exam Grade/Feedback Expected: **Within 3 weeks of submission**
  - If revisions are required, revisions are due: **Within 3 weeks after feedback is provided by committee**
- Area Exam Completed: **August 31<sup>st</sup> prior to the start of the third year of doctoral study**

### **Part 2: Publishable Paper**

- Students must choose to complete the publishable paper during their second or third year of study. The dates below guide students in either year rotation. Regardless of this choice, all students must complete Part 2 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination by the end of their third year of study.
- Work on Publishable Paper Commences: **No later than August 1<sup>st</sup> preceding enrollment in the spring research and writing practicum**
- Publishable Paper Submitted to 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam Committee: **No later than December 5<sup>th</sup> preceding enrollment in the spring research and writing practicum**
- Formal Committee Reviews of Publishable Paper Due: **January 4<sup>th</sup>**
- Paper and Reviews Submitted to SCCJ Graduate Program Office: **January 4<sup>th</sup>**
- Student Completes the Research and Writing Practicum: **Spring semester**
- Student Makes Revisions to the Publishable Paper and Submits the Paper for Publication: **Prior to the start of the fall semester (August 31<sup>st</sup>) following the completion of the research and writing practicum**

### **Process and Roles of Students, Chairs, and Readers**

Students may begin the Area Exam process (Part 1 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination) at any time during the summer following their first year in the doctoral program. Once started, the process has several deadlines, as specified above and reiterated below. Students must complete Part 1 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination no later than August 31<sup>st</sup> prior to the start of their third year of doctoral study. Students are allowed to complete the area exam in advance of the deadlines indicated in the policy manual. Doing so is encouraged in situations where students have passed the foundations exam and have a well-developed area of interest.

#### ***Role of Student***

During the summer between the student's first and second year in the program, the student must contact the selected Chair for the second qualifying exam to begin to discuss the timing and potential question for the Area Exam (Part 1 of the second qualifying exam).

1. Submit a first draft of that question to the Chair for comments, feedback and/or revision (no later than December 31<sup>st</sup> of the second year of doctoral study). Once the student and Chair are in agreement on the question, the Chair will send the question

to the reader for comments, suggestions and/or approval. Questions are expected to be approved within two weeks of being received by the committee. Approved area exam questions must be submitted to the SCCJ graduate program office.

2. Answer the Area Exam question in a written response that should not exceed 30 pages of double-spaced text (excluding references).
  - a. Students have 3 months to submit an answer to the Area Exam question
    - i. Keep in mind this is an examination. Students need to work independently and submit a complete and comprehensive answer to this take home examination question. Students should not expect any feedback from their Chair or reader until they have submitted a full and complete answer to the question. This is an examination response, not a paper that will go through drafts with the two-person grading committee.
    - ii. Do NOT exceed the 30 double-spaced page limit. If the answer exceeds thirty pages, faculty may stop reading at the 30<sup>th</sup> page and grade on the basis of the first 30 pages.
  - b. Students will be given one opportunity to revise if the answer does not earn a passing grade on the first submission.
    - i. If given the opportunity to revise, the revision is due no later than August 10<sup>th</sup> of the summer preceding the third year of doctoral study (to provide the Chair and Reader 3 weeks to review the revised submission). The revised answer will be graded on a Pass/Fail basis by the Chair and the Reader. If either member of the grading committee deems the Area Exam answer to be a failing answer, the exam response will be graded by a third reader. If two of the three graders deem the answer a failing answer, the student has failed the Second Qualifying Examination (see the “Progress Expectation” section below).
3. Students may elect to complete their publishable paper in year 2 or year 3 of the doctoral program. The student should begin work on the publishable paper prior to the beginning of the Fall semester preceding the year they will take the research and writing practicum. Students should work with their Chairs to discuss ideas for the direction of this paper.
  - a. Students spend the Fall semester prior to the research and writing practicum developing this paper in conjunction with the Qualifying Exam Preparation course (with their 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam Chair).
  - b. This paper will go through a lengthy review, revision, and rewriting process over the course of the Spring semester, so the goal in the Fall is to prepare a complete draft of the paper with all relevant sections in place.
  - c. The draft of the publishable paper should not exceed 25 pages of double-spaced text (not including references, tables, and figures).

4. Submit a complete draft of the publishable paper to committee members no later than December 5<sup>th</sup> of the semester prior to the research and writing practicum so that each committee member can provide a review prior to the beginning of the Spring semester.
  - a. Students need to submit a draft and the two reviews (Chair and Reader) to the graduate program office **NO LATER THAN** January 4<sup>th</sup>. Students must also bring copies to the first session of the Practicum in Writing and Publishing in the Spring semester.
5. If the student chooses to complete the publishable paper process during the third year of graduate study, then the Area Exam must be completed first (prior to the start of the third year of study). If the student chooses to complete the publishable paper process during the second year of graduate study, then the student **may** complete Part 2 of the second qualifying exam (the publishable paper) prior to completing Part 1 of the second qualifying exam (the Area Exam). However, the student cannot pass the Second Qualifying Examination until both the Area Exam and publishable papers have been judged as meriting a passing grade by both committee members, and the publishable paper has been submitted to an appropriate publication outlet.

### ***Role of Qualifying Exam Chair***

The Chair for the Second Qualifying Examination works with the student as s/he completes the two parts of this examination. Over the Fall and Spring semesters of the second year of doctoral study (and the third year as well if the student opts to begin the publishable paper process in year 3), the student will be registered for a “Qualifying Exam Preparation” course with the Examination Chair – the product of this course depends on whether the student chooses to complete the publishable paper process in year 2 or year 3 of the doctoral program). There CAN be significant overlap between the Area Exam answer and the publishable paper, but it is anticipated that they would not be the same paper (as the Area Exam answer will likely address too broad a question to be publishable). The role of the Area Exam Chair will include the following:

1. Work with the student to refine the Area Examination question and send it to the assigned reader for approval.
  - a. The Area Exam question should be approved by both committee members no later than **February 15<sup>th</sup>** of year 2.
2. Coordinate with the reader to grade the Area Exam answer within three weeks of submission.
  - a. Students are expected to submit the Area Exam answer no later than **May 15<sup>th</sup>**.
  - b. Anticipated grades on first submission are either “Pass,” “Revisions Required,” or “Fail” (written comments are *required* for a recommendation of “Revisions Required”)
    - i. The student is permitted one opportunity to revise the Area Exam response.

- ii. If the student is required to revise, the Chair then grades the revision and assigns a grade of “Pass” or “Fail”. Revisions deemed failing by the Chair will go to the reader. If both members of the grading committee deem the revised Area Exam answer to be a failing answer, the student has failed the Second Qualifying Examination (see the “Progress Expectation” section below). In the event of a split vote (one Pass/one Fail), a third reader shall be assigned by the graduate program office and their vote shall be the tie-breaking vote.
3. Consult with the student around the nature and direction of the publishable paper. The paper in its initial formulation must be sole-authored by the student. A complete draft of the publishable paper is due no later than **December 5<sup>th</sup>** in the semester proceeding students taking the research and writing practicum.
4. Provide feedback on the draft and a written review of the publishable paper (much like a review for a journal) no later than **January 4<sup>th</sup>** in the semester proceeding the students taking the research and writing practicum.
  - a. The graduate program office provides templates for these reviews.
  - b. The paper should be a complete draft that can be reviewed by both the Chair and the reader... it does NOT need to be in final, publication-ready shape. Students will be expected to revise on the basis of these reviews in the Spring semester Practicum in Writing and Publishing course,
    - i. It is imperative that the Chair and Reader complete the review of the publishable paper by the end of Fall semester so that students can come to the Practicum course with faculty feedback in hand.
5. Second qualifying examination Chairs are expected to submit a grade of IP (In Progress), “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory” for the Qualifying Examination Preparation course.
  - a. Grades of Satisfactory should be submitted for students who have met all deadlines indicated above.
  - b. In Progress (IP) grades should be submitted for students who have not completed these requirements by the end of each given semester.
  - c. A grade of “Unsatisfactory” should be submitted for any student who has not completed the Area Exam (Part 1) by the end of the summer of the second year or who has not completed the publishable paper (Part 2) by the end of the summer of the third year.
6. Approve the final revised version of the paper prior to it being sent out for publication.
7. The student passes the Second Qualifying Examination when both the Area Exam and publishable papers have been judged as meriting a passing grade by both committee members, and the publishable paper has been submitted to an appropriate publication outlet.

### ***Role of Reader***

Readers are randomly assigned to Second Qualifying Examination committees by the SCCJ graduate program office. Readers need not be subject matter experts to judge the quality of the content of the Area Exam response and the publishable paper. When contacted by Chair/Student, the assigned reader is expected to:

1. Approve the Area Exam question (offering suggestions for revision as necessary)
2. Provide feedback and a “Pass,” “Revisions Required,” or “Fail” grade on the initial Area Exam answer submitted by the student within two weeks of receiving the answer (expected at the beginning of the Fall semester).
  - a. Written comments are required for a recommendation of “Revisions Required.”
  - b. The student is permitted one opportunity to revise the Area Exam response.
  - c. If the student was required to revise, the Chair grades the revision. If the Chair deems the revision to merit a grade of Fail, the reader grades the revision and assigns a grade of “Pass” or “Fail”. In the event of a split decision, a third reader is assigned to read the exam. The third reader issues the tie-breaking vote. If two graders deem the answer to be a failing answer, the student has failed the Second Qualifying Examination (See “Second Qualifying Examination Progress Expectation”).
3. Provide a written review of the publishable paper (much like a review for a journal) within two weeks of receiving the draft of this paper (due no later than December 1<sup>st</sup>).
  - a. The graduate program office provides templates for these reviews.
  - b. Students will be expected to revise on the basis of these reviews in the Spring semester Practicum in Writing and Publishing course,
  - c. It is imperative that the reader completes the review of the publishable paper by the end of Fall semester so that students can come to the Practicum course with faculty feedback in hand.

### **Progress Expectations and Probation Guidelines**

Funding in the Ph.D. program is predicated on satisfactory progress toward degree completion. To maintain satisfactory progress, full-time funded Ph.D. students are expected to complete the Area Exam by the end of the second year of study (August 31<sup>st</sup>) and to submit the publishable paper to an outlet for publication by the end of the third year of study (August 31<sup>st</sup>).

If the Area Exam is not completed by the end of the summer following year 2 in the program, the student will be placed on academic probation for one semester with potential loss of funding. If the Area Exam is not completed by the end of the subsequent semester, the student may be dismissed from the program.

If the publishable paper is not submitted to committee for review by 12/5 (or 30 days prior to the start of the spring semester) and the student therefore does not qualify for the Practicum (year 3, spring semester), the student will be placed on academic probation with potential

loss of funding. The student will have one additional year to submit the paper to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Examination committee for review (by 12/5 in fourth year of study). If the paper is not submitted to the committee by that time and does not enroll in the Practicum in the spring of year 4 in the program, then he/she will be dismissed from the program.

If the paper is not submitted to a journal by the end of the summer following the Practicum, the student will be placed on probation for one semester with potential loss of funding before facing the possibility of dismissal from the program.

### Third Qualifying Examination: Dissertation Proposal Defense

#### Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Format

A doctoral dissertation is a fully executed research project that makes a significant and original contribution to the field of study. A dissertation is required of all candidates in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the granting of the doctoral degree. The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice recognizes two basic dissertation formats: the traditional monograph format and the multiple paper model format. The format of the dissertation is decided by the student in conjunction with the Chair and the broader committee.

The **traditional dissertation format** is a formal, written thesis that represents the culmination of the candidate's doctoral work. Dissertations differ from the traditional graduate research paper (that one might complete for a course) because the candidate must do more than summarize the existing literature and the empirical findings of others. In a dissertation, the doctoral student demonstrates his/her ability to contribute substantively to the accumulation and advancement of knowledge. Although the typical model in the social sciences is an original empirical research project, students may propose other types of dissertations (theoretical, historical, etc.). Care should be taken in the selection of a dissertation topic as the project must make an independent and original contribution. It is the responsibility of the student to thoroughly search existing literature and previously completed doctoral dissertations to ensure that the proposed dissertation research meets these criteria. ProQuest has a searchable Dissertations and Theses (PQDT) database, available through Northeastern University's library.

The **multiple paper model** requires a portfolio of manuscripts that are ultimately submitted for publication. As described in more detail below, the multiple paper model consists of: an introduction; a review of theory and literature; (at least) three complete manuscripts; and a discussion section that summarizes the body of work.

#### Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Pre-Proposal and Recruitment of the Committee

Students are required to draft a five-page pre-proposal to share with a potential dissertation Chair as well as potential committee members. The pre-proposal should succinctly summarize the student's research question(s), embed the research question(s) in the literature, outline the underlying theoretical framework(s), and identify the methodological and analytical strategy. The student submits the pre-proposal to the potential dissertation

Chair and potential committee members, soliciting feedback to smooth the proposal preparation process. Moreover, through the pre-proposal process, faculty members can gain a sense of the direction of a student's work prior to formally agreeing to serve on the committee.

### **Preparing for the Proposal: Dissertation Committee**

After identifying a dissertation Chair and committee members, the student distributes the pre-proposal. Once the pre-proposal is approved by the Chair and committee members, the student must file an Examination/Dissertation Committee Approval Form signed by all committee members and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs with the Graduate Office.

Any changes in the make-up of the committee must result in a new form being approved and filed in the Graduate Office. Students **must** notify the graduate program in the event of any change in the composition of the committee (new Chair, new committee member, etc.) immediately. Such changes **require** the completion of a new committee approval form. No third exams or proposal defenses may be scheduled without a current Examination/Dissertation form being on file in the Graduate Office.

The committee should include a minimum of THREE tenured or tenure-track faculty or full-time terminally prepared research faculty (including the Chair) – at least two of whom MUST be faculty from within the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. The third member may be from the School, from another department in the College or University, or a terminally prepared (Ph.D. holding) committee member from outside of Northeastern University. Petitions for outside readers will be considered by the full Graduate Committee.

### **Preparing for the Proposal: IRB Approval**

Pursuing a dissertation (and successfully defending a dissertation proposal) that might fail to receive IRB approval/exemption is futile. It is therefore strongly recommended that all students obtain IRB approval or exemption early in the dissertation planning process and prior to the scheduling of the dissertation proposal defense. If this is not possible, all students must, at a minimum, meet with the Director of Northeastern's Institutional Review Board and file all required forms prior to scheduling the defense.

### **Preparing the Traditional Dissertation Proposal**

The traditional dissertation proposal, which must be developed in conjunction with the student's Chair, should have the following components:

- An "introduction" or section that introduces the topic, thoroughly describes the theoretical orientation, and identifies the problem or issue to be addressed in the proposed dissertation. The proposal should introduce a problem and explain why it is a problem worthy of research attention.

- A concise "literature review" section that reviews the previous research that is directly relevant to the proposed study (the literature review in the final dissertation will be much more comprehensive than is necessary at the proposal stage). It should then review the relevant literature in a concise and useful fashion i.e., the literature that is most directly relevant to the problem should be reviewed. One does not review all the literature on crime if one is studying the ecology of crime in a small city. If the paper involves theory or hypothesis testing, these should be stated and the operational and conceptual matters outlined. Relevant definitions should be critically reviewed and evaluated as to their utility in the research. At the end of the literature review, students should identify the knowledge gap that will be filled by the proposed study.
- A section that concisely presents the specific "research questions" and the way in which they will be addressed.
- A "data, methodology, and analytic strategy" section will likely be the most substantial section of the proposal. The data and methodology should be described in enough detail that the committee fully understands exactly what it is that the student proposes to do in their own research. At a minimum, the data and methodology should include a detailed description of the:
  - Population and sample
  - Sampling/Subject selection criteria
  - Independent and dependent variables or variables of interest
  - Measures/Instruments
  - Methodology
  - Analytic Strategy

This section must include a discussion of how the data will be gathered, their adequacy and limitations and why these methods of collection are superior to others should be included. Data analysis should describe what means will be used to analyze the data, available software, analytic coding, philosophical-critical analysis, statistics to be used and the format for presentation of findings should be outlined.

Moreover, in this section, the student should directly and concretely address how s/he will decide if the findings are evidence (or not) of the questions raised or arguments addressed.

- A concluding section that discusses how the study will make a significant and new "contribution to theoretical and methodological knowledge." Students should have established the need for the proposed study and explicitly describe the contribution the study will make to existing knowledge.

The length of the dissertation proposal will vary based on a number of factors. That said, a long proposal is not necessarily better than a shorter one. It is expected that proposals will

likely range from 35 - 50 double-spaced pages of text in length (not including tables, figures, and references). A succinct, well-argued document is preferable.

### **Preparing the Multiple-Paper Model Dissertation Proposal**

The multiple-paper model dissertation differs from the traditional dissertation in several respects. With respect to the number and scope of the papers:

- The multiple-paper model dissertation must be comprised of 3 (or more) manuscripts.
- These manuscripts should be framed as journal articles and must represent original work that commences with the pre-proposal; previously published work is not eligible.
- Manuscripts may use existing data and/or data to be collected.
- At least 2 of the manuscripts must be empirical pieces (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, or mixed method).
- The papers must form a cohesive program of research, with clear bridges and links between each manuscript.

With respect to authorship:

- At least one of the manuscripts must be sole-authored by the student.
- One or more of the remaining manuscripts may be co-authored with the dissertation chair and/or members of the dissertation committee, but the student must be the lead author on these co-authored manuscripts. The co-author(s) may influence the framing, scope, research methods, analysis, and writing of the manuscript, as would be appropriate in the traditional dissertation model. But, the expectation is that the co-author will not substantively edit or write any parts of the manuscript until the manuscript is approved by the chair and the dissertation committee.
- The assumption is that each manuscript represents independent research conducted by the student under the guidance of the dissertation chair and committee members.
- Manuscripts may be submitted for publication between the time the proposal is defended and the time of the dissertation defense, with the approval of the dissertation Chair and committee members.

The multiple paper model dissertation proposal, which must be developed in conjunction with the student's Chair, should have the following six sections:

- A brief “introduction” or section that introduces the program of research and identifies the problem(s) or issue(s) to be addressed in the proposed dissertation. The introduction should introduce a problem and explain why it is a problem worthy of research attention.
- A concise “literature review” section ties together the broad literature on a question. It should provide a summary of the literature base and theoretical foundation for the larger research agenda. If the paper involves theory or hypothesis testing, these should be stated and the operational and conceptual matters outlined. Relevant definitions should be critically reviewed and evaluated as to their utility in the research. This section should also review the relevant literature in a concise and

useful fashion (i.e., the literature that is most directly relevant to the problem should be reviewed). One does not review all the literature on crime if one is studying the ecology of crime in a small city. At the end of the literature review, students should identify the knowledge gap that will be filled by the proposed studies.

- Whether the manuscripts are quantitative or qualitative in nature, a “data, methodology, and analytic strategy” section is an important part of the proposal. As part of the alternate dissertation proposal, **there should be 3 distinct “data, methodology, and analytical strategy” sections**. Each section should first include a brief discussion of the purpose and scope of the specific manuscript and then a more detailed description of the data and methodology to be used in the specific manuscript. At a minimum, the data and methodology sections should include a detailed description of the:
  - Research method, data gathering, population, and/or sampling/subject selection criteria
  - Variables of interest
  - Tools, software, measures, and/or instruments
  - Analytic strategy

These sections must include a discussion of how the data will be gathered, their adequacy and limitations and why these methods of collection are superior to others should be included. Data analysis should describe the type of quantitative or qualitative analytic strategy to be employed, the tools that will be used to support that strategy (including software), and the format for presentation of findings should be outlined. Moreover, in these sections, the student should directly and concretely address how s/he will decide if the findings are evidence (or not) of the questions raised or arguments addressed.

- A summative discussion chapter commenting on the contributions, implications, limitations and future directions of the whole program. This section should discuss how the manuscripts as a whole will make a significant and new “contribution to theoretical and methodological knowledge.”

The length of the dissertation proposal will vary based on a number of factors. That said, a long proposal is not necessarily better than a shorter one. It is expected that proposals will likely range from 35 - 50 double-spaced pages of text in length (not including tables, figures, and references). A succinct, well-argued document is preferable.

### **Communication with and Feedback from Committee**

As the student works on their dissertation proposal, they should seek regular feedback from the chair. Although the student's mentor will serve as the primary source of feedback in the proposal development stage, students should be regularly (monthly) updating their full committee as to their progress.

As the student develops the proposal, s/he should be respectful of the many commitments of faculty members and keep lines of communication open and flowing. Students should, where

possible, give committee members advance notice of his/her intentions to send a draft soon. Although there will clearly be some variation, the general guidelines for content and length of proposals should be followed as closely as possible.

Students should expect to receive feedback from all committee members on a draft of a full dissertation proposal **no sooner than two weeks and no longer than one month from the date of delivery** to committee members.

- The quantity and nature of feedback provided by committee members cannot be dictated. However, as a general rule, committee members should provide some written feedback on a draft (whether in the document itself or in a separate document/email).
- Students are required to respond to the comments/concerns of all committee members – not just those of the Chair of the committee. Where conflicts arise (between recommendations of different members of the committee), the Chair of the committee, together with the student, should work with the committee members to find an acceptable approach.
- Faculty should be able to reasonably expect that any subsequent drafts of a proposal will have taken into account earlier feedback provided. Faculty members should not have to make the same recommendations multiple times. Where necessary, students are responsible for explicitly explaining why a certain recommendation was not followed.
- Students should expect that they will be asked to submit multiple drafts of proposals – with each new draft incorporating suggested revisions of their committee members.

Where there are concerns, direct communication between committee members and the Chair is also recommended.

### Scheduling the Third Examination

Once the full committee has indicated that the student is ready for the third examination, the student is responsible for identifying mutually agreeable examination dates with their committee. The third examination (proposal defense) will then be scheduled by the Chair of the Dissertation Committee once the student has a fully developed dissertation proposal. Only the Chair of the committee can initiate the scheduling of the proposal defense.

A request to schedule must be submitted to the Graduate Program Office ***a minimum of 30 days in advance of the requested examination dates***. All committee members must have had an opportunity to comment on a complete draft of the proposal prior to the scheduling of a defense. The Chair of the committee is responsible for ensuring that all committee members feel the student is ready to proceed to the defense prior to signing off on the scheduling form.

The student must complete the Third Examination Scheduling Form found at:

<http://www.northeastern.edu/cssh/sccj/graduate/current-student-resources/>

The form indicates that the student has met the requirements to schedule the third examination.

A hardcopy of the final dissertation proposal must be provided to all committee members as well as the SCCJ Graduate Office at least two weeks in advance of the examination. Failure to provide hard-copies of examination materials to the committee may result in the cancellation of the examination. Although the student is ultimately responsible for getting copies of the proposal to all members of the committee, the process has run most smoothly when the Chair of the committee has facilitated the soliciting of feedback.

An announcement for the dissertation proposal defense will be sent to the broader college community at least two weeks prior to the scheduled date. Proof of IRB approval or exemption must be provided to the SCCJ Graduate Office before work on the dissertation can begin.

### **The Dissertation Proposal Defense**

The proposal defense will be open to all faculty and graduate students. Each proposal defense will be announced via email and on the school's graduate program web page at least two weeks prior to the date of the proposal defense. Proposal defenses are scheduled for two hours.

Students should prepare a **30 minute presentation** to be given at the start of the proposal defense. During this presentation, the student will concisely present the purpose, methodology, and analytic strategy for their study to the committee and audience. During the remainder of the exam, the student orally defends the proposal addressing any question or concern that a member of the examining committee or the audience may raise.

At the conclusion of the proposal defense, the student and all non-committee participants leave the room, and the committee discusses the student's proposal and oral presentation. Once a consensus has been reached, the student is invited back into the room to hear his/her results. Where deficiencies are identified, the committee will summarize those deficiencies - and the steps required to remedy them - in written feedback to the student. The written feedback is the responsibility of the Chair of the committee.

There are **three** potential outcomes for the proposal defense. After deliberation, the committee can vote to:

- **Pass:** If the committee decides that the proposal needs no revision (or only minor revisions), the student works with the Chair of the committee to complete those revisions prior to proceeding. The Chair of the committee must certify that the revisions are complete and the final proposal must be deposited before the student is advanced to candidacy.
- **Pass with Revisions:** If the committee concludes that the revisions needed are fairly substantial, the student must complete the revisions and the entire committee must certify that the revisions are satisfactory before any data collection can begin. The

candidate will only be advanced to candidacy once the final approved proposal signed by all the committee members has been filed in the graduate program office.

- **Fail:** The committee can vote to fail the proposal when the revisions needed are so substantial that the student will need to rethink or restructure the proposal.

A student is considered to have passed the proposal defense only upon completion of any required revisions and, therefore, the student will not be “advanced to candidacy” until all members of the committee have certified that the student has passed the exam with no further conditions and the final approved proposal has been submitted to the Graduate Program Office. A copy of the IRB approval (or exemption) must be filed with the proposal. The student must provide the SCCJ Graduate Office with a PDF of the final approved proposal.

### Third Qualifying Examination Progress Expectation

Regardless of whether students choose to complete Part 2 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Qualifying Exam during their second or third year of study, the dissertation proposal defense is expected by the end of the student’s third year of study for students entering with Advanced Standing, and by the end of the student’s fourth year of study for students not entering with Advanced Standing.

Funding in the Ph.D. program is predicated on satisfactory progress toward completion of degree requirements. Only students entering with a Master’s degree who have successfully completed the proposal defense by the end of their third year, and students entering with a Bachelor’s degree who have successfully completed the proposal defense by the end of their fourth year, will be guaranteed funding in their fourth and fifth years, respectively. Additionally, only those who have achieved candidacy may be offered a chance to teach.

Students who have not successfully defended a dissertation proposal at least one month prior to the beginning of their fourth year (for students entering with a Master’s degree) or their fifth year (for students entering with a Bachelor’s degree) may lose funding and will be placed on academic probation for failure to make satisfactory progress. The student on academic probation will be given one additional semester to successfully complete the third examination (proposal defense). Failure to successfully complete the third qualifying exam in this time frame may result in dismissal from the program.

### Repeat Probation

Students cannot be placed on probation while already on probation. Failure to remedy the deficiency for which one is on probation prior to being placed on academic probation again (for failure to meet an additional programmatic goal) will face possible dismissal from the program.

Students cannot be placed on academic probation (and then remedy the deficiency) more than two times during tenure in the program. Students facing a third distinct instance of probation may be dismissed from the program.

## Appeal of Failing Grades

Students who are judged to have failed a course or a qualifying exam may appeal the grade to the full Graduate Committee. It should be noted that appeals should be justified based on substantive grounds relating to problems with the administration of the exam itself or related concerns.

- In such a scenario, the student must submit in writing a narrative explaining why they believe the grade was inaccurate within 28 days of receipt of news of the failed examination. This appeal will be reviewed by the full Graduate Committee;
- The student will be permitted to appear before the full Graduate Committee to explain his/her rationale for the appeal;
- In such a scenario, a representative from the examination committee will also appear before the full Graduate Committee to detail the committee's rationale for the failing grade;
- Following the appeal process, the Graduate Committee must provide written feedback to the student detailing the reasons for the committee's decision.

## Ph.D. Candidacy

Doctoral students in the Criminology and Justice Policy program are advanced to candidacy upon successful completion of: (1) the required semester hours (42 for those entering the program with a Master's degree and 54 for those entering with a Bachelor's degree), (2) the Foundations Qualifying Exam, (3) the Second Qualifying Exam (Area Exam and publishable paper), and (3) the Proposal Defense before the dissertation committee. Following the proposal defense, students are required to complete any required post-defense revisions and submit a copy of the final approved dissertation proposal, along with the signed approval form, to the SCCJ Graduate Program Office. Candidacy is then certified, in writing, by the College of Social Sciences and Humanities and posted on the student's official academic record.

## DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY DISSERTATION

Upon achieving candidacy, the student commences work on the doctoral dissertation. The student should view the proposal as a contract and follow the methodology and analytical strategy as outlined in the proposal as closely as possible. Contact with the Chair and committee is necessary in all cases in which the methodological and/or analytical plan changes substantially. Additionally, the student should update the Chair and committee regularly (at least twice throughout each semester) on his or her progress.

Students should expect to receive feedback on dissertation drafts no sooner than 4 weeks from the date that s/he sent the complete draft out to his/her committee members.

- Although students work primarily with their Chairs through early drafts of the dissertation, the entire committee should be kept apprised of any important

development (data access problems, change in methodology, analytic technique, etc...). The first full draft of the dissertation should not be the first time a committee member learns of such a change.

- Dissertation drafts are generally quite lengthy and reviewing them is time intensive and therefore 4 weeks for a thorough review is reasonable – though comments sooner are obviously welcome.
- Faculty members can reasonably request more time when full drafts are sent during busy periods (e.g. at the very end of a semester, in the weeks prior to national conferences, etc.).

Dissertation proposals and dissertations are not written in a month or two – nor even usually a semester or two. Students should expect that they will be asked to submit multiple drafts of both proposals and dissertations – with each new draft incorporating suggested revisions of their committee members (and then the revision needing further review). Review/feedback/revision/review loops can be found throughout academia and will follow students throughout their careers. In developing timelines, students should take into account these often time-consuming review, feedback, and revision loops.

### The Dissertation Defense

Both the dissertation proposal and the dissertation itself are publicly defended before the examining committee. All students, faculty members, and other members of the academic community are invited to attend. Although they are certainly welcome to come to campus for post-defense celebrations, the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice *does not permit* friends or family members to attend proposal or dissertation defenses.

### Dissertation Defense Timeline

The dissertation defense must be scheduled at least two weeks before the anticipated defense date. If a student is hoping to defend their dissertation in time for a May graduation, they should plan on getting a complete draft to the full committee no later than January 1<sup>st</sup>. For an August graduation a draft should be submitted by April 1<sup>st</sup>, and for a December graduation, a draft should be submitted to the full committee by August 1<sup>st</sup>. The process of getting from a first full draft to the point where a student can defend and deposit a dissertation typically takes about 4 months (see the timelines below).

### What is a full draft?

A full draft of the dissertation is a complete paginated draft *as the student will be expected to defend it*. Full drafts include (1) a title page, (2) a table of contents, (3) each of the chapters labeled and in order – including the introduction and conclusion chapters, (4) all figures and tables formatted as they will be in the final draft (e.g., output from statistical software programs like SPSS is not acceptable), (5) any appendices, and (6) a current and formatted

works-cited section. The document must be paginated so that committee members can refer to specific pages where revisions are required.

### **Why 4 Months?**

Using the Spring semester as an example... If a student submits their dissertation draft to the full committee January 1<sup>st</sup>, the committee has 30 days to send feedback on the complete draft (February 1<sup>st</sup>). If this is the first time that some of the committee members are seeing the dissertation, there will likely be revisions requiring a second review. If students set aside about a month to make those revisions, they could get the revised draft to the committee by March 1<sup>st</sup> – and they might be able to quickly look it over and allow the student to schedule an early April defense. They might, however, require another round of revisions before scheduling a defense, in which case the student would NOT be able to graduate as they had hoped at the end of the Spring semester. If a student defends in early to mid-April, they will have a couple of weeks to make post-defense revisions in time for an end of April deposit and May graduation. Keep in mind, when required, post-defense revisions must be signed off on by the Chair so the student MUST allow time for the Chair to review the final dissertation.

This four month timeline should be the working timeline regardless of whether a student hopes to graduate in May, August, or January. Model timelines are provided below, and thesis guidelines can be found here:

<http://www.northeastern.edu/cssh/graduate/commencement>.

### **May Graduation**

January 1<sup>st</sup> – Full Draft to Committee

February 1<sup>st</sup> – Feedback on Draft from Committee Members

March 1<sup>st</sup> – Revised Draft to Committee

Early to Mid-April – Potential Defense

Mid- to Late-April – Post-Defense Revisions

End of April (date changes each year): Deposit deadline for May graduation

### **August Graduation**

April 1<sup>st</sup> – Full Draft to Committee

May 1<sup>st</sup> – Feedback on Draft from Committee Members

June 1<sup>st</sup> – Revised Draft to Committee

Early to Mid-July – Potential Defense

Mid- to Late-July – Post-Defense Revisions

Early August (date changes each year): Deposit deadline for August graduation

### **January Graduation**

August 1<sup>st</sup> – Full Draft to Committee

September 1<sup>st</sup> – Feedback on Draft from Committee Members

October 1<sup>st</sup> – Revised Draft to Committee

Early to Mid-November – Potential Defense

Mid- to Late-November – Post-Defense Revisions

Early December (date changes each year): Deposit deadline for January graduation

### **Doctoral Dissertation – Other Guidelines**

The Chair of the Dissertation committee should not sign the signature page until the dissertation is in final approved form. Once all final signatures are obtained, doctoral students need to make a copy of the dissertation signature page for the SCCJ graduate office before turning the form in to the CSSH Graduate Office of Admissions and Student Services. Once the form is submitted, the dissertation should be uploaded.

All graduating doctoral students are required to provide the SCCJ graduate office with a bound hard-copy of their dissertation, so please be sure to order an extra copy.

As a courtesy, a PDF copy of the final approved dissertation should be provided to each of the committee members. Additionally, students must order one bound copy of the dissertation for the SCCJ graduate program office.

### **Doctoral Dissertation Progress Expectations**

As per university guidelines, doctoral students have five years from the date of candidacy to defend their dissertations.

Following the completion of traditional coursework, proposal and dissertation related courses are graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis. Doctoral students are required to maintain contact with their proposal and dissertation Chair each semester to communicate ongoing progress toward degree requirements. Failure to do so will result in the assignment of a grade of unsatisfactory in the dissertation related coursework.

Academic Progress Review: A grade of unsatisfactory in dissertation-related coursework in any semester will trigger academic probation and may result in the loss of funding. A second grade of unsatisfactory (whether consecutive or not) may result in dismissal from the program (see the SCCJ Academic Review and Probation Policy).

## APPENDIX A: FOUNDATIONS EXAMINATION SAMPLE QUESTION

*Note: The question below is a \*sample question\* for the First Qualifying “Foundations” Examination that the Graduate Committee generated to provide an example of the \*type\* of question students might be expected to answer. As the examination grading committees draft new questions for each sitting of the examination, the form and substance of questions will vary across exam administrations. All questions will be designed to elicit a response that demonstrates a student's ability to integrate theory with methods and statistics and to think critically about policy implications of work in criminology and criminal justice.*

### Sample Question

Based on the anomie/strain tradition of theorizing, one could formulate a criminological model under which factors at more than one level of analysis influence the decision to engage in crime.

- Trace the history of anomie/strain theory, providing an explanation of each of the key iterations of this theoretical tradition. Make sure to discuss how U.S. and/or global contexts and social movements led to the development of each theory in the tradition. In addition, summarize the state of empirical tests of theories in the strain/anomie tradition, providing relevant examples.
- Formulate a comprehensive, testable model of criminal offending based on the anomie/strain tradition. This model should take into account more than one level of analysis, and may, if necessary, integrate different theories in the strain/anomie tradition. Include a causal diagram, if applicable, to illustrate your conceptual model. Discuss the connection between your model and different iterations of the theory.
- Design a study to test your model of offending. At the very least, discuss sampling strategy, research design, and the advantages and disadvantages of your approaches.
- Discuss measurement strategies for the key concepts in your model: identify and define the key concepts in your model; discuss the operationalization of your concepts; and identify specific instruments that might be used in this process.
- Discuss an analytical strategy to test your model. What type of modeling strategy would you use? What is your dependent variable? How is the model appropriate to answer your research question based on the distribution of your dependent variable? Discuss model assumptions. Discuss test statistics that could be used to examine the applicability of the model and results to your formulated model of crime.
- If the results support your model of crime, what are the policy implications?

## **APPENDIX B: SECOND QUALIFYING “AREA” EXAMINATION SAMPLE QUESTIONS**

Area Exam questions should be answered through a comprehensive and critical review of the literature that bears on the question. Although only a relatively confined portion of the extant literature might be directly cited in the answer, it is recommended that students develop and maintain a comprehensive bibliography of relevant classic and contemporary readings in their area.

*Note: These two examples are provided to illustrate the \*types\* of questions that might be appropriate for the Area Exam. Students work with their two-person Area Exam committee to craft a question appropriate to their specific interests and objectives.*

### **AREA: Gender and Crime**

What are the major approaches to understanding sex differences in crime? In a critical review of the relevant literature, discuss the nature and extent of sex differences in crime and how theory and empiricism have explained these differences.

### **AREA: Penology**

How have social theorists explained the rapid expansion of the U.S. prison system since the 1970s? In a critical review of the relevant literature, review the dominant explanations for the growth of prison populations and discuss how and why that growth has been sustained over the past several decades despite fluctuating (and then decreasing) crime rates. Conclude with some speculative comments on the recent trends demonstrating slight annual declines in prison populations.

## **APPENDIX C: GUIDELINES, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR SGAs AND FACULTY SUPERVISORS**

### **1. Objectives of this Appendix**

This appendix formally outlines the appropriate roles and responsibilities for graduate teaching and research assistants, and their faculty supervisors. The School recognizes that Stipended Graduate Assistants (SGAs) provide valuable services to the University and the School. SGAs are instrumental to the School's mission of producing cutting edge social science research and delivering high quality education in the fields of Criminology and Criminal Justice. These objectives could not be carried out without the active participation and engagement of the School's SGAs. As such, the academic and personal well-being of SGAs is the School's top concern.

It is our hope that these guidelines will serve as a framework to facilitate the development and maintenance of mutually beneficial relationships among graduate students, their faculty supervisors, and the wider University community. These recommendations are designed to complement University and School policies for graduate assistants, as well as to provide additional guidance where needed and appropriate. This document will outline best practices, help clarify expectations, and reduce miscommunication, frustration, and dissatisfaction among faculty, graduate students, and the administrative staff in the School.

### **2. Types of Stipended Graduate Assistants and their Duties**

A Stipended Graduate Assistant (SGA) is a student who receives financial support for work in an academic unit. There are two main types of SGAs: teaching assistants and research assistants. Additional SGA assignments are occasionally given, although such positions are far less common and are determined based on the needs of the School.

A teaching assistant (TA) is a student whose work primarily involves an instructional assignment. TA responsibilities vary greatly and may include, but are not limited to:

- Giving guest lectures on occasion
- Tutoring individual or small groups of students
- Holding office hours and meeting with students
- Administrative course support
- Assisting with the grading of homework, exams and/or written assignments
- Administering tests or exams
- Assisting an instructor with a large lecture class by teaching students in recitation, laboratory, or discussion sessions
- Helping to resolve software-related difficulties experienced during classes taught in a computer laboratory

The specific roles and expectations for TAs should be discussed at the beginning of each semester. TAs should be provided a copy of the course syllabus in a timely manner and given adequate notice when they are asked to lead class discussion or run the class – either because the opportunity would be beneficial to the TA or because the faculty member is away. TAs should not be responsible for planning activities for a class session without the assistance and active involvement of the faculty supervisor or the instructor of record for the course (hereinafter referred as faculty supervisor). TAs should not be expected to lecture or teach more than 5 class sessions per semester. Nor is it the TA's responsibility to assign final course grades or to ensure their accurate reporting to the registrar; however, TAs may support the faculty in this process. When TAs ask to lecture on a specific topic covered in a course, the faculty supervisor should make a reasonable effort to accommodate that request. When possible, the faculty supervisor should be present for the class sessions led by a TA and offer constructive feedback.

A research assistant (RA) is a student whose work primarily entails assisting a faculty member(s) with academic research. RAs are not independent researchers and are not directly responsible for the outcome of a research project. They are responsible to, and report to a research supervisor or principal investigator (PI). RAs' responsibilities vary greatly and may include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting literature reviews or library research
- Collecting, coding, cleaning or analyzing quantitative, qualitative, or textual data
- Conducting interviews and other forms of field work
- Preparing materials for submission to funding agencies and foundations
- Preparing materials for IRB review
- Writing reports or designing conference presentations
- Organizing conferences or workshops
- Supervising other team members, including undergraduate research assistants
- Participating in training sessions
- Mentoring undergraduate students on the research team

RAs should carry out all research assignments with the highest degree of scientific integrity. When human subjects are involved, RAs should comply with all of the mandates as specified by the Northeastern IRB (available at: <http://www.northeastern.edu/research/hsrp/irb/>).

With respect to the publishing of research findings, the issue of authorship should be discussed in an open and honest manner between the RA, the faculty supervisor, and any additional project leaders (e.g., other PIs) prior to the beginning of manuscript preparation. Decisions about authorship should be consistent with the norms and practices in the given subfield.

As much as possible, an RA assignment should clearly specify to whom the RA should report. This may include faculty or students who serve as project supervisors.

In cases that fall outside of the more typical TA/RA assignments, active communication between the SGA and faculty supervisor becomes even more important in order to define the nature and boundaries of work.

Additional SGA assignments may include, but are not limited to:

- Administrative support to the College of Social Sciences and Humanities; Program Director, Graduate Program Director, or administrative staff
- Serving as an undergraduate advisor, or preceptor, and providing support to the Undergraduate Program Director
- Providing editorial support to an academic journal

Regardless of their type, all graduate assistantships should be beneficial to both the graduate student and the academic or teaching unit. As a general rule, SGA duties should center on tasks that benefit both the academic unit and advance the professional development of the student.

### **3. Supervisory Roles for Faculty**

Faculty supervisors should treat SGAs with respect, as colleagues-in-training. Faculty members should meet with the SGAs they supervise at the beginning of the semester, and regularly thereafter, to discuss the collective goals for the semester in teaching or research, the SGA's progress toward these goals, and the ways in which the faculty member will support the student in achieving these goals. Faculty supervisors should serve as mentors, which entails explaining the course design and describing pedagogical choices and teaching philosophy; research aims and project trajectories; and/or perspectives on School service. More broadly, the SGA's overall professional development is a topic that should be discussed during such meetings.

When supervising TAs, a faculty member's responsibilities may include, but are not limited to: providing grading criteria and rubrics for assessment; giving TAs guidance and feedback on course ideas or syllabus drafts; and providing guidance and constructive feedback on guest lectures.

Faculty members supervising RAs should provide guidance and regular feedback on all aspects of their work, including grant or fellowship applications, the IRB process, and presentations given at professional conferences.

Faculty members should provide a formal evaluation of an SGA (both TAs and RAs). When a SGA is assigned to different faculty supervisors in an academic year, separate evaluations should be prepared at the end of each semester. Only one evaluation is necessary when a SGA is assigned to a single faculty supervisor in a given academic year.

Faculty members should recognize that a graduate assistant's SGA responsibilities are only one part of a student's workload. As SGAs are primarily students, they should never be

asked to skip a class or delay their work on other program requirements. SGAs should not be asked to provide personal services for a supervisor.

#### **4. Dates of Employment and Weekly Workloads**

All graduate assistantships are either 10 or 20 hours per week for a semester (typically, 14-weeks). Although there may be weekly variation in the workload of a graduate assistant, ideally the number of hours worked should not fluctuate widely. Faculty supervisors should ensure that they do not consistently assign more than 20 hours of work per week (or 10 hours for first year students). An exception to this is an additional 6 hours as permitted by the Director of the School, where an RA is compensated for this time based on an hourly rate as stipulated by the University. The dates that a TA can be expected to work are regulated by the academic calendar. If the TA's assignment is connected to a course, the TA must be ready to start work by the beginning of the semester. This might involve a small amount of preparation before the start of the semester. When the TA is finished with all assigned duties for the course, no more work should be expected.

The dates that an RA can be expected to work are regulated by the payroll dates of the assignment and should be discussed and worked out before the assignment begins.

All efforts are made to provide graduate students with SGA assignments as early as possible. The School will strive to base SGA placement decisions on a number of factors, including student year of study, student requests, academic interests, and professional goals. Students may seek additional unpaid research opportunities in the School or College outside of their TA or RA assignment, as long as those opportunities do not interfere with their primary TA or RA duties.

#### **5. Student Expectations, Rights and Responsibilities**

The proposed guidelines are consistent with both the College contract and the policies of the School. Students have the right to notify the Graduate Program Director or Program Director of any perceived unreasonable duty. This includes tasks with little to no notice or duties that consistently exceed the allotted 20-hours per week. In such cases, students may be asked to provide a log of the hours worked in previous weeks.

#### **6. University Policies and Additional Resources**

Graduate assistants, faculty supervisors, and School administrators are all subject to the rules and regulations of the University. These include, but are not limited to, Northeastern University's policies on Sexual Harassment and Discrimination, the Student Code of Conduct, and the Graduate Academic Regulations. For a more complete list of regulations and resources about teaching and research, please visit the Office of Graduate Studies website (<https://www.northeastern.edu/policies/index.html>).

## 7. Procedure for Grievances

SGA appointments usually end after a designated period of appointment. They may also be terminated at any time for cause (e.g., failure to perform the required responsibilities, expulsion from program, unsatisfactory academic progress, failure to enroll, etc.). Decisions to end funding for a SGA are made in strict accordance with School, College, and University mandates.

Efforts should be made to resolve concerns informally between the SGA and the faculty supervisor. When issues cannot be resolved informally, the SGA and/or faculty supervisor should raise the issues with the Graduate Program Director and/or Program Director. The Graduate Program Director and Program Director should be viewed as resources for both the SGA and the faculty member and can be consulted at any time.

Disputes will be handled according to the review policies of the School, which recognize the need for confidentiality, preserving trust, and acknowledging the power differential present in student-faculty relationships. The order of review for employment disputes is as follows:

- Faculty member employing the research assistant;
- Graduate Program Director;
- Program Director;
- Associate Dean for Graduate Affairs