

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

PROGRAM POLICY MANUAL

2017 – 2018

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION,
NURSING AND HEALTH PROFESSIONS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Welcome	4
1.1	Program Mission Statement	4
1.2	Faculty	4
1.3	Faculty and Staff Contact Information	8
2.0	Doctoral Admissions Policy	8
3.0	The Program of Study	10
3.1	Filing a Program Plan	10
3.2	The Doctoral Curriculum	10
3.3	Course Transfer Policy	11
3.4	Course Waiver Policy	12
3.5	Time Limit for Program Completion	12
4.0	Synthesis	13
4.1	Academic Publishing Course & Administrative/Teaching Internship	13
4.1.1	Academic Publishing Course	13
4.1.2	Administrative/ Teaching Internship (Optional)	14
4.2	The Synthesis Seminar	14
4.3	The Proposal Seminar	14
4.3.1	Initial Faculty Review of the Chapter 1 Assignment	15
4.3.2	Final Review of Chapter 1 Assignment	16
5.0	Academic Standing Policies	16
5.1	Academic Performance	16
5.2	Incomplete Grades	17
5.3	Grade Point Average Reviews	17
5.4	Advancement to Candidacy	18
5.5	Student Appeals to Program Policies	18
6.0	The Doctoral Dissertation	19
6.1	The Faculty Dissertation Advisor	19
6.2	Sequence of Courses Related to Completion of the Dissertation	20
6.2.1	Doctoral Dissertation	20
6.3	Mandatory Continuous Registration	21
6.4	The Doctoral Examining Committee	21
6.4.1	Appointment of Members of the Committee	21

6.4.2	Responsibilities of Doctoral Examining Committee Members	22
6.4.3	The Proposal Committee Meeting	23
6.4.4	The Dissertation Committee Meeting	25
6.5	Procedures for Binding the Dissertation	28
6.6	Summary Chart of Steps in the Dissertation Process	29

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Doctoral Student Program Plan	31
Appendix B	Request for a Course Waiver	32
Appendix C	Request for Extension of Program Time Limit	33
Appendix D	Dissertation Guidelines	34
Appendix E	Incomplete Grade Contract	42
Appendix F	Change of Faculty Advisor Request	43
Appendix G	Doctoral Examining Committee Guidelines	44
Appendix H	Proposal Approval Form	46
Appendix I	Second Proposal Review	48
Appendix J	Dissertation Approval Form	49
Appendix K	Second Dissertation Review	51
Appendix L	Library Approval Form	52
Appendix M	Course Sequence	53
Appendix N	Higher Education Internship Contract	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Faculty and Staff Contact Information	8
Table 2.	Admissions Criteria	9
Table 3.	The Doctoral Curriculum	11
Table 4.	Steps in the Dissertation Process	30

1.0. WELCOME

The University of Hartford's Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership reflects the latest thinking and research related to higher education's leadership, organizational dynamics, and institutional challenges. Participants benefit from the rich interactions of our diverse student body, drawn from colleges and universities, public and private schools, health-related professions, government, and human service organizations. Our students share a dedication to the improvement of possibilities for their respective constituencies through change and enhancement of their service delivery systems, particularly as they relate to higher education.

The faculty and staff of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership are delighted to welcome you into the Doctoral Program. Together, we will continue to develop and explore leadership strategies and skills that best fit the needs of the organizations in which we work.

1.1 Program Mission Statement

The mission of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is to create a learning environment through which learners build on their knowledge and skills in ways that enable them to shape their work settings into dynamic learning environments, creating colleges and universities, schools, organizations, and communities in which energies are devoted toward excellence, achievement, and quality outcomes.

A variety of experiences have been infused into the doctoral program of study, enabling students to acquire cognitive understandings, refine thinking and writing skills, cultivate intellect, and develop research. The program is committed to supporting the leadership development of students in order to enable them to change and enhance their respective organizations, and to develop potential in those they lead.

1.2 Faculty

There are currently four full-time members of the Educational Leadership faculty. All are dedicated to exploring various dimensions of individual, group and institutional leadership, and change. The program also draws on the several part-time faculty, all of whom are accomplished leaders and teachers.

Dr. Karen I. Case

Dr. Case has been a member of the faculty since the inception of the program. She has been a public school teacher, Peace Corps volunteer, and instructor at the University of Iowa and the University of Connecticut. She has over twenty-five years of teaching experience in higher education. Dr. Case teaches courses in academic publishing and community based research. She has published numerous articles concerning feminism and curriculum theory and is a member of the Peer Review Board for the Journal of Public Scholarship in Higher Education. Dr. Case has made numerous refereed professional presentations across the nation. A book coauthored with a former doctoral student and colleague, entitled *At Promise: Rethinking ADHD Through the Lens of Multiple Intelligences Theory*, was published by Teachers College Press in 2009.

Dr. Case's research is concerned with employing curriculum modifications to disenfranchised populations. More specifically, she works with doctoral students interested in the value and importance of non-traditional educational curricula (biography and autobiography, popular culture, media and marketing strategies, arts-based initiatives, literacy and moral development) to those students who have been marginalized within the current educational system. A secondary research objective is to synthesize and integrate "theory" generated outside of the field of education with leadership practice, particularly in community settings. A critical theorist, she is interested in the adaptation of innovative research methodologies for uncovering how exclusion is socially structured.

Dr. Karla I. Loya

Dr. Loya received her doctorate in higher education with a minor in women's studies from Pennsylvania State University. After that, she completed a postdoctoral research position at the University of Virginia conducting the internal evaluation of a National Science Foundation ADVANCE grant aimed at increasing the recruitment, retention, and success of female and URM faculty in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) and social, behavioral, and economic (SBE) sciences. Dr. Loya completed her master's in higher education at the University of Kansas while working as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Coordinator of the Doctoral Program at a graduate-level seminary school in Kansas City. Dr. Loya brings to the University of Hartford her more than ten years of academic administration and research

experience in higher education. Her research interests include faculty, curriculum, teaching, learning, and assessment; identity and gender studies; and access, equity, and diversity issues in higher education. As part of her research work at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State, she worked in projects on faculty development, students' transition to college and college choice, women's colleges, student-athletes, and LatinX students. A former Montessori teacher, Dr. Loya is interested in liberatory and learner-center teaching approaches, which guide her teaching.

Dr. H. Kenny Nienhusser

Dr. Nienhusser came to the University of Hartford from Teachers College, Columbia University where he received his doctorate and served as Assistant Director of Housing and Director of Academic Administration in the Department of Mathematics, Science, and Technology. Prior to attending Teachers College, Columbia University he worked as a Residence Hall Director at Stony Brook University, where he also earned his bachelor and master degrees. Dr. Nienhusser brings to our program a focus on research methods and design, public policy, and issues of racial and ethnic diversity in higher education. His scholarly interests center on the implementation of public and institutional policies that shape the access of minority and other underserved populations to higher education. He is currently working on research projects that are examining: the role of community college staff professional values and personal beliefs in the implementation of state and institutional policies that impact undocumented students, the development of a college-going culture for and factors related to the college choice process of underserved minority students in Hartford high schools, the impact of individual and ecological factors on high school students' college choice process (utilizing High School Longitudinal Study of 2009 (HSLs:09) data), and the role of immigration status on undocumented families' social-emotional well-being. Dr. Nienhusser infuses his years as a higher education practitioner and researcher into his teaching. He has taught the following courses: organizational theory and change, qualitative research methods, synthesis seminar, proposal seminar, higher education policy, diversity in higher education, and student affairs administration.

Dr. Donn Weinholtz

Dr. Weinholtz started his career as a high school, social studies teacher and track coach in Chapel Hill, NC. He later served on the faculties of the University of Texas Medical Branch, the University of Iowa, and East Tennessee State University. In 1991 he came to the University of Hartford as Dean of the College of Education, Nursing, and Health Professions, a position he held for seven years. His teaching areas in the doctoral program include quantitative and qualitative research methodologies, foundations of higher education and ethical issues in educational leadership. For many years, he also taught an undergraduate American Studies course and a leadership course in the University's All-University Curriculum.

Donn is the author of the Phi Delta Kappa monograph, *Restructuring an Urban School* (1992.) He has also published several articles on merging qualitative and quantitative research methods and on effective instruction in clinical, medical settings. The findings from these medical education works were synthesized in a book, *Teaching During Attending Rounds* (1992), co-authored with Janine Edwards.

His death and dying memoir, *Longing to Live... Learning to Die*, was published in 2002. He also published a novella, *Carolina Blue* (2012). In 2007, he founded the on-line publication, *Quaker Higher Education*; which subsequently led to him editing, along with Jeffrey Dudiak and Donald Smith, the book, *Quaker Perspectives in Higher Education* (2014). Donn is currently heavily involved in the University of Hartford's *Rwanda Teacher Education Program*, in which he and his wife, Diane, teach peace and conflict resolution skills. From June 2015 until June 2017, he served as clerk (presiding officer) of the international organization, Friends Association for Higher Education.

A former Chair of the University of Hartford Faculty Senate, and current Director of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, Donn is especially interested in collaborating with students conducting studies addressing leadership challenges in higher education. He also remains interested in a wide range of mixed-method, action research studies in other educational settings.

1.3 Faculty and Staff Contact Information

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership's offices are located in Suite 223, Auerbach Hall, which also houses the Barney School of Business. A list of direct contact information for the doctoral faculty and staff follows.

Table 1

Faculty and Staff Contact Information

NAME	Office	Telephone	E mail Address
Dr. Karen I. Case	A 223 C	860.768.4369	kcase@hartford.edu
Dr. Karla I. Loya	A 223 E	860.768.5807	loyasquare@hartford.edu
Dr. H. Kenny Nienhusser	A 223 D	860.768.4411	nienhusse@hartford.edu
Dr. Donn Weinholtz	A 223 G	860.768.4186	weinholtz@hartford.edu
Ms. Suzanne Cohen	A 223	860.768.5263	scohen@hartford.edu

Our office coordinator, Ms. Suzanne Cohen, provides support to faculty, students, and prospective candidates for admission. She can be reached at the main office telephone number, 860.768-5263, and at scohen@hartford.edu. The office fax number is 860.768.4329.

As a matriculated student, there are a number of things you should know about the policies and procedures that guide our Doctoral Program. The remainder of this manual addresses these issues.

Doctoral students are responsible for adhering to all the policies in this Manual. When appropriate, these guidelines will be updated and placed on the Program website. Students need to review any changes and stay current with the information contained within.

2.0 DOCTORAL ADMISSIONS POLICY

Students who gain admission to the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership have a deep personal commitment to helping educational, health, government, and human service organizations to become places where all adults and children can succeed. In addition, they seek increasingly responsible leadership positions in order to initiate and/or contribute to reform

efforts in their practice. As such, we seek a diverse group of individuals with high intellectual acuity, scholarly potential, and a commitment to substantive organizational reform.

Students should provide the following as evidence that they meet each of the admissions criteria in the following table.

Table 2

Admissions Criteria

Admissions Criteria	Evidence
Demonstrate competence to complete scholarly work at the doctoral level.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hold a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership, or in a related area, from a qualified institution. 2. Ordinarily have obtained a 3.5 GPA in the Master's Degree and in other advanced graduate studies. (Provide official transcripts of all previous course work.)
Demonstrate skills and/or aptitude for leadership in educational, health, and human service organizations.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Typically, have at least three years of successful experience working in an organizational setting. 2. Three Letters of Reference, including one from a recent employer. (Use the forms included in the application.) 3. Other information as requested by the doctoral faculty and/or at the candidate's discretion. 4. Successful completion of a personal interview with a faculty member.

In rare instances, a prospective student may be offered Conditional Admission into the program. This might occur if a candidate meets all but one of the above criteria. The student would be allowed to take two courses during the first summer. If a minimum 3.67 Grade Point Average is obtained, then the student will be offered full admission into the Doctoral Program.

3.0. THE PROGRAM OF STUDY

3.1 Filing a Program Plan

Upon matriculation into the doctoral program, each student is assigned a Program Advisor, one of the full-time faculty members. Program Advisors meet with students in order to assist them with their entry into the university as doctoral students, the development of their programs, and their progress in the program.

Students meet with their advisors to complete an initial Doctoral Student Program Plan, which may include up to nine credits that may be transferred in from graduate work taken beyond the student's master's degree. It is the student's responsibility to schedule this meeting. See Appendix A for a copy of the form. These forms should preferably be completed *no later than* the fall semester of the student's first year in the doctoral program

3.2 The Doctoral Curriculum

Students complete a *minimum* of 63 credit hours beyond an earned master's degree in order to be eligible to receive the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Educational Leadership. The components of the program and associated courses are listed below.

Courses in the Professional Studies component of the program constitute core learnings in the discipline of educational leadership and higher education. Selections from the Specialization component are made according to the student's practice community and future professional interests. These decisions should be made in consultation with the student's Program Advisor. Research Methods, Synthesis, Proposal, and dissertation courses are required of all students. A list of the courses in the Doctoral curriculum follows in Table 3:

Table 3
Doctoral Curriculum

Professional Studies (21 credits)

EDD 820: Community Based Research
 EDD 821: Educational Policy Studies
 EDD 822: Organizational Theory and Change in Educational Organizations
 EDD 825: Seminar in Instructional Development
 EDD 826: Professional and Ethical Issues in Educational Leadership
 EDD 827: Seminar in Educational Leadership
 EDD 837: Diversity in Higher Education

Specialization Courses (15+ credits)

EDD 832: Human and Fiscal Resource Management
 EDD 834: Higher Education Foundations
 EDD 835: Higher Education Law
 EDD 836: Student Affairs Administration
 EDD 839: Special Topics in Educational Leadership

Research Methods (9 credits)

EDD 840: Research Skills for Educational Leaders
 EDD 842: Qualitative Research Methods
 EDD 844: Quantitative Research Methods

Synthesis (9-12 credits)

EDD 850: Academic Publishing
 EDD 851: Administrative/Teaching Internship (Optional)
 EDD 852: Synthesis Seminar
 EDD 860: Doctoral Proposal Seminar

Dissertation (9+ credits)

EDD 861: Doctoral Dissertation

3.3 Course Transfer Policy

Students may typically transfer up to nine graduate credit hours from *post-master's courses* in related fields into their program plan of study by petitioning their Faculty

Program Advisor. Ordinarily, transferred courses may be no more than *seven* years old.

In order to have a course officially added to a student's transcript, the appropriate University form must be completed and transmitted to the College Evaluator. Students should consult their Program Advisor to complete this paperwork. Transfer of credit is not guaranteed, until the credits are approved for transfer by the College Evaluator, and are noted on a student's official transcript.

3.4 Course Waiver Policy

In the event that a student comes to the program with previous preparation in specific courses in the doctoral program curriculum, the Program Advisor may *exempt* that student from taking a particular course and *substitute* another doctoral course into the student's Program Plan.

Course waivers are *rare* exceptions. They do not reduce the minimum of 63 credits required for graduation. Ordinarily, courses over *seven* years old are not eligible for waiver consideration. If students request a waiver for a doctoral course, they are responsible for the content of that course, when it comes to synthesis-qualifying activities. When requesting a course waiver, students must take the following steps:

1. Provide the Program Advisor with a copy of the course syllabus that is to be substituted;
2. Identify the substitute course that they propose to take and the rationale for why it was selected; and
3. Complete the Request for a Course Waiver form and submit it to the Program Advisor for final approval (see Appendix B).

3.5 Time Limit for Completion of the Program

Typically, students complete their coursework and earn advancement to candidacy no later than *five years* from the official date that they matriculate into the program.

Ordinarily, students have *two years* from the date of approval of their dissertation proposal by their Doctoral Examining Committee to complete their research, defend the full dissertation, and complete all University and Program requirements for graduation.

If extenuating circumstances arise, students must make a formal request to the Program

Director to obtain an extension. A letter of support must accompany the request from the Faculty Dissertation Advisor. (See Appendix C for a copy of the form.) If a student is inactive for more than two consecutive semesters/terms he/she will be withdrawn from the program. The student will be required to reapply to the program if he/she wishes to matriculate further.

4.0 SYNTHESIS

This component of the Doctoral Program consists of three requirements: (1) The Academic Publishing Course and (optional) Administrative/Teaching Internship, (2) Synthesis Seminar, and (3) Doctoral Proposal Seminar. These requirements are undertaken after *all* coursework in the Professional Studies, Specialization, and Research Methods areas of the program have been successfully completed, and the student has maintained at least a 3.5 GPA.

4.1 Academic Publishing and (optional) Administrative/Teaching Internship

Depending on their work setting and the specialization focus that students wish to pursue, they will take (1) the required Academic Publishing course and perhaps (2) an optional Administrative/Teaching Internship.

4.1.1 Academic Publishing (EDD 850).

The required Academic Publishing course is designed to help students to learn how to construct research projects for publication in a variety of journals. Taught as a hybrid course, in-class activities have been crafted to help students make better sense of their research and/or to generate fresh ideas on where to look next for new data and possible publication outlets. The course addresses such considerations as selecting possible avenues open to the graduate student for publishing, conference papers, grants, journals, scholarly books, and texts.

The course objectives are to have students work both independently and together in a workshop-like learning community to: (1) explore possible publication outlets, (2) explain the basic processes of publishing articles for peer-reviewed journals, (3) demystify the publishing process, and (4) endorse ethical standards in the writing and publication.

Areas that are covered include how to choose a journal, preparation of the manuscript, the review process and editorial decision-making, criteria for judging manuscripts, and the ethics

and etiquette of writing and publication. Students are expected to uncover a publishing or presentation venue. Typically, students write and submit a proposal for the New England Educational Research Organization and if accepted, present their work at the annual conferences spring conference.

4.1.2 Administrative/Teaching Internship (EDD 851)

Inherent in the mission of the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program is the goal of providing aspiring and practicing educational leaders with the opportunity to engage in various clinical experiences. Students and collaborating faculty advisors design optional internships so that students are not required to take extensive time away from their full time jobs.

Students selecting to pursue this optional internship may choose to work in an administrative or teaching capacity in a higher education setting, school district, healthcare, or a government or human service agency placement. In addition to field activities, each student meets with a supervising faculty member to discuss issues they confronted in the internship setting. Students choosing this option complete an independent study contract with the faculty member serving as the internship supervisor.

4.2 Synthesis Seminar (EDD 852)

The purpose of the Synthesis Seminar is to enable students to demonstrate their ability to complete an *initial* review of the literature designed to demonstrate: (1) the significance of this research area, (2) how it addresses a gap in the relevant knowledge base, and (3) how further study in that area would add to our understandings of the discipline of leadership.

This initial review of the literature provides the student with an initial understanding of a research topic that can be further developed in EDD 860 Doctoral Proposal Seminar.

4.3 Doctoral Proposal Seminar (EDD 860)

This is the final course in the Synthesis component of the doctoral curriculum. Students *narrow* the research area explored during the Synthesis Seminar into a focused

research proposal (referred to as the Advancement to Candidacy Paper) preferably related to higher education.

Students work closely with course instructors to design and complete a preliminary, substantial Chapter 1 of their dissertation proposals. This document must conform to the criteria articulated in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership's *Dissertation Guidelines*. A copy of this document may be found in Appendix D. Upon completion of the EDD 860 course, this assignment is reviewed by the Educational Leadership faculty. The review process is described below.

4.3.1 Initial Faculty Review of the Chapter 1 Assignment.

Students prepare three copies of their Chapter 1 Assignment and deliver them to their course instructors on the last night of class in EDD 860. Each student will initially receive a course grade of "Incomplete." The papers will then be distributed to members of the Educational Leadership faculty, who serve as the major readers of the assignment.

Subsequently, the educational leadership faculty members make a holistic judgment of the quality of each paper, based on *both*:

- the extent to which it conforms to the Dissertation Guidelines (Chapter 1), and
- the quality of the technical writing, including sentence structure, grammar, and punctuation, as well as adherence to the APA style manual (Refer to the Guidelines in Appendix D.)

Faculty will make one the following decisions about each student's Chapter 1 assignment: (a) PASS, or (b) FAIL AND REWRITE. Course grades will then be assigned based on the results of the faculty discussions of the assignments.

Obtaining a PASS in this initial review means that the student has completed an acceptable Chapter 1 assignment and that the student is eligible to be advanced to candidacy, will be assigned a Dissertation Advisor, and therefore may continue his/her dissertation research.

If a student's Chapter 1 is assigned a FAIL AND REWRITE in this initial review, the student will receive a detailed list of the areas/items that need to be addressed. The student will work with the course instructor to rewrite the Chapter 1 assignment under the following conditions:

- *All* areas/items on the list must be addressed.
- The student has one academic semester from the time of the Initial Review to complete the rewrite.
- The revised Chapter 1 must be submitted *by the last day of classes* of that semester to the Program Director, who will arrange for a final review of the document.

Students who successfully move to candidacy after the initial review of the Chapter 1 assignment will receive a grade in EDD 860 after the Chapter 1 assignment is evaluated. Students who receive a FAIL AND REWRITE after the initial review of the assignment will receive an Incomplete Grade for the EDD 860 course. The grade will be updated after the second and final review of the assignment at the end of the semester.

4.3.2. Final Review of the Chapter One Assignment

In cases where a student is asked to rewrite the Chapter 1 assignment, two members of the Educational Leadership faculty will conduct the final review of the revised Chapter 1 assignment. The faculty can make one of two decisions: (1) PASS, or (2) FAIL.

Students who PASS will be advanced to candidacy, assigned a Dissertation Advisor, and formally begin dissertation research.

Students who FAIL the final review of the Chapter 1 assignment will be removed from the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

5.0 ACADEMIC STANDING POLICIES

All students in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership are bound by the academic standards set in the *University of Hartford Manual of Academic Policies and Procedures* (MAPP). However, the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership has standards for academic progress that often exceed and supersede some of the standards in the MAPP. These standards are explained below.

5.1 Academic Performance

All students must maintain a Grade Point Average of *at least 3.5* throughout their

program of study. Students should remain aware of their GPA at all times, and the program will monitor student performance to determine whether students are in good academic standing or must be placed on probation.

A matriculated doctoral student who receives a course grade of *B- or below* must retake the course at the next available opportunity. If the course is a prerequisite for subsequent courses, the student may not register for those courses without specific permission from their Program Advisor. Courses may be retaken *only once*.

5.2 Incomplete Grades

Incomplete grades will be granted only under conditions of special need and approved by the course instructor. In the event a course instructor agrees to grant an Incomplete Grade, students must prepare a specific written contract *by the time the Incomplete Grade is assigned*. This contract must indicate: (a) the reasons for the Incomplete; (b) precisely what needs to be done to complete the course requirements; and (c) the specific time frame in which the work will be completed. A copy of this written contract must then be filed in the student's permanent folder, after the Program Director's signature is obtained (see Appendix E).

Students *must* complete the missing work by the date agreed upon with the instructor or no later than the last day of classes of the following semester, once the course instructor assigns the Incomplete grade. Under extraordinary circumstances, formal requests for a second-semester extension can be initiated by the student and approved by both the course instructor and the Program Director. If the work is not completed on time, the Incomplete grade will remain on the student's record, and the student must register for and take the course again.

If a student has two or more Incomplete grades, she/he will not be permitted to enroll in additional courses until *all* the Incomplete grades are removed. Please note, this also applies to EDD 861: Doctoral Dissertation.

5.3 Grade Point Average Reviews

Cumulative grade point averages (GPA) are reviewed upon completion of each semester in the program. Students who fall below the overall 3.5 GPA will receive an Academic Warning Letter from the Program, informing them that they have one semester (6 credit hours) in which to raise their GPA to at least a 3.5.

Students who receive an Academic Warning Letter must meet with their Program Advisor *before* registering for any additional classes. At that time, a determination will be made about which two courses should be taken.

If the student has not earned a cumulative GPA of 3.5 during this period, s/he will be issued a Second Academic Warning. Students who receive a Second Academic Warning must take the following steps. Students take two courses, or six credit hours, to correct the deficiency. The following conditions apply when taking the six additional credit hours:

- Students may take only *one* course per semester, as approved by their faculty advisor.
- Students must re-take each previous/new course for which they received a grade of *B-* or below.

If students do not achieve a 3.5 cumulative GPA after completing these additional six credit hours, they will be removed from the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

5.4 Advancement to Candidacy

For students to begin their dissertation research, they must formally Advance to Candidacy. This occurs at the point in time when the student has: (a) successfully completed the Doctoral Proposal Seminar and (b) passed the Chapter 1 assignment (Advancement to Candidacy Paper). Procedures for assessment of the Chapter 1 assignment are provided in the description of EDD 860: Doctoral Proposal Seminar in Section 4.3 of this document. Official Advancement to Candidacy entitles the student to formally engage in the dissertation research process, the final stage in the doctoral program.

5.5 Student Appeals to Program Policies

Students who wish to appeal any of the Educational Leadership Program Policies outlined in this Policy Manual must submit a letter to the Program Director describing the policy to be reconsidered and the circumstances that merit such consideration. The Program Director will consult with the Program Faculty and will communicate the results of the appeal to the student.

6.0 THE DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

Each doctoral candidate is required to write a dissertation based upon soundly conceived and skillfully conducted and written research that will contribute to current knowledge of leadership. Given the mission of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, dissertation research must be substantive, scholarly, and designed in a way that suggests a direct connection with issues confronting the practice of leadership in educational, health, government, or human service organizations.

Dissertations sponsored by the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership encompass all of the components expected of rigorous research studies. The approach may be quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods. As such, the research designs must carefully adhere to all the rules associated with the research tradition chosen. The complete dissertation is often composed of five chapters: (1) Introduction to the Study; (2) Review of Literature; (3) Research Design and Methodology; (4) Findings; and (5) Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations. The content of each of these chapters is fully described in the Program's *Dissertation Guidelines* (Appendix D). All dissertations *must* conform to the latest edition of the American Psychological Association's *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*.

The quality of dissertation research is an indicator of both the quality of the accomplishments of the doctoral candidate and the credibility of the University of Hartford's Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. It is expected that research sponsored by the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership will be subjected to public scrutiny, starting with inclusion of the final dissertation in the ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (PQDT). Therefore, all approved dissertation research must be *rigorous*, and the document itself must be *flawless*. No document will be approved that does not conform completely to the tenets of quality technical writing and to APA style format.

6.1 The Faculty Dissertation Advisor

At the time students are Advanced to Candidacy, each will be assigned a Faculty Dissertation Advisor, who has expertise or experience in the doctoral candidate's research area. A doctoral candidate's Faculty Dissertation Advisor may or may not be the same individual who served as the student's Program Advisor during earlier stages

of the student's program of study.

The Faculty Dissertation Advisor serves as the Chair of the Doctoral Examining Committee and works extensively with the doctoral candidate until the dissertation is completed and evaluated.

If a doctoral candidate wishes to request a change in Faculty Dissertation Advisor, s/he must take the following steps: (1) inform the current Faculty Dissertation Advisor; (2) discuss with the Program Director the desired change; (3) identify and obtain agreement from another member of the Educational Leadership faculty to serve as the Faculty Dissertation Advisor; and (4) complete the Change of Faculty Dissertation Advisor form (see Appendix F), and transmit it to the Program Director, who will make the formal appointment of the new Faculty Dissertation Advisor. *Note:* In the event that the first Faculty Dissertation Advisor is the Program Director, the Department Chair will function in this capacity.

Doctoral candidates should understand that a change in Faculty Dissertation Advisor has important implications, particularly if the Doctoral Examining Committee has already met and approved the Dissertation Proposal. The new Faculty Dissertation Advisor shall review the proposal and, if necessary, require modifications in the articulation of the problem, research design, data collection procedures, and/or data analysis procedures. If these changes are substantial, the new Faculty Dissertation Advisor may reconvene the Doctoral Examining Committee (see below).

6.2 Sequence of Courses Related to Completion of the Dissertation

Dissertations are developed in two stages. First, a substantial proposal is prepared, composed of the first three chapters of the dissertation. Second, once the data are collected and analyzed, the remaining two chapters are developed, and refinements are made to the entire document. Both documents must conform to the Dissertation Guidelines.

Note: Whenever possible, students should register for the dissertation course (EDD861) selecting the Pass/Fail grading option

6.2.1. Doctoral Dissertation (EDD 861)

This course serves as the sole course taken while students are working on their dissertations. It can be taken multiple times for varying credit and is conducted as an

independent study with the doctoral candidate's Faculty Dissertation Advisor. Doctoral candidates develop their dissertation proposals, work with their Faculty Dissertation Advisors to appoint a Doctoral Examining Committee, and obtain formal approval of those proposals from that committee. The Dissertation Proposal summary must also be submitted for approval to the University's Human Subjects Committee before the research may be conducted. Following collection of the dissertation data the candidate (in consultation with the Faculty Dissertation Advisor) work on writing up the study's findings, conclusions and recommendations.

A "Pass" or a letter grade in this course is not dependent upon, and does not constitute, formal approval of a proposal by a Doctoral Examining Committee. Rather, the Faculty Dissertation Advisor assigns a "Pass" or letter grade based upon completion of the scope of work.

6.3 Mandatory Continuous Registration

Doctoral candidates who begin the dissertation course sequence must be registered *continuously* in one of the dissertation courses each semester (including summers) until the Doctoral Examining Committee has approved the full dissertation. Continuous registration allows students to have access to the university library and computer services, and to have continuing supervision from their Faculty Dissertation Advisor. Decisions about the number of credits to take during a particular semester are made by the Faculty Dissertation Advisor.

6.4 The Doctoral Examining Committee

The purposes of the Doctoral Examining Committee are to: (1) serve as a resource to the doctoral candidate and Faculty Dissertation Advisor, providing specialized technical assistance when appropriate; (2) review and assess the Dissertation Proposal in a formal Committee meeting; and (3) review and assess the completed Dissertation in a formal Committee meeting. The Program has clear guidelines for appointments to Doctoral Examining Committees, and for the Committees' operating procedures.

6.4.1 Appointment of Members of the Committee

Doctoral Examining Committees are appointed during the time that doctoral candidates

are refining their Dissertation Research Proposals. Doctoral Examining Committees must be composed of *at least three* members who hold doctoral degrees that required them to complete a doctoral dissertation:

1. The Faculty Dissertation Advisor, who is typically a member of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership faculty;
2. One University of Hartford faculty member from within or outside the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership; and
3. Either another university or external faculty member *or* an external professional, either of whom should be knowledgeable about the content and/or methodology used in the study.

It is the doctoral candidate's responsibility to insure all committee members (a) receive a copy of the *Doctoral Examining Committee Guidelines* document (see Appendix G) and (b) make personal contact with each committee member before the formal meeting.

Ordinarily, once the Doctoral Examining Committee is appointed, membership remains constant throughout the dissertation process. Should a member of the committee leave the University, and/or indicate that s/he is unable to continue to serve, the doctoral candidate and the Faculty Dissertation Advisor *must* take the following steps:

1. Identify a replacement committee member in the same membership category (see above);
2. Ensure that the replacement committee member has seen all official documents (i.e., the proposal, required modifications memo) established by the Doctoral Examining Committee to date.

6.4.2 Responsibilities of Doctoral Examining Committee Members

Ordinarily, there are two formal meetings of the Doctoral Examining Committee. The first meeting is convened to review and assess the Dissertation Proposal. The second meeting is convened in order to review and assess the completed Dissertation.

All committee members must be present at *both* the Proposal Committee Meeting and the Dissertation Committee Meeting. In the event of an emergency, the Faculty Dissertation Advisor, in consultation with the doctoral candidate, may identify a replacement committee member. Procedures for appointing a replacement committee member are delineated in 6.4.1

above.

Upon request, each committee member must agree to read a draft of the Dissertation Proposal and/or dissertation chapter drafts and provide feedback to the doctoral candidate and the Faculty Dissertation Advisor, before each of the two Committee Meetings. Doctoral candidates are responsible for meeting with each committee member, upon request, to respond to any questions they have before the Committee meeting.

During the two formal Doctoral Examining Committee meetings, the Committee Chair is responsible for ensuring that the Committee follows the defined procedures and policies for Dissertation Research in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

6.4.3 Proposal Committee Meeting

Ordinarily, students have two years from advancement to candidacy to successfully defend a dissertation proposal. The doctoral candidate's Faculty Dissertation Advisor, who also serves as the Committee Chair, is responsible for deciding when the Proposal Committee Meeting should take place. These decisions are made based upon the Faculty Dissertation Advisor's assessment of the quality of the document and its readiness to be reviewed and assessed by members of the Doctoral Examining Committee. When the Faculty Dissertation Advisor determines that a document is ready for review, s/he will instruct the student to convene the Committee.

Doctoral candidates must provide Doctoral Examining Committee members with copies of the Dissertation Proposal *at least two weeks before* the scheduled Committee meeting.

During the Proposal Committee Meeting, the members of the Doctoral Examining Committee: (1) review and assess the proposed research study, ensuring that it conforms to the Dissertation Guidelines; (2) ascertain whether the doctoral candidate is sufficiently prepared to conduct the study; and (3) help the doctoral candidate refine the study, where appropriate.

Upon completion of these tasks, Doctoral Examining Committee members sign the *Proposal Approval Form* (see Appendix I), thereby indicating their assessment of the Dissertation Proposal. Committee members adhere to the following *Decision Rules* in assessing the quality of the Proposal. Approval requires an affirmative vote of a majority or the committee members. Each Doctoral Examining Committee member *must* cast a vote

during the Proposal Committee Meeting; abstentions are not permitted.

At the end of the Proposal Committee meeting, the Doctoral Examining Committee makes one of the following four decisions:

1. UNCONDITIONAL PASS. The committee agrees that the proposal and defense are acceptable. The committee members then sign the *Proposal Approval Form*, indicating *Unconditional Pass*.
2. PASS WITH MINOR REVISIONS. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but that the proposal document still requires minor revisions. The committee members sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Pass with Minor Revisions*, but the doctoral examining committee chair withholds the signature certifying approval of the dissertation pending satisfactory revisions and corrections. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the doctoral candidate with a *deadline* for making all revisions and corrections. Once approved by the committee chair, the final signature is made.
3. PASS WITH MAJOR REVISIONS. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but the proposal document requires substantial revision. The committee members mark *Pass with Major Revisions* on the *Approval Form*, but withhold signatures. Such signing may take place only after all the *committee members* have examined and approved the revised proposal document. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the doctoral candidate with a *deadline* for re-submitting all revisions and corrections.
4. FAIL. If the dissertation and/or its defense are not acceptable, the candidate fails. *The Proposal Approval Form*, is signed by the committee members and the

committee chair, indicating *Failure*.

If the committee foresees the possibility that the candidate can revise the proposal in a way that might eventually be acceptable, it may recommend a re-examination.

A list of required changes is prepared by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting.

Doctoral candidates then have *four months* from the date of the first Proposal Committee Meeting to complete these required modifications.

In the case of FAILURE, the Faculty Dissertation Advisor transmits the signed Dissertation Proposal Approval form with the list of changes and a copy of the proposal to the Program Director. Within this four-month period, Faculty Dissertation Advisors have the authority to decide when the Doctoral Examining Committee should be reconvened.

When the Doctoral Examining Committee is reconvened for the *second* formal Proposal Committee meeting, the Committee may decide either (1) to APPROVE the revised proposal, or (2) NOT TO APPROVE the revised proposal. Upon completion of the second meeting, committee members must sign the form entitled *Second Proposal Approval Form* (see Appendix J for a copy of this form).

If the revised proposal is not approved during the second meeting of the Doctoral Examining Committee, then the doctoral candidate will be dismissed from the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

6.4.4 The Dissertation Defense Committee Meeting

Dissertation defense meetings will be publicly announced events, via University Notes. The defense may be attended by individuals other than the candidate's committee members. These individuals may ask questions, but will be asked to leave the room during committee deliberations. The doctoral candidate's Faculty Dissertation Advisor, who also serves as the Committee Chair, is responsible for deciding when the Dissertation Committee Meeting should take place. These decisions are made based upon the Faculty Dissertation Advisor's assessment of the quality of the document and its readiness to be reviewed and assessed by members of the Doctoral Examining Committee.

The Dissertation Committee Meeting ordinarily occurs within *two calendar* years of

the date of official approval of the Dissertation Proposal. A one-year extension of this deadline may be obtained under extraordinary circumstances. To obtain such an extension, the doctoral candidate must *first* obtain the approval of the Faculty Dissertation Advisor, and then follow the procedures outlined in Section 3.5 above.

Dissertation Committee Meetings are typically scheduled during the Fall and Spring academic semesters. Sufficient time after the meeting should be allowed in order for the doctoral candidate to make modifications, to deliver the revised copy to the University Library for binding, and to complete all graduation requirements. Ordinarily, the deadlines for convening the committee during the Fall semester are by *December 1*, and during the Spring semester, by *May 1*.

Doctoral candidates must provide Doctoral Examining Committee members with copies of the completed Dissertation *at least two weeks before* the Committee meeting. The document must conform to the Dissertation Guidelines (see Appendix D).

During the meeting, Committee members will: (1) examine the content and/or methodological issues pertinent to the dissertation, and (2) engage in discussions with the doctoral candidate about the conclusions and implications of the study. Attention will be paid both to its contribution to the evolving leadership knowledge base, and to its potential application or utility for the organizational settings in which the study was conducted, or organizational settings that might be impacted by the information derived in the study.

Upon completion of these tasks, Doctoral Examining Committee members sign the *Dissertation Approval Form* (See Appendix K), thereby indicating their assessment of the dissertation. Committee members adhere to the following *Decision Rules* in assessing the quality of the dissertation. Assessments require an affirmative vote of either 3 out of 3, or 2 out of 3 Committee members. Affirmative votes of 1 out of 3, or 0 out of 3 members constitute non-approval of the decision option. Each Doctoral Examining Committee member *must* cast a vote during the Dissertation Committee Meeting; abstentions are not permitted.

At the end of the Dissertation Committee Meeting, the Doctoral Examining Committee makes one of the following four decisions:

1. UNCONDITIONAL PASS. The committee agrees that the dissertation and defense are acceptable. The committee members then sign the *Dissertation Approval Form*,

indicating *Unconditional Pass*.

2. PASS WITH MINOR REVISIONS. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but that the dissertation document still requires minor revisions. The committee members sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Pass with Minor Revisions*, but the dissertation committee chair withholds the signature certifying approval of the dissertation pending satisfactory revisions and corrections.

A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The Committee provides the doctoral candidate with a *deadline* for making all revisions and corrections. Once approved by the committee chair, the final signature is made.

3. PASS WITH MAJOR REVISIONS. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but the dissertation document requires substantial revision. The committee members mark *Pass with Major Revisions* on the *Approval Form*, but withhold signatures. Such signing may take place only after the committee members have examined and approved the revised dissertation document.

A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the doctoral candidate with a deadline for re-submitting all revisions and corrections.

4. FAIL. If the dissertation and/or its defense are not acceptable, the candidate fails. *The Dissertation Approval Form* is signed by the committee members and the committee chair, indicating *Failure*.

If the committee foresees the possibility that the candidate can revise the dissertation in a way that might eventually be acceptable, it may recommend a re-examination. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting.

Doctoral candidates then have *six months* from the date of the first Dissertation Committee Meeting to complete these required modifications.

In the case of passing options 1-3 above, the Faculty Dissertation Advisor transmits the signed Dissertation Approval form to the Program Director. In the case of FAILURE, the Faculty Dissertation Advisor transmits the signed Dissertation Approval form with the list of modifications and a copy of the proposal to the Program Director. Within this six-month period, Faculty Dissertation Advisors have the authority to decide when the Doctoral Examining Committee should be reconvened.

When the Doctoral Examining Committee is reconvened for the *second* formal Dissertation Committee meeting, the Committee may decide either: (1) to APPROVE the revised dissertation, or (2) NOT TO APPROVE the revised dissertation. Upon completion of the second meeting, committee members must sign the form entitled *Second Dissertation Approval Form* (see Appendix K).

If the revised dissertation is not approved during the second meeting of the Doctoral Examining Committee, then the doctoral candidate will be dismissed from the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

6.5 Procedures for Binding the Dissertation

All dissertation documents must include the following front pages (before the text):

1. Program Approval Page
2. Title Page
3. Copyright Page
4. Acknowledgements (optional)
5. Abstract
6. Table of Contents (following APA format)

When all changes recommended at the Dissertation Committee Meeting are completed to the satisfaction of the Faculty Dissertation Advisor, and the Faculty Dissertation Advisor has signed the Approval Form that is bound into the document, doctoral candidates must prepare the following:

First, make copies of the final document on *20 pound, acid-free paper*. The University library will then arrange to have them bound. Doctoral candidates are responsible for delivering these copies to the University Library. There is a small charge for binding each copy, which is payable when the doctoral candidate delivers the copies of the dissertation to the University Library. At minimum, doctoral candidates must arrange for binding the following number of copies: (a) one copy for the library, which remains in the library's collection, and (b) one copy for the Doctoral Program.

Second, consult the Library website (www.hartford.edu) for instructions on inclusion of the manuscript into the appropriate database.

The final step is transmittal of the signed Library Approval Form (see Appendix M) to the Program Director by Mortensen Library, before a doctoral candidate will be approved for graduation. Doctoral candidates, who have not completed the dissertation document in time for a particular graduation date, will be held over until the next university graduation date before they can receive their degree. *There are no exceptions to this policy.*

6.6. Summary Chart of Steps in the Dissertation Process

The following Table summarizes the typical steps that doctoral candidates must follow in the Dissertation Process.

Table 4
Steps in the Dissertation Process

Required Task	Policy Manual Section
Official Advancement to Candidacy	5.6
Appointment of Faculty Dissertation Advisor	6.1
Enroll in the Dissertation Course - EDD 861	6.2
Maintain continuous enrollment	6.3
Appointment of Doctoral Examining Committee	6.4.1
Distribution of proposal to Committee members two weeks before scheduled meeting	6.4.3
Convening of the Proposal Committee Meeting	6.4.3
Transmit proposal and forms to the University Human Subjects Review Committee	www.hartford.edu
Transmit signed <i>Dissertation Proposal Approval</i> Form with proposal to the Program Director	6.4.3 Appendix I
Collect and analyze data, working with the Faculty Dissertation Advisor, and write Chapters 4 and 5 of dissertation	6.0
Faculty Advisor approves convening of the Final Oral Examination Meeting	6.4.4
Distribution of Dissertation to Committee members two weeks before scheduled meeting	6.4.4
Transmit signed <i>Dissertation Approval Form</i> with a copy of the dissertation to the Program Director	6.4.4 Appendix J
Make final edits in document and obtain official approval signature of Faculty Dissertation Advisor on the front page	6.4.4
Arrange with the University Library to get the required number of copies bound, and to do paperwork for inclusion in ProQuest.	6.5
Transmit signed <i>Library Approval Form</i> to Program Director.	Appendix L

Note: Additional steps must be followed in the event that the first Proposal Committee meeting results in an assessment of Failure (See section 6.4.3). The same is true if the first Dissertation Committee Meeting results in an assessment of Failure (see section 6.4.4).

**APPENDIX A
DOCTORAL STUDENT PROGRAM PLAN**

STUDENT: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Course	Transfer/Substitute	Semester Planned	Semester Taken	Grade
PROFESSIONAL STUDIES [21]				
EDD 820				
EDD 821				
EDD 822				
EDD 825				
EDD 826				
EDD 827				
EDD 837				
SPECIALIZATION COURSES [15+]				
EDD 832				
EDD 834				
EDD 835				
EDD 836				
EDD 839				
RESEARCH METHODS [9]				
EDD 840				
EDD 842				
EDD 844				
SYNTHESIS [9-12]				
EDD 850				
EDD 851 (Optional)				
EDD 852				
EDD 860				
DISSERTATION [9+]				
EDD 861				

SIGNATURES

Student: _____ DATE: _____

Advisor: (initial) _____ DATE: _____

Program Director: (initial) _____ DATE: _____

Advisor: (final) _____ DATE: _____

Program Director: (final) _____ DATE: _____

APPENDIX B

STUDENT: _____ Student ID Number: _____

EDD Course to be waived: _____
(Number) (Title) (Semester Offered)

Substitute Course Taken: *Attach a syllabus for this course.*

Course Number and Title _____

Institution and Date Taken _____

Grade _____

Replacement University of Hartford Doctoral Course:

Course Number and Title _____

Semester Offered _____

Brief Rationale for Inclusion in the Student's Program:

Student Signature _____ Date _____

Advisor Signature _____ Date _____

Form must be filed in the student's official folder.

APPENDIX D
Dissertation Guidelines

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study	✓
<p>1. The Introduction to the study section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Includes a clear statement demonstrating that the focus of the study is on a significant issue or problem that is worthy of study. b. Contains a brief, well-articulated summary of the content of each section of the chapter. 	
<p>2. Problem Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describes the issue or problem to be studied. b. Situates the issue or problem in context. c. Contains a purpose statement stating the specific objectives of the study. 	
<p>3. Theoretical Orientation or Conceptual Framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Delineates ideas or concepts that are being applied to the issue or problem under investigation. b. Provides description of the ideas or concepts of the theory(ies). c. Provides explanation of the relevance of the ideas or concepts of the theory(ies) to the issue or problem chosen for study. d. Links descriptions to prior knowledge and the research under investigation. 	
<p>4. Overview of Review of Literature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides a brief summary of the literatures that will guide the study. b. Includes the relationship of literatures to topic. c. Briefly summarizes major themes in each literature. d. Identifies some gaps that exist in the literatures that the proposed study seeks to fill. 	
<p>5. Key Terms or Operational Definitions of technical terms and central words used in the proposed study.</p>	
<p>6. Research Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides research and analytic questions associated with study. b. Brief explanation of the rationale for asking research/analytic questions. 	
<p>7. Overview of Research Design and Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides a brief description of the proposed research design. b. Brief overview of research site(s) and/or participant(s). c. Brief explanation of the data to be collected and rationale for collection of such data. 	

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study	✓
8. The Significance of the Study section a. Describes the importance of the research. This can be described in applicable terms from the list below: i. Application to education, ii. Generation or extension of knowledge, iii. Implications for social or organizational change, or iv. Advancement of a methodological approach for examining the issue or problem under study	
9. The chapter ends with a brief Summary or Conclusion of the key points that were reviewed and an overview of the contents of the remaining chapters in the document.	

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature	✓
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Introduction to the chapter <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presents a summary of the content of the literature review. b. Describes the organization of the review. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The literature review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is integrated. b. Is organized around major ideas or themes. c. Includes comparisons of different viewpoints or different research outcomes. d. Makes explicit connections between prior knowledge and research and the issue or problem under investigation. e. Explains the connection of all studies or thematic areas to the proposed study. f. Presents a full explanation of the theoretical orientation or conceptual framework, if not presented in Chapter 1. This narrative should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i.</i> Concise summaries of literature that help substantiate the rationale for the theoretical orientation or conceptual framework, and <i>ii.</i> A rationale for its selection. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The content of the review <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is drawn from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>i.</i> The most relevant published knowledge and current research on the topic under investigation. <i>ii.</i> Scholarly sources, such as books, peer-reviewed journals, or other materials appropriate to the issue or problem chosen for study. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The contents of the review may also include a review of literature related to the research design, if not presented in Chapter 3. 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the literature review and its connection to the issue or problem under investigation. 	

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology	✓
1. The Introduction includes a clear outline of the major areas of the chapter.	
2. Re-Statement of the Problem (paraphrasing Chapter 1).	
3. Research Questions (same as Chapter 1).	
<p>4. The Research Design derives logically from the problem statement and the purpose of the study. The narrative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Includes an explicit description of the design and methods. b. Provides a justification for using the design and methods. c. Contains an explanation of the steps taken to ensure validity and reliability of the design (e.g., member checks, peer debriefing, methodological triangulation). d. Refers, as appropriate, to evidence of quality contained in the appendixes (e.g., sample transcripts, researcher logs, and field notes). 	
<p>5. The Research Site and/or Participants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Are suitable for the study's purpose (e.g., number of subjects, sample drawn from an appropriate population). b. The narrative describes and justifies: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The population from which the sample is drawn. ii. The sampling method. iii. The sample size. iv. The eligibility criteria for study participants. 	
<p>6. The Instruments or data collection tools are consistent with the research approach, the theoretical orientation, and/ or conceptual framework. The narrative:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Presents a description of each instrument or data collection tool (e.g., interview guide, questionnaire, and focus group protocol). Each description includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Name of the instrument, ii. Type of the instrument, iii. Concepts measured by the instrument, iv. How scores are derived and their meaning, v. Processes for assessment of reliability and validity of the instrument, and vi. Processes for participants' completion of the instrument. b. Includes a detailed description of data sources, the items, and their connection to the theoretical orientation or conceptual framework (i.e., Data Source Chart). 	
7. If a treatment is used, it is described and justified clearly and in full detail.	

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology	✓
<p>8. The Data Collection narrative contains:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A detailed description of procedures for recruiting study participants and collecting data. b. A study protocol that outlines the chronology of events for the conduct of the study. c. A statement about where raw data are or will be available (e.g., appendices, tables, or by request from the researcher). 	
<p>9. The Data Analysis procedures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conform to the research approach (quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods). b. Are appropriate for the methods and instruments or tools. c. Are traceable to the purpose of the study, research questions, and methodology. d. The narrative for the data analysis section must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. A precise description of the data analysis procedures. ii. A description of the systems for keeping track of data and emerging understandings (e.g., research logs, reflective journals, cataloging systems). 	
<p>10. The Protection of Human Subjects section</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provides a detailed description of the ethical measures taken for the protection of human subjects. This includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Processes for seeking participants' informed consent or in the case of minors their assent and the consent of parents or guardians. ii. Appropriate safeguards to maintain the confidentiality or anonymity of participants' private information, responses, or behavior, including security of all raw data in any form. iii. The strategies for maintaining confidentiality of information. iv. The voluntary nature of participation, stating that withdrawal will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which participants are otherwise entitled. v. The benefits for participation, if any (e.g., incentive(s), experimental credits). vi. Foreseeable risks or discomforts. b. Includes study materials, such as the informed consent form, assent form, recruitment or debriefing forms, that meet guidelines set forth in the University of Hartford Human Subjects Committee's <i>Policies and Procedures for Conducting Research with Human Subjects</i>. 	
<p>11. The Limitations of the Study</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Describe, where appropriate: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Facts assumed to be true but not actually verified. ii. Potential weaknesses of the study. iii. Boundaries of the study. iv. Researcher bias and an explanation of how the research design controls for that bias. 	

Chapter 4: Presentation of the Findings	✓
1. The Introduction contains a clear, brief description of the processes used to gather and analyze the data.	
2. The research site and characteristics of study participants are described, if not presented in Chapter 3.	
3. The Findings (i.e., patterns, relationships, or themes): a. Build logically from the problem and purpose statements and the research questions. b. Are supported by the data.	
4. The Findings are presented and explained in a manner that: a. Address each research question. b. Are consistent with the research approach (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods). c. Are consistent with the theoretical orientation or conceptual framework.	
5. Discrepant cases and non-confirming data are included, where appropriate.	
6. The Tables and Figures used to present and organize data: a. Are as self-descriptive as possible. b. Are referred to and commented on in the directly adjacent, narrative. c. Are properly identified (titled or captioned). d. Show copyright permission, if not in the public domain.	
7. The chapter ends with a brief summary of the significant or most salient findings.	

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	✓
<p>1. The chapter begins with a summary of the study (Chapters 1 - 4): The narrative should be brief and include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The issue or problem under investigation and the purpose of the study. b. The questions being addressed. c. The theoretical orientation or conceptual framework that guided the study. d. How the study was conducted. e. Summary of the findings. 	
<p>2. The Conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Address research questions. b. Are bounded by the evidence collected and derived from the findings. <p>The narrative for each conclusion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Makes specific connections to the findings. b. Relates the conclusion to a larger body of literature on the topic. c. Leads to recommendations. 	
<p>3. The Recommendations are implied by and logically connected to the conclusions. They and may address policy, (future) research, and/or practice. The narrative for each area of recommendation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Contains a full explanation. b. Contains steps to useful action, where appropriate. c. Is directed a particular audience. 	
<p>4. The work concludes with researcher's thoughts about the implications of study.</p>	

<p>Overall Presentation: Style and Form</p> <p><i>The following indicators of quality apply to BOTH the Proposal and the full Dissertation.</i></p>	✓
<p>1. The proposal and the full dissertation must conform to the guidelines for style as set forth in the most recent edition of the <i>Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association</i> (APA Manual). This includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Correct grammar, punctuation, and spelling. b. Proper in-text citations for references, direct quotations, and paraphrasing. c. The reference list. d. All tables and figures. e. Headings and subheadings. f. Appendices 	
<p>2. The writing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is scholarly (i.e., the language is accurate, balanced, objective, tentative). b. Is direct and precise. c. Is smooth and comprehensible. <p>3. Paragraphs focus on a main point and all sentences within the paragraph relate to it.</p> <p>4. Transitions are used strategically throughout document.</p>	
<p>5. The proposal and the full dissertation must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Be organized logically and comprehensively. b. Include headings and subheadings to identify the logic and movement of the work. c. Have smooth and coherent transitions between chapters. d. Be written so that the Chapters add up to an integrated “whole”. 	
<p>6. The Abstract for the full dissertation complies with UMI guidelines.</p>	

Note: These guidelines should be discussed with and approved by the Dissertation Advisor.

APPENDIX E

INCOMPLETE GRADE CONTRACT

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Course: _____ Course Reference Number: _____

Instructor: _____ Semester/Year Taken: _____

DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION OF THE WORK: _____

Why are you requesting an incomplete grade for the above course?

INCOMPLETE GRADE

What is the exact work that must be finished to complete the course requirements?

I understand that it is my obligation to complete the work for the course during the time frame specified in this contract. Under extraordinary circumstances, I may petition for a one semester extension of this deadline. I understand that if I do not complete the work according to this contract, the Incomplete Grade will remain on my permanent record, and I will have to retake the course.

Student: _____ Date: _____

Instructor: _____ Date: _____

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX F

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

CHANGE OF DISSERTATION ADVISOR

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Student Research Interests: _____

Reason for Request: _____

Please change my Faculty Dissertation Advisor to the following member of the Educational Leadership faculty:

Student: _____

Student Signature _____ Date: _____

Previous Research Advisor: _____ Date: _____

Proposed Research Advisor: _____ Date: _____

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX G

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE GUIDELINES

Ordinarily, there are two formal meetings of the Doctoral Examining Committee: (1) The Proposal Committee Meeting, and (2) the Dissertation Committee Meeting.

Prior to either formal meeting of the Doctoral Examining Committee, both the student and/or the Faculty Dissertation Advisor may request feedback on written documents from any member of the Doctoral Examining Committee.

The student's Faculty Dissertation Advisor, who also serves as the Committee Chair, is responsible for deciding when each meeting should take place. These decisions are made, based upon the Faculty Dissertation Advisor's assessment of the quality of the document and its readiness to be reviewed and assessed by members of the Doctoral Examining Committee.

During the Proposal Committee Meeting, the members of the Doctoral Examining Committee: (a) review and assess the proposed research study, (b) ascertain whether the student is sufficiently prepared to conduct the study, and (c) help the student refine the study, where appropriate.

During the Dissertation Committee Meeting, Committee members: (a) examine content and/or methodological issues pertinent to the dissertation, and (b) engage in discussions with the student about the conclusions and implications of the study - in terms of both its contribution to the evolving leadership knowledge base, and its potential application or utility for the organizational settings in which the study was conducted, or organization settings which might be impacted by the information derived in the study.

At the end of each Committee meeting, the Doctoral Examining Committee must make one of the following four decisions:

_____ Unconditional Pass.

The committee agrees that the document and defense are acceptable. The committee members then sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Unconditional Pass*.

_____ Pass with Minor Revisions.

The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable but that the document still requires minor revisions. The committee members sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Pass with Minor Revisions*, but the doctoral examining committee chair withholds the signature certifying approval of the document pending satisfactory revisions and corrections.

A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a *deadline* for making all revisions and corrections. Once approved by the committee chair, the final signature is made.

_____ Pass with Major Revisions.

The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but the document requires substantial revision. The committee members mark *Pass with Major Revisions* on the *Approval Form*, but withhold signatures. Such signing may take place *only* after the committee members have examined and approved the revised dissertation document.

A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a *deadline* for re-submitting all revisions and corrections.

_____ Fail.

If the document and/or its defense are not acceptable, the candidate fails. *The Approval Form*, is signed by the committee members and the committee chair, indicating *Failure*. If the committee foresees the possibility that the candidate can revise the dissertation in a way that might eventually be acceptable, it may recommend a re-examination.

A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. A date for reconvening the committee is set: 4 months after the first meeting for Proposals, and 6 months after the first meeting for Dissertations.

Each of the decision options articulated above requires a vote of either 3 out of 3, or 2 out of 3 members to be approved. Votes of 1 out of 3, or 0 out of 3 members constitute non- approval of the decision option. As part of this agreement to serve on the Doctoral Examining Committee, each member is asked to indicate a willingness to discuss decision outcomes until one of the above four decision options has been selected and approved. Therefore, each Doctoral Examining Committee member *must* cast a vote during each Committee Meeting; abstentions are not permitted.

APPENDIX H
 Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

PROPOSAL APPROVAL FORM

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Title of Proposal: _____

Defense Date: _____

The Doctoral Examining Committee made the following decision regarding the above-named Proposal: (check one)

_____ Unconditional Pass. The committee agrees that the proposal and defense are acceptable. The committee members then sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Unconditional Pass*.

_____ Pass with Minor Revisions. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but that the proposal document still requires minor revisions. The committee members sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Pass with Minor Revisions*, but the doctoral examining committee chair withholds the signature certifying approval of the dissertation pending satisfactory revisions and corrections. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a *deadline* for making all revisions and corrections. Once approved by the committee chair, the final signature is made.

_____ Pass with Major Revisions. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but the proposal document requires substantial revision. The committee members mark *Pass with Major Revisions* on the *Approval Form*, but withhold signatures. Such signing may take place only after the committee members have examined and approved the revised proposal document. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a *deadline* for re-submitting all revisions and corrections.

_____ Fail. If the proposal and/or its defense are not acceptable, the candidate fails. The *Approval Form*, is signed by the committee members and the committee chair, indicating *Failure*. If the committee foresees the possibility that the candidate can revise the proposal in a way that might eventually be acceptable, it may recommend a re-examination. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. A time limit of *4 months* from the date of this meeting is set.

Approvals are based upon a vote of either 3 out of 3 members, or 2 out of 3 members.

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Name Signature Date

Chair/Dissertation Advisor: _____

Ed. Leadership Faculty: _____

University Faculty: _____

Faculty/External Member: _____

PROGRAM DIRECTOR *INITIAL* APPROVAL

Please attach a copy of this form and the **list of agreed upon revisions** with timelines in order to obtain the Program Director signature.

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

PROGRAM DIRECTOR *FINAL* APPROVAL

Please attach a copy of this form with signatures and **the revised document**, indicating that the student has met the set time limit.

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX I
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
SECOND PROPOSAL REVIEW

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Title of Proposal: _____

The Doctoral Examining Committee made the following decision regarding the above named Proposal: (check one)

_____ Approve the Proposal

_____ Not Approve the Proposal

Approvals are based upon a vote of either 3 out of 3 members, or 2 out of 3 members

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Name

Signature

Date

Chair/Dissertation Advisor: _____

Ed. Leadership Faculty: _____

University Faculty: _____

Faculty/External Member: _____

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

ATTACH A COPY OF THE REVISED PROPOSAL

APPENDIX J
 Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

DISSERTATION APPROVAL FORM

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Title of Dissertation: _____

Defense Date: _____

The Doctoral Examining Committee made the following decision regarding the above named Dissertation: (check one)

_____ Unconditional Pass. The committee agrees that the dissertation and defense are acceptable. The committee members then sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Unconditional Pass*.

_____ Pass with Minor Revisions. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable but that the dissertation document still requires minor revisions. The committee members sign the *Approval Form*, indicating *Pass with Minor Revisions*, but the doctoral examining committee chair withholds the signature certifying approval of the dissertation pending satisfactory revisions and corrections. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a deadline for making all revisions and corrections. Once approved by the committee chair, the final signature is made.

_____ Pass with Major Revisions. The committee agrees that the defense is acceptable, but the dissertation document requires substantial revision. The committee members mark *Pass with Major Revisions* on the *Approval Form*, but withhold signatures. Such signing may take place only after the committee members have examined and approved the revised dissertation document. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. The committee provides the student with a *deadline* for re-submitting all revisions and corrections.

_____ Fail. If the dissertation and/or its defense are not acceptable, the candidate fails. *The Dissertation Approval Form* is signed by the committee members and the committee chair, indicating *Failure*. If the committee foresees the possibility that the candidate can revise the dissertation in a way that might eventually be acceptable, it may recommend a re-examination. A list of required modifications is developed by the doctoral candidate and faculty advisor, and distributed to each Committee member immediately after the meeting. A time limit of *6 months* from the date of this meeting is set.

Approvals are based upon a vote of either 3 out of 3 members, or 2 out of 3 members.

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Name Signature Date

Chair/Dissertation Advisor: _____

Ed. Leadership Faculty: _____

University Faculty: _____

Faculty/External Member: _____

PROGRAM DIRECTOR *INITIAL* APPROVAL

Please attach a copy of this form and the **list of agreed upon revisions** with timelines in order to obtain the Program Director signature.

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

PROGRAM DIRECTOR *FINAL* APPROVAL

Please attach a copy of this form with signatures and the **revised document**, indicating that the student has met the set time limit.

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX K
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

SECOND DISSERTATION REVIEW

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Title of Dissertation: _____

The Doctoral Examining Committee made the following decision regarding the above named Dissertation: (check one)

_____ Approve the Dissertation

_____ Not Approve the Dissertation

Approvals are based upon a vote of either 3 out of 3 members, or 2 out of 3 members.

DOCTORAL EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Chair/Dissertation Advisor: Name _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Ed. Leadership Faculty: _____

University Faculty: _____

Faculty/External Member: _____

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

ATTACH A COPY OF THE REVISED DISSERTATION

APPENDIX L
 Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
 LIBRARY APPROVAL FORM

This is the final step that students must complete before they will be cleared for graduation. It begins with delivering an electronic, clean copy (i.e., in error-free 6th edition APA style) of your dissertation to the library, along with paper copies for binding. You need to bind at least the following:

- 1 hardcopy for Mortensen and 1 PDF copy
- 1 hard copy for the program (to be delivered to the Program Director)
 (You may also have additional copies bound for your personal use.)

Second, you must obtain an approval signature from the library, and deliver it to the Program Director for final approval. At that point, you will be cleared for graduation. **THERE ARE NO EXCEPTIONS** to this policy.

Student: _____ Student ID Number: _____

Daytime Phone: _____ Email Address: _____

Faculty Dissertation Advisor: _____ Date: _____

LIBRARY REVIEW

A. Mortensen Library has received and approved _____ copies of the above student's dissertation. S/he is recommended for graduation.

Library Official: _____ Date: _____

B. Mortensen Library has received _____ copies of the above student's dissertation.

The following must be completed before the approval sign off: _____

Library Official: _____ Date: _____

Program Director: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX M
Doctorate in Educational Leadership
Course Sequence

The common PIN number for fall and spring is 333333 (eddedd on a telephone keypad). During the summer, the PIN is 123456.

Term	Course(s)
Summer 1	EDD 826 Ethics EDD 827 Leadership
Fall 1	EDD 834 Foundations of Higher Education EDD 840 Research Methods
Spring 1	EDD 820 Community Based Research EDD 844 Statistics
Summer 2	EDD 821 Policy Studies EDD 835 Higher Education Law
Fall 2	EDD 822 Organizational Theory and Change EDD 842 Qualitative Research Methods
Spring 2	EDD 837 Diversity in Higher Education EDD 836 Student Affairs Administration
Summer 3	EDD 825 Instructional Development EDD 832 Human and Fiscal Resources
Fall 3	EDD 850 Academic Publishing EDD 852 Synthesis Seminar
Spring 3	EDD 860 Proposal Seminar EDD 851 Administrative/Teaching Internship (optional)
Remainder of Program	EDD 861 Doctoral Dissertation

APPENDIX N
Higher Education Internship Learning Contract

An internship can provide an opportunity to observe, and participate in, work responsibilities and functions within an area of higher education that is outside your day-to-day experience. You can design it in a way that leads to opportunities to learn about a new function in higher education, to explore the possibility of pursuing a career in a higher education area new to you, or to apply your present knowledge and experience to challenges within a new setting.

Before the internship experience can begin you must:

1. Meet with the course instructor to identify overall learning goals and objectives of the internship experience and identify mentor and placement.
2. Meet with identified mentor to discuss overall learning goals and objectives of the internship experience.
3. Prepare an individualized learning contract that contains a set of individualized learning goals and objectives that both you and your internship mentor agree upon.
4. Secure any needed release time from employer to carry out the internship.
5. Meet with the course instructor to review and finalize the learning contract.

The purposes of the learning contract are:

1. To clarify the overall learning goals and objectives of the internship experience.
2. To stipulate any specific deliverables expected by the internship mentor.
3. To serve as the basis for evaluation by the internship mentor of the intern's success in the internship, and to allow the intern to gauge their own success.
4. To connect the internship to the student's overall academic and professional plans.

Internships are based on 10 hours per week of work per semester (a minimum of 150 hours). Not all of that time needs to be face-to-face (e.g., an intern might be working from home on the writing of a report) but, overall, the intern must account for the minimum number of hours required for the internship. The intern, internship mentor, and course instructor should agree on how many hours are available and what the nature of work during those hours would look like, and how to track those hours.

The intern and internship mentor should meet to discuss the contract and, after agreeing on its contents, sign the contract. The intern will have course instructor sign the contract, as well. Once signed by everyone, the intern should distribute a copy to everyone and then file the original to be included in a final portfolio. This should all occur no later than the end of the second week of the academic term during which the internship is being completed. Submitting the learning contract to the course instructor is an important step for officially enrolling in internship credits.

Higher Education Internship Learning Contract

Intern Contact Information

Name of Intern: _____

Internship Site: _____

Intern Contact Information during Internship:

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone Number: _____ E-mail: _____

Primary Internship Mentor Contact Information

Name of Primary Site Mentor: _____

Title: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Phone Number: _____ E-mail: _____

Internship Information

Academic Term and number of credits:

Term: _____ Credits: _____

General Schedule for On-site Hours: _____

Intern's Learning Goals and Deliverables

Intern and the Internship Mentor should discuss and agree on learning goals, responsibilities, AND indicate how success will be measured for each goal. Attach extra pages if necessary. Also, the intern and the internship mentor should agree upon one deliverable, due at the end of the term.

Learning Goal 1: _____

How success on goal will be measured:

Learning Goal 2: _____

How success on goal will be measured:

Learning Goal 3: _____

How success on goal will be measured:

Description of a Deliverable to be completed by end of term: _____

***Internship
Agreement***

We, the undersigned, agree to the following:

1. The Intern and the Mentor agree on the goals of the learning contract, as stipulated above.
2. This learning contract will be filed Course Instructor no later than the end of the second week of each academic term for which credit is being sought.
3. Each credit hour is based on a minimum of 10 hours spent on internship work (on-site or otherwise) during the academic term (a minimum of 150 hours). The hours do not have to be evenly spread throughout the term. The distribution of hours is at the discretion of the internship mentor, in consultation with the intern.
4. The Intern agrees to maintain complete confidentiality of all materials and discussions to which they are privy during the internship. The Intern may be released from their duty of confidentiality only with expressed written permission of the Mentor.
5. Although some internship sites are able to compensate students for their internship work, this decision is left to the discretion of the Mentor. The Intern agrees that compensation is not required.
6. The Mentor will identify a suitable workspace for the student to use during the times such space is necessary.
7. At their discretion, the Internship Mentor agrees to invite the Intern (merely as observer) to important staff meetings and other events that extend beyond the immediate work of the internship. In this way, the Intern can gain exposure to policy and decision-making conversations.
8. The Mentor will complete an evaluation form at the end of the Internship period. This form will be provided to the mentor by the intern at the end of the term, but will be returned confidentially to the Intern's Course Instructor.
9. The Mentor must offer the student a satisfactory evaluation (as determined by successful completion of this Learning Contract) in order for the specified academic credit to be earned.

Signature of Intern

Date

Signature of Internship Mentor

Date

Signature Student's Course Instructor Advisor

Date