

# Graduate Academic Board

Agenda

November 14, 2014

ADM 204

9:30 to 11:30

## I. Roll Call

<input type="checkbox"/> Arlene Schmuland	<input type="checkbox"/> Anthony Paris	<input type="checkbox"/> Peter Olsson	<input type="checkbox"/> Hsing-Wen Hu	<u>Ex-Officio Members</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Cindy Knall	<input type="checkbox"/> Dennis Drinka	<input type="checkbox"/> Clayton Trotter	<input type="checkbox"/> Sam Thiru	<input type="checkbox"/> David Yesner
<input type="checkbox"/> Jervette Ward	<input type="checkbox"/> FS at Large	<input type="checkbox"/> FS at Large	<input type="checkbox"/> FS at Large	<input type="checkbox"/> Lora Volden
<input type="checkbox"/> FS CAS				<input type="checkbox"/> Scheduling and Publications

## II. Approval of Agenda (pg. 1)

## III. Approval of Meeting Summary (pg. 2)

## IV. Administrative Reports

- A. Associate Dean of the Graduate School David Yesner
- B. University Registrar Lora Volden
- C. GAB Chair Arlene Schmuland

## V. Program/Course Action Request - First Readings

- Chg BA A648 Business Intelligence and Data Mining (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 3-6)
- Chg EDEN A695 Mentorship, Leadership and Advocacy (1-6cr)(0+3-18)(pg. 7-12)
- Chg EDEN A698 Research and Creative Scholarship (1-12cr)(1-6+0)(pg. 13-16)

## VI. Program/Course Action Request - Second Readings

- Add Doctor of Education in Education, Culture, and Leadership (pg. 17-21)

## VII. Old Business

## VIII. New Business

- A. Curriculum Management System Demonstration
- B. Proposal for Designation Process for Community-Engaged Academic Courses (22-24)
- C. Graduate Academic Board Curriculum Review Discussion (pg. 25-26)
- D. Stacked Course Review (pg. 27-29)

## IX. Informational Items and Adjournment

# Graduate Academic Board

Summary

October 24, 2014

ADM 204

9:30 to 11:30

## I. Roll Call

(x) Arlene Schmuland

(e) Cindy Knall

(x) Jervette Ward

() FS CAS

(x) Anthony Paris

(x) Dennis Drinka

() FS at Large

(x) Peter Olsson

(x) Clayton Trotter

() FS at Large

(x) Hsing-Wen Hu

(x) Sam Thiru

() FS at Large

## Ex-Officio Members

(x) David Yesner

(x) Lora Volden

(e) Scheduling and Publications

## II. Approval of Agenda (pg. 1)

*Approved*

## III. Approval of Meeting Summary (pg. 2-3)

*Approved*

## IV. Administrative Reports

A. Associate Dean of the Graduate School David Yesner

*The Chancellor and Provost signed off on the Master of Science in Computer Science and Engineering, it will proceed to the next SAC meeting and potentially will make the December BOR meeting.*

*All nursing courses have been signed, the program changes will be held until the accreditation process has been completed.*

B. University Registrar Lora Volden

*Continuing to work with CourseLeaf on the electronic curriculum, new software is coming out. Received a pre-view on the agendas and will provide an update at the next meeting time allotting.*

C. GAB Chair Arlene Schmuland

## V. Program/Course Action Request - Second Readings

Add ANTH A654 Advanced Studies in Culture and Ecology (stacked with ANTH A454)  
(3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 4-19)

### Approved for second

Chg AE A681 Frozen Ground Engineering (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 20-23)

Chg AE A682 Ice Engineering (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 24-27)

Chg AE A683 Arctic Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 28-31)

Chg AE A684 Arctic Utility Distribution (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 32-35)

Chg AE A685 Arctic Mass and Heat Transfer (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 36-39)

Chg AE A689 Cold Regions Pavement Design (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 40-43)

Add AE A698 Arctic Engineering Project (3 cr)(0+9)(pg. 44-47)

### All AE courses approved for second

## VI. Program/Course Action Request - First Readings

Chg BA A648 Business Intelligence and Data Mining (3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 48-51)

### Faculty initiator not present, will be on the November 14, 2014 agenda

Add ME A651 Aerodynamics (stacked with ME A451)(3 cr)(3+0)(pg. 52-61)

### Waived first, approved for second

Add Doctor of Education in Education, Culture, and Leadership (pg. 62-68)

### Repeatability approved for EDEN A695

### Accepted for first reading

## VII. Old Business

## VIII. New Business

## IX. Informational Items and Adjournment



**COURSE CONTENT GUIDE**  
**UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA ANCHORAGE**  
**COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC POLICY**

**I. Date Initiated** November 10, 2014

**II. Course Information**

**College/School:** College of Business and Public Policy

**Department:** Business Administration

**Program:** Master of Business Administration, General Management

**Course Title:** Business Intelligence and Data Mining

**Course Number:** BA A648

**Credits:** 3

**Contact Hours:** 3 per week x 15 weeks = 45 hours

0 lab hours

6 hours outside of class per week x 15 weeks = 90 hours

**Grading Basis:** A-F

**Course Description:** Covers basic business intelligence and data mining including Data Warehousing and Querying. Applies business intelligence and data mining techniques to marketing campaigns, fraud detection, and terrorism detection. Uses SAS Enterprise Miner to illustrate decision trees, classification algorithms, and other data mining techniques. Students may apply for SAS Data Mining Certification.

**Course Prerequisites:** N/A

**Registration Restrictions:** Graduate Standing and undergraduate statistics course with a minimum grade of C

**Fees:** Standard CBPP computer lab fee

**III. Course Activities**

- A. Discussion
- B. Case studies
- C. Lecture

**IV. Course Level Justification**

This course requires rigorous data analysis and synthesis of quantitative and logical thinking skills gained at the undergraduate level.

## **V. Outline**

- A. Business Decision Modeling
  - 1. Decision making process
  - 2. Decision making with uncertainty
- B. Business Data Environment
  - 1. Database and data warehousing
  - 2. Data reporting and querying
  - 3. Online analytical processing
  - 4. Data preprocessing and transformation
- C. Introduction to Business Intelligence (BI)
  - 1. The BI Lifecycle
  - 2. BI implementation
  - 3. BI and technology
- D. Data Mining Techniques
  - 1. Unsupervised learning methods
    - a. Decision trees
    - b. Association rule learning
    - c. K-Mean cluster analysis
  - 2. Supervised learning methods
    - a. Classification analysis
    - b. Neural network
    - c. Regression analysis

## **VI. Suggested Texts**

SAS Publishing. (2007). Applied analytics using SAS® Enterprise Miner™ 6.1.  
Cary: SAS Press.

Tan, P., Steinbach, M., & Kumar, V. (2005). Introduction to data mining (US ed.).  
Boston: Addison Wesley.

**VII. Bibliography**

Cerrito, P. B. (2007). *Introduction to data mining - using SAS Enterprise Miner*. Cary: SAS Press.

Roiger, R., & Geatz, M. (2003). *Data mining - a tutorial based primer* (3rd ed.). Boston: Addison Wesley.

Sarma, K. S. (2007). *Predictive modeling with SAS Enterprise Miner: practical solutions for Business Applications*. Cary: SAS Press.

SAS Publishing. (2006). *Data mining using SAS Enterprise Miner: a case study approach* (2nd ed.). Cary: SAS Press.

SAS Publishing. (2009). *Getting started with SAS Enterprise Miner 6.1*. Cary: SAS Press.

Shmueli, G., Patel, N. R., & Bruce, P. C. (2010). *Data mining for business intelligence: concepts, techniques, and applications in Microsoft Office*. Hoboken: Wiley.

**VIII. Instructional Goals and Student Outcomes**

<b>A. Instructional Goals.</b>	
<b>The instructor will:</b>	
1.	Introduce students to business intelligence and data mining
2.	Present the role and significance of business intelligence organizations
3.	Introduce classical data mining techniques used in business intelligence projects
4.	Describe how to use data mining techniques and business intelligence concepts to solve various business decision making problems
5.	Demonstrate how to use popular data mining software

<b>B. Student Outcomes.</b>	
<b>Students will be able to:</b>	<b>Assessment Method</b>
1. Describe the role of business intelligence in everyday business decision making	Exams and written assignments
2. Explain the BI implement process	Exams and written assignments
3. Explain mechanisms of some popular data mining techniques	Exams and written assignments
4. Apply selected data mining techniques	Case studies and presentations



**Course Content Guide  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
College of Education**

**I. Date Initiated:** February 15, 2011/October 28, 2014

**II. Information for the Course Action Request**

College/School: College of Education

Course Prefix: EDEN

Course Number: A695

Title: Mentorship, Leadership and Advocacy

Credits: 1-6 (variable)

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass

Implementation Date: Spring 2015

Course Description: Advanced mentorship, leadership, and/or advocacy experience in an approved organizational setting.

Course Prerequisites(s): EDEN A600

Test Scores(s): N/A

Corequisite(s) N/A

Registration Restrictions: Advancement to Candidacy required and Instructor Approval

Course Fee: No



### III. Instructional Goals, Student Outcomes, and Assessment Procedures

#### A. Instructional Goals

The instructor will facilitate:

Selection of an appropriate mentorship site and the development of a mentorship proposal that addresses one or more elements of the core content of engaged leadership
Collaboration with the student to set specific learning goals and measures for assessing attainment of these goals
Discussions about selected literature and its application to the mentorship experiences
Reflective inquiry that addresses knowledge, skills, and dispositions while emphasizing the connections among principles of leadership within the educational realm, the context of Alaska, and the College of Education Core Values
Critical analysis of the student's development for professional growth in leadership within the context of Alaskan Educational systems

#### B. Student Outcomes/Assessment Procedures

Student Outcomes

Upon successful completion of the course, the student will be able to do the following:

Assessment Procedures

This outcome will be assessed by one or more of the following:

Develop a proposal that includes: a) personal and professional learning goals related to core content of leadership, education and culture b) activities and projects that support the learning goals c) assessment measures that provide evidence of goal attainment	Portfolio Proposal Dissertation in Practice Proposal
Analyze current literature and apply to the mentorship setting	Literature Review
Reflect and document on critical issues and propose effective solutions for dilemmas experienced during the mentorship	Critical Issue Reflection Impact/Solution Presentation
Demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions relevant to leadership in the Alaskan educational context	Mentorship Evaluation Impact/Solution Presentation
Articulate, record, and defend a 5-year growth plan for continued leadership development	Professional Growth Plan Presentation

#### **IV. Course Level Justification**

This course requires admission to the Doctoral program.

It also requires the following:

- Application of expert knowledge of research
- Critical thinking skills to synthesize new information
- Mastery of theoretical knowledge
- Ability to read, interpret, and evaluate literature and research
- Ability to collaborate with other leaders or professionals in field

#### **V. Course Outline**

- 1.Mentorship development
- 2.Proposal development
- 3.Literature review and analysis
- 4.Reflective inquiry
- 5.Knowledge, skills, and dispositions
- 6.Professional growth plan

#### **VI. Suggested Text**

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American psychological association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Terrell, R. D., & Lindsey, R. B. (2008). *Culturally proficient leadership: The personal journey begins within*. Tyler, TX: Corwin Press.

#### **VII. Bibliography**

Balfanz, R. (2007). What your community can do to end its drop-out crisis: Learnings from research and practice. Center for Social Organization of Schools: Johns Hopkins University, Washington, DC. 29 pgs.

Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, O. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Alaska Native education: Views from within*. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, Center for Cross-cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Bell, D. (2005). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Conger, J.A., & Riggio, R.E. (2007). *The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.

- \*Dewey, J. (1915). *Schools of tomorrow*. NY: E.P. Dutton.
- \*Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban public high school*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- \*Finn, P. (1999). *Literacy with an attitude: Educating working-class children in their own self-interest*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- \*Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Freire, P. (2004). *EPZ Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed (continuum impacts)*. New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fry, R. (2007). The changing racial and ethnic composition of U.S. public schools. Pew Hispanic Center. Washington, DC. 17 pgs.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gándara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldhaber, D. (2006). Teacher pay reforms: The political implications of recent research. *Center of American Progress: University of Washington and Urban Institute*. 40 pgs.
- \*Goodlad, J., & McMannon, T. (1997). *The public purpose of education and schooling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Goodman, D. J. (2011). *Promoting diversity and social justice: Educating people from privileged groups*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hackman, H. W. (2005). Five essential components for social justice education. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38(2), 103-109.
- \*Henig, J., Hula, R., Orr, M., & Pedescleaux, D. (2001). *The color of school reform: Race, politics, and the challenge of urban education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hirsch, E. D. (2006). *The knowledge deficit: Closing the shocking education gap for American children*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kozol, J. (2005). *The shame of the nation*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.

\*Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.

Lopez, M., Barrueco, S., Feinaurer, E., & Miles, J. (2007). Young Latino infants and families: Parental involvement implications from a recent national study. *Family Involvement Research Digests*, Harvard Graduate School of Education. Online publication.

Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2008). *The literature review: Six steps to success*. Tyler, TX: Corwin Press.

Marshall, C., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing educational politics for social justice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

National Public Radio (2007, October 30). *Economic segregation impacting education* [Audio podcast]. *NPR: News and Notes*

Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Spradlin, L., & Parsons, D. (2008). *Diversity matters: Understanding diversity in schools*. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth.

Stein, S. (2004). *The culture of education policy*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Tung, R., Uriarte, M., Diez, V., Lavan, N., Agusti, N., Karp, F., & Meschede, T. (2009). *English learners in Boston Public Schools: Enrollment, engagement, and academic outcomes, AY2003-AY2006*. The Mauricio Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy: University of Massachusetts, Boston.

\*Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

\*Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

\**Classic texts and references*



**Course Content Guide  
University of Alaska Anchorage  
College of Education**

**I. Date Initiated:** October 29, 2014

**II. Information for the Course Action Request**

College/School: College of Education

Course Prefix: EDEN

Course Number: A698

Title: Research and Creative Scholarship

Credits: 1-6 (variable)

Grading Basis: Pass/No Pass

Implementation Date: Fall 2015

Course Description: Research and scholarly activities leading to a professional portfolio of exemplary work, including a dissertation in practice, conducted under faculty and/or committee supervision. Special note: 6 credits are required.

Course Prerequisites(s): EDEN A600

Test Scores(s): N/A

Corequisite(s) N/A

Registration Restrictions: Advancement to Candidacy required and Instructor Approval

Course Fee:  Yes  No

### III. Instructional Goals, Student Outcomes, and Assessment Procedures

#### A. Instructional Goals

The instructor will facilitate:

Review strategies for conducting a literature review on a topic for research/scholarly inquiry relevant to Alaska's education context
Explain the process of research/scholarly activity leading to the professional portfolio and a dissertation in practice project
Guide candidate in completing a research/scholarly activity that produces a professional portfolio that includes a dissertation of practice
Demonstrate strategies for disseminating research/scholarly activity findings to a professional audience

#### B. Student Outcomes/Assessment Procedures

Student Outcomes

Upon successful completion of the course, the student will be able to do the following:

Assessment Procedures

This outcome will be assessed by one or more of the following:

Synthesize relevant literature to formulate and refine research/scholarly activity relevant to Alaska's education context	Literature review for dissertation in practice project
Demonstrate knowledge and skills in conducting research/scholarly activity	Professional portfolio Dissertation in practice project
Demonstrate ability to complete a research/scholarly activity project under the guidance and supervision of a research advisor and/or committee	Professional Portfolio Dissertation in practice
Disseminate research/scholarly activity findings	Present professional portfolio to faculty and professional audience

#### IV. Course Level Justification

This course requires admission to the Doctoral program. It also requires the following:

- Application of expert knowledge of research
- Critical thinking skills to synthesize new information
- Mastery of theoretical knowledge
- Ability to read, interpret, and evaluate literature and research
- Ability to collaborate with other leaders or professionals in field

#### V. Course Outline

This course is designed to support the individualized nature of research and creative scholarship. Therefore, it does not have a fixed outline. At the beginning of each

semester, the student and supervising faculty member will develop a written contract outlining the specific tasks to be performed by the student over the course of the semester. The student and supervising faculty member will meet on a regular basis to discuss the progress of the written contract. The student will receive a Deferred Grade (DF) until the total number of required credits (6) has been successfully completed.

## **VI. Suggested Text**

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American psychological association*, (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

## **VII. Bibliography**

Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, O. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Alaska Native education: Views from within*. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network, Center for Cross-cultural Studies, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Bell, D. (2005). *Silent covenants: Brown v. Board of Education and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Conger, J.A., & Riggio, R.E. (2007). *The practice of leadership: Developing the next generation of leaders*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.

\*Dewey, J. (1915). *Schools of tomorrow*. NY: E.P. Dutton.

Johnson, R.S., Mims-Cox, J.S., & Doyle-Nichols, A.R. (2009). *Developing portfolios in education: A guide to reflection, inquiry, and assessment* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Sage Publications.

Machi, L.A., & McEvoy, B.T. (2008). *The literature review: Six steps to success*. Tyler, TX: Corwin Press.

Ogden, E.H. (2006). *Complete your dissertation or thesis in two semesters or less*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Terrell, R. D., & Lindsey, R. B. (2008). *Culturally proficient leadership: The personal journey begins within*. Tyler, TX: Corwin Press.





**Program/Prefix Action Request**  
**University of Alaska Anchorage**  
**Proposal to Initiate, Add, Change, or Delete a Program of Study or Prefix**

1a. School or College EA COE	1b. Department COE - Teaching & Learning								
2. Complete Program Title/Prefix <b>Doctor of Education in Education, Culture, and Leadership</b>									
3. Type of Program Choose one from the appropriate drop down menu:      Undergraduate:      or      Graduate: Other: specify type in box 2 Doctoral Program									
This program is a Gainful Employment Program: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes      or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No									
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;">           4. Type of Action:      <b>PROGRAM</b> </td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> <b>PREFIX</b> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add         </td> <td style="border: none;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Change         </td> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Change         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Delete         </td> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Inactivate         </td> </tr> </table>		4. Type of Action: <b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>PREFIX</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add	<input type="checkbox"/> Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Delete	<input type="checkbox"/> Inactivate
4. Type of Action: <b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>PREFIX</b>								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Add								
<input type="checkbox"/> Change	<input type="checkbox"/> Change								
<input type="checkbox"/> Delete	<input type="checkbox"/> Inactivate								
5. Implementation Date (semester/year) From: <b>Fall/2015</b> To: <b>/9999</b>									
6a. Coordination with Affected Units      Department, School, or College: <b>COE</b> Initiator Name (typed): <b>Ed McLain</b> Initiator Signed Initials: _____      Date: _____									
6b. Coordination Email submitted to Faculty Listserv ( <a href="mailto:uaa-faculty@lists.uaa.alaska.edu">uaa-faculty@lists.uaa.alaska.edu</a> )      Date: <b>3/31/14</b>									
6c. Coordination with Library Liaison      Date: <b>3/28/14</b>									
7. Title and Program Description - Please attach the following: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cover Memo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catalog Copy in Word using the track changes function									
8. Justification for Action The Ed.D. in Education, Culture, and Leadership is a professional doctorate. The UAA Ed.D program is a practice-based program intended to prepare future leaders in P-12, higher education, and community-based educational contexts. A focus of this degree program is to prepare leaders who have a greater understanding of and who develop the knowledge and skills necessary to provide leadership and support in the Alaskan context, serving and working with diverse populations, and committed to equity for all students in these environments.									
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;">           Initiator (faculty only) _____ Date _____  <b>Ed McLain</b>            Initiator (TYPE NAME)         </td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved  <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Dean/Director of School/College _____ Date _____         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved  <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Department Chair _____ Date _____         </td> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved  <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Board Chair _____ Date _____         </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved  <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      College/School Curriculum Committee Chair _____ Date _____         </td> <td style="border: none;"> <input type="checkbox"/> Approved  <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Provost or Designee _____ Date _____         </td> </tr> </table>		Initiator (faculty only) _____ Date _____ <b>Ed McLain</b> Initiator (TYPE NAME)	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Dean/Director of School/College _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Department Chair _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Board Chair _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      College/School Curriculum Committee Chair _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Provost or Designee _____ Date _____		
Initiator (faculty only) _____ Date _____ <b>Ed McLain</b> Initiator (TYPE NAME)	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Dean/Director of School/College _____ Date _____								
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Department Chair _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Board Chair _____ Date _____								
<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      College/School Curriculum Committee Chair _____ Date _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved <input type="checkbox"/> Disapproved      Provost or Designee _____ Date _____								

## **Proposed Catalog Copy for the Doctor of Education**

### **DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (EdD) in Education, Culture, and Leadership**

The EdD in Education, Culture, and Leadership is a professional doctorate. The UAA EdD program is a practice-based program intended to prepare future leaders in P-12, higher education, and community-based educational contexts who can effectively translate research into practice, use data to inform decision-making, influence policy, and organize individuals and groups to collaboratively address challenges. A focus of this degree program is to prepare leaders who have a greater understanding of and who develop the knowledge and skills necessary to provide leadership and support in the Alaskan context, serving and working with diverse populations, and committed to equity for all students in these environments.

The doctoral degree requires completion of 52 credit hours. It is offered in cohort, part-time, and distance education modes and has a residency requirement. The program does not provide State certification or licensure.

### **STUDENT (Scholar-practitioners) LEARNING OUTCOMES**

Scholar-Practitioners who complete this program will be able to:

1. Inquire about issues surrounding education, equity and social justice to bring about solutions to complex challenges in practice.
2. Construct and apply knowledge to make positive difference in the lives of individual, families, organizations, and communities.
3. Develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
4. Analyze context and practice, and use multiple frames to develop meaningful, systemic systems that promote positive change.
5. Integrate both practical and research knowledge linking theory with systemic inquiry.
6. Emphasize transformation and use of professional knowledge and practice.

### **ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS**

The College of Education requirements for admission to the doctoral program include the following:

1. Provide evidence of an earned master's degree, with evidence of successful research and study, or the equivalent from a regionally accredited institution or foreign equivalent.
2. Provide transcripts documenting a minimum grade point average in graduate study of 3.5; transcription of earned Master Degree; and six credits of

approved graduate-level research courses with a minimum GPA of 3.0. (The six credits in research will often be part of the candidate's Masters degree program.)

3. Submit professional resume documenting appropriate preparation and experience pertinent to educational and/or organizational leadership and potential to benefit from the program.
4. Submit two professional letters of reference attesting to the leadership ability and scholarship of the applicant.
5. Submit a goal statement that reflects on career goals and how they relate to the EdD.
6. Meet all applicable admission requirements for graduate study as established by UAA and the UAA Graduate School.
7. Successfully pass an interview by a College of Education graduate admission committee (if requested by the Admission Committee).

### **ACADEMIC PROGRESS**

All doctoral course work must be completed with a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0. No more than two courses may be completed with a grade of C. Candidates must successfully complete all program course work prior to enrollment in the Scholarship courses - Research and Creative Scholarship (EDEN A698), and Internship in Engaged Leadership (EDEN A695).

### **GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS**

See the beginning of this chapter for University Requirements for Doctoral Degrees.

### **PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**

This program includes courses delivered by distance technology. Admitted students must have the technological knowledge and skills to engage in distance learning. An initial intensive summer residency is required as the entry point and grounding experience for all members of the EdD program.

- |  |              |
|--|--------------|
| 1. <b>Initial Program Residency-Intensive</b>                                    | (4 credits)  |
| EDEN A600 Education, Culture, and Leadership Residency 4                         |              |
| 2. <b>Inquiry-Based Scholarship Foundation</b>                                   | (9 credits)  |
| STAT A601 Statistical Methods 3  |              |
| EDEN A601 Inquiry-Based Scholarship: Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed-modes I 3  |              |
| EDEN A602 Inquiry-Based Scholarship: Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed-modes II 3 |              |
| 3. <b>Education, Culture, and Leadership Core</b>                                | (18 credits) |
| EDEN A611 Engaged Leadership: Ethics and Stewardship 3                           |              |
| EDEN A612 Indigenous Epistemologies in Alaska 3                                  |              |
| EDEN A613 Leading Change & Innovation (transformation and innovation) 3          |              |
| EDEN A615 Law, Policy, and Advocacy 3  |              |
| EDEN A616 Building Responsive Organizational Capacity 3                          |              |

**4. Focused Inquiry**

Cognate in the candidate's field of engagement and study by advisement.

(9 credits)

**5. Final Scholarship**

(12 credits)

EDEN A695 Mentorship, Leadership and Advocacy

6

EDEN A698 Research and Creative Scholarship

6

**6. Advancement to Candidacy**

Advancement to candidacy status is a prerequisite to graduation and is determined by the program chair or designee. Candidacy is the point in a graduate study program at which the student has demonstrated an ability to master the subject matter and has progressed to the level at which a Graduate Studies Plan can be approved.

To be approved for candidacy, a student must:

1. Be in good academic standing – I.e., have successfully completed 40 credits of doctoral program course work with a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0. No more than two courses may be completed with a grade of C.
2. Successfully pass a qualifying exam and receive approval of the student's scholarship and research project proposal from the student's graduate committee.
3. Satisfy all prerequisites, remove all academic deficiencies and satisfy all terms of provisional admission.

The final step in a student's Advancement to Candidacy is the student's submission of an approved, final official Graduate Studies Plan.

See more at:

<http://catalog.uaa.alaska.edu/graduateprograms/degreerequirements/#sthash.WG0tvQ60.dpuf>

**7. Professional Portfolio – including the *Dissertation in Practice* (DiP)**

The Professional Portfolio consists of exemplary work selected by the student to document the student's refined mastery of target knowledge/skill sets. It also includes the Dissertation in Practice (DiP). The Professional Portfolio serves as the organizing tool for the summative or culminating assessment of the student's work in the program. This portfolio is constructed by each student in the program for the review and approval of the student's advisor and doctoral committee.

The *Dissertation in Practice* serves as a demonstration of the scholarly practitioner's ability to solve problems of practice and a defense of the project. "The *Dissertation in Practice [DiP]* exhibits the doctoral candidate's ability "to think, to perform, and to act with integrity" (Shulman, 2005). As such, the student's *Dissertation in Practice* (DiP) and documentation relating to the student's successful defense of the DiP comprise essential and integral components of the Professional Portfolio.

**8. Total credits for degree: (52 credits)**

# Proposal for Designation Process for Community-Engaged Academic Courses October, 2014

---

The Faculty Senate approved new definitions for community engaged academic curriculum in February 2014. The approved modifications will better distinguish between courses that generally include community engagement in the course objectives and more stringently-defined service-learning courses. The Community Engagement designation (CE) encompasses a broad range of ways that courses might engage students in learning about and taking action for the public good. Courses with the Service-Learning designation (SL) are a subset of that broad range meeting additional criteria. A course may be designated as either CE or SL but not both.<sup>i</sup>

This request addresses a deficiency noted in the CCEL's recent self-evaluation for the Carnegie Institute – the absence of accurate data on classroom engagement. The course designation process is critical to the CCEL's ability to adequately assess the efficacy of engagement at the course level. Absent course designation, there is no mechanism for capturing, assessing, and reporting these efforts. Capturing this data, assessing it, and reporting out are integral to UAA's accreditation reports and to our continued status as a Carnegie Engaged University. Assessment to date has been hampered by difficulty identifying classroom initiatives across campus; the alternative processes described below are suggested as methods that will allow data collection to begin as quickly as possible.

Following the October 2014 E-Board meeting, the Faculty Senate requested that the Community Engagement Task Force propose a process for the designation of courses. The following proposal recommends that both designations be self-imposed by individual faculty for a period of three semesters: Fall 2015-Fall 2016. In Summer 2016, a CCEL research project will assess the workability of the self-designations with two semesters of data and make recommendations to both the Faculty Senate and the Community Engagement Task Force.

## **Self-Designation for both Community Engaged (CE) and Service Learning (SL)**

The attribution of a community-engaged course may apply to a broad spectrum of courses that could include a wide variety of experiences and activities. There may be a portion of the course or set of assignments that require the students' interaction with community and/or community issues that does not carry throughout the semester. Activities might be indirect or direct service to a community organization or individuals and could potentially take place entirely in the classroom. This broad definition may sometimes capture work that is exploratory for faculty beginning to engage with community in their courses, brings an application of theory to practice that is appropriate for only part of a course, or requires a relatively low level of community interaction due to large course size or other practical considerations that make more intensive engagement difficult.

In any case, with the new Faculty Evaluation Guidelines (FEGs), we want to make it as easy as possible for faculty to document the work they are doing, describe it accurately, and to look for guidance in how to do the best engaged teaching and engaged scholarship that is possible in their individual circumstances. We suggest

<sup>i</sup>Definitions and parameters are taken and modified from University of Massachusetts Amherst Office of Civic Engagement & Service Learning (<http://cesl.umass.edu/>).

# Proposal for Designation Process for Community-Engaged Academic Courses October, 2014

---

that faculty can be thoughtful about the designator they choose for their courses, and in fact, that the FEGs and the preparation of their faculty files are best served by faculty describing accurately what they are doing that can be called engaged teaching and engaged scholarship.

The SL designation, by definition, asks more of the faculty and the students in designing a more significant experience based in the community and asks that issues of impact, sustainability and reciprocity be addressed with the community partner, in addition to the requirements that students be prepared for the service roles, that reflection be more structured, and that there be some attempt at evaluation of impact for students and community.

We propose that a pilot project of three semesters be established with self-designators for both CE & SL. Each semester, Fall 2015 & Spring 2016, the course schedule forms will be designated in concert with faculty by whomever in that department completes the forms, similar to the process for designating distance learning courses. In Spring and Summer of 2016, a faculty research project will begin to review the designations for each semester, assessing for the workability of self-designation and the validity and reliability of the process. A mid-term report of the pilot project will be submitted to the Faculty Senate and the Community Engagement Task Force in April 2016 with a final report in August 2016. It is likely that the process would not be able to be changed substantially in time for the Fall 2016 semester, which is the reason it was extended to three semesters, rather than the one academic year. Changes could be proposed, if needed, for Spring 2017.

The Registrar's Office is prepared to implement this process for Fall 2015 with the CE or SL designation being entered on the Final Schedule Proofs in the "attendance method" column. The final Fall 2015 Schedule Proofs are due to the Curriculum Office on 2/6/15. This will hold true for the main campus in Anchorage and for courses taught in Eagle River. If Mat-Su, Kodiak and Kenai Peninsula faculty wish to code their courses in this way, Lora Volden is willing to work with the appropriate office on adapting or adopting the process that we've set in place.

---

\*Definitions and parameters are taken and modified from University of Massachusetts Amherst Office of Civic Engagement & Service Learning (<http://cesl.umass.edu/>).

# Proposal for Designation Process for Community-Engaged Academic Courses October, 2014

---

---

<sup>i</sup> The two definitions that were approved by the Faculty Senate March 7, 2014 are:

**CE\*** A **Community Engaged course** involves the student(s) in some kind of work outside of the classroom that contributes to the public good. At a minimum, the course should:

- Design and implement the community work with appropriate community input so that the students' efforts will provide an identifiable public benefit rather than a community burden.
- Clearly link the community work to student learning outcomes in the syllabus.
- Engage students in some oral or written reflection that explores their experience of engagement and connects it with the course learning goals.

**SL\*** A **Service-Learning course** is a Community-Engaged course which integrates the service and learning more deeply and more intentionally. At a minimum, the course should have:

- Service: significant community-based work defined in response to a need or aspiration presented by one or more partnering community organizations and for which core issues of impact, sustainability and reciprocity have been addressed.
- Clear linkage between the service and student learning outcomes: both academic and civic learning are addressed, and this is communicated in the syllabus.
- Preparation for service: students are prepared for the roles they will play, including engaging respectfully with a community that may differ significantly in race, class, age, or other elements of social identity.
- Structured reflection: intentional, systematic reflection on students' experience in the community is integrated throughout the course, not added as a one-time or final assignment. Reflection activities may include talking, writing or other means, and may be individual, group-based, or both.
- Evaluation: assessment of student learning and community impact has been planned. This could consist of asking the CCEL to survey the community partner and students, or could be instructor-designed assessment activities.

\*Definitions and parameters are taken and modified from University of Massachusetts Amherst Office of Civic Engagement & Service Learning (<http://cesl.umass.edu/>).



Curriculum review (from both CAR and CCG)

What do GAB members expect to review? What do we expect college curriculum committees, Deans, Registrar's Office, or others to review?

<b>Element from CAR</b>	Other levels of review (Who?)	UAB/GAB review
School/College		
Division		
Department		
Course prefix		
Course #		
Previous course prefix/#		
Credits		
Contact hours		
Course title		
Abbreviated title		
Type of course		
Type of action		
Repeat status		
Grading basis		
Implementation date		
Crosslisted/stacked with		
Impacted courses/programs		
Initiator name		
Faculty coordination		
Library liaison coordination		
GER		
Course description		
Course prerequisites		
Course corequisites		
Other restrictions		
Registration restrictions		
Fees		
Selected topics course		
Justification for action		
<b>Element from CCG</b>		
Date of initiation/change		
Grading basis		
Course level justification		
Instructional goals		
Student learning outcomes		
Guidelines for evaluation or assessment methods		
Topical course outline		
Suggested texts		
Bibliography		

Program Review (from PAR and additional)

<b>Element from PAR</b>	College committee review	UAB/GAB review
School/college		
Department		
Complete program title/prefix		
Undergrad/grad program		
Gainful employment program		
Type of action		
Implementation date		
Coordination with affected units		
Initiator name		
Faculty coordination		
Library coordination		
Justification for action		
<b>Elements from other sources</b>		
Cover memo		
Dept name/contact info		
Degree/certificate program name/desc		
Overview & career information		
Student learning outcomes		Reviewed by AAC
Honors status		
Accreditation information		
Research possibilities		
Gainful employment statement		
Admission requirements		
Advising		
Academic progress requirements		
General university graduation requirements		
GERs		
College graduation requirements		
Major degree requirements		
Other graduation requirements		
Faculty		

Other considerations?

## **Curriculum handbook: The Expurgated Version (Stacked courses references)**

### 2.1.2 Academic Considerations Addressed in Review

The faculty member initiating the curriculum action should be prepared to address the following and any other appropriate issues that members of the curriculum review committees may ask when the curriculum action is presented to the appropriate boards/committees at each level of review.

- A. Academic considerations for a new course proposal:
  - v. Justification for stacking or cross listing

### Section 9 - Step-By-Step Instructions for the Course Content Guide

When developing a new course the CCG should be developed first. Considerations are: level, title, goals and student learning outcomes, content, and bibliography. This information is then transferred to the CAR. The Course Content Guide should provide a concise description of the course. Topical areas, instructional goals and student learning outcomes should be clearly related to each other. It is recommended that the CCG contain five or fewer pages. While there is not a standard template for the CCG, current CARs and CCGs can be found at <http://curric.uaa.alaska.edu/curric/courses/>.

#### I. Stacking (if applicable)

- i. Stacked courses are courses from the same prefix but at different levels offered at the same time and location.
- ii. Existing and new courses may not be stacked unless approved as stacked courses by UAB/GAB.
- iii. Courses may not be stacked informally for scheduling purposes.
- iv. The course description and course content guide of a stacked course must clearly articulate the difference in experience, performance and evaluation of students at different levels, including graduate students vs. undergraduate students.
- v. Courses that are at the 500 level may not be stacked with any other course.
- vi. If stacking status is requested, rationale must be provided.
- vii. Courses at the 300 level may not be stacked with 600-level courses.

All graduate-level courses must meet certain criteria established by the GAB. In addition, when 400-level courses are stacked with 600-level courses, the faculty initiator must consider the impact of stacking the course on the graduate student experience and how that affects the criteria for 600-level courses. If a graduate-level course is stacked with a 400-level course, or if undergraduate students are taking the course as part of their baccalaureate degree, the justification must clearly describe how the quality of the graduate students' experience will be maintained in a mixed-level classroom.

The following guidelines may assist in determining whether a course is suitable for stacking according to graduate criteria:

- i. Do the prerequisites (not registration restrictions) differ for the 400- vs. 600-level versions of the course?

It is difficult to justify stacked courses in which the graduates and undergraduates have a significantly different knowledge base relevant to the course material. If the knowledge is required for the course, the prerequisites must be comparable. If the knowledge is only required for extra coursework performed by the graduate students, this difference should be stated explicitly and addressed in the instructional goals, student learning outcomes and course activities sections of the CCG.

ii. Is the course format predominantly discussion- or seminar-based?

This type of course is not likely to be suitable for stacking, as the discussion level/theoretical base can differ significantly between graduate and undergraduate students. In addition, the ratio between undergraduate and graduate students should be addressed. Courses that are evenly divided may provide a more balanced environment than a course in which only one or two graduate students are present.

iii. Is the course format predominantly lecture-based? (Is the main intent of the course to provide a detailed knowledge set?)

a. Is the PRIMARY source of information/reading the primary research literature of the field?

This course is not likely to be suitable for stacking, as undergraduate students generally lack the knowledge base and experience to derive all information from the primary literature.

b. Is the PRIMARY source of information/reading material derived from textbooks or other less-specialized literature?

This course is likely to be suitable for stacking. However, the performance expectations for graduate students should be explicitly defined, with special emphasis on how these expectations differ from the 400-level students.

Some suggested student learning outcomes/assessments that may be appropriate for 600-level students in a stacked course:

- i. Extra reading assignments based in the primary research literature, evaluated via written critical reviews and/or oral presentations
- ii. Extra writing assignments that evince ability to synthesize research fields (comprehensive scholarly reviews or synthesis of other disciplinary areas with the course material)
- iii. Assignments to measure the ability of graduate students to integrate course material into experimental design, such as writing formal research grant proposals, or oral or written presentation of how the course material informs the student's own thesis research
- iv. Separate exams for graduate students that measure not only comprehension of the lecture material but the ability to integrate and apply the material at more advanced levels, such as hypothesis formulation and experimental design, or the ability to interpret raw research data
- v. Teaching experiences, in which graduate students instruct undergraduates, lead discussion groups or present analysis of primary research, offer another context in which graduate students may demonstrate and more advanced knowledge and be assessed accordingly.

As a result of completing this course, students will be able to:

## Student Learning Outcomes

Typical Assessments	
demonstrate the ability to conduct a literature search on the course topic material	written critical reviews and/or oral presentation of literature reviews
Synthesize research fields	comprehensive scholarly reviews or synthesis of other disciplinary areas with the course material produced by the student
Integrate course material into experimental design	Written formal research grant proposals, oral or written presentation of the how the course material informs the student's own thesis research
Integrate and apply the course material at advanced levels	Exams requiring students to formulate hypothesis, design experiments, or interpret raw research data
Instruct undergraduates, lead discussion groups, or otherwise present the course material to other audiences.	Observed teaching exercises, teaching evaluations, performance of their students on examinations

## Section 10 - Step-By-Step Instructions for the Course Action Request

### Box 12. Cross-Listed or Stacked

#### 2. Stacked

- A. Stacked courses are courses from the same prefix but at different levels offered at the same time and location.
  - B. Existing and new courses may not be stacked unless approved as stacked courses by UAB/GAB.
  - C. Courses may not be stacked informally for scheduling purposes.
  - D. The course description and course content guide of a stacked course must clearly articulate the difference in experience, performance, and evaluation of students at different levels, including graduate students vs. undergraduate students.
  - E. Courses at the 300 level may not be stacked with 600-level courses.
  - F. A500-A599 level (professional development) courses may not be stacked with any other course
  - G. If stacking status is requested, rationale must be provided.
- If the graduate-level course is stacked with a 400-level course, or if undergraduate students are taking the course as part of their baccalaureate degree, the justification must clearly describe how the quality of the graduate students' experience will be maintained in a mixed-level classroom. (See Section 9 for guidance on the CCG.)