

# Memorandum

**To:** General Faculty  
**Date:** November 7, 2011  
**Regarding:** Agenda, Faculty Senate Meeting, November 11<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 pm TLC 1-303

The agenda for the November 11, 2011 Faculty Senate Meeting will be as follows:

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of the minutes of the October 14<sup>th</sup> meeting ([See Addendum I](#))
4. Committee Reports

## **Committee I: Undergraduate Programs Committee (Chair, Dr. Camilla Gant)**

### **Action Items: ([See Addendum II](#))**

- A) College of Arts and Humanities
- 1) Foreign Languages and Literatures
    - a) Minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved  
Recommend that an approved list of elective courses is submitted, including specific titles for Special Topics. This process will ensure that students receive credit for approved courses without the inconvenience of securing petitions; and will serve as a record that specific programs have approved their course(s) to support the minor, i.e., agree to provide seats for the minor, particularly if programs have major restrictions.
- B) College of Education
- 1) Department of Leadership and Applied Instruction
    - a) Post-baccalaureate initial Certification in Middle Grades Education  
Request: Deactivate  
Action: Approved  
Rationale: Market demand is for candidates not only for a candidate with certification, but with a Master of Education degree and more content specialization than the middle-degree certification alone provides. Students will be encouraged to pursue the UWG MAT in Secondary Education in lieu of this degree. This action will accomplish both of the above goals.

## Information Items:

- A) Proposal for creating the XIDS Subcommittee ([See Addendum III](#))
  
- B) College of Sciences and Mathematics
  - 1) Department of Biology
    - a) Bachelor of Science with a Major in Biology  
Request: Modify  
Action: Approved
  
- C) College of Social Sciences
  - 1) Department of Mass Communications
    - a) COMM 4421N – Practicum - *The West Georgian*  
Request: Modify (title, credit, description, prerequisite)  
Action: Approved
  
    - b) COMM 4421P – Practicum - Student-Managed Public Relations Firm  
Request: Modify (title, credit, description, prerequisite)  
Action: Approved
  
    - c) COMM 4421R – Practicum – The WOLF Internet Radio  
Request: Modify (title, credit, description, prerequisite)  
Action: Approved
  
    - d) COMM 4421T – Practicum – UTV13  
Request: Modify (title, credit, description, prerequisite)  
Action: Approved
  
- B) Richards College of Business
  - 1) Department of Marketing and Real Estate
    - a) Bachelor of Business Administration with a Major in Marketing (Add MKTG 4861 to marketing minor for non-business majors)  
Request: Modify  
Action: Approved
  
- D) School of Nursing
  - a) NURS 2101 - Pathophysiology and Pharmacology I  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
  
  - b) NURS 2102 - Pathophysiology and Pharmacology II  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
  
  - c) NURS 3000 - Holistic Health Assessment  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved

- d) NURS 3101 - Professional Nursing Concepts I  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- e) NURS 3102 - Professional Nursing Concepts II  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- f) NURS 3201 - Health Care of the Client I  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- g) NURS 3202 - Health Care of the Client II  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- h) NURS 3301 - Clinical Practice I  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- i) NURS 3302 - Clinical Practice II  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved
- j) NURS 3400 - Nursing Research and Evidence-Based Practice  
Request: Add (review attachment)  
Action: Approved

**Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Chair, Susan Ashford)**

**Action Item:**

- A) Academic Standards for Graduate Programs ([See Addendum IV](#))
- B) Time Limits to Complete a Graduate degree

**Revised Policy**

**Time Limits to Complete A Graduate Degree**

It is expected that a student will complete the degree program with reasonable continuity.

- Degree programs in the College of Education must be completed within seven years.
- The Ph.D. in Psychology: Consciousness and Society program must be completed within eight years.
- All other graduate degree programs must be completed within six years.

A student called into military service or a student with extraordinary circumstances may apply for an extension of time. The student should submit the [Degree Time Limit Extension Form](#) and a letter of appeal to the director of his or her graduate degree program. The time

limit exception must be approved by both the Program Director and Director of Graduate Studies in the college or school.

[[Make the Degree Time Limit Extension Form an active link that takes the reader to the form](#)].

~~From Graduate Catalog:~~

~~In any graduate program, except education, all work (including the comprehensive examinations) must be completed within a six year period. For degree programs in education, all work must be completed within seven years. It is expected that students will complete the program with reasonable continuity. Students called into military services or students with other extraordinary circumstances may apply for an extension of time.~~

C) College of Education ([See Addendum V](#))

1) COE Doctoral

a) Program: Doctor of Education with a Major in School Improvement

Request: Modify

Action: Approved

b) EDSI-9923 Leadership for Diversity in the 21st Century

Request: Add

Action: Approved

c) EDSI-9925 Policy Analysis for School Improvement

Request: Add

Action: Approved

d) EDSI-9933 Leadership for Change

Request: Add

Action: Approved

e) EDSI-9963 Action Research for Change I

Request: Add

Action: Approved

f) EDSI-9964 Action Research II

Request: Add

Action: Approved

g) EDSI-9998 Research for Doctoral Dissertation

Request: Add

Action: Approved

h) EDSI-9942 Instructional Leadership that Facilitates School Improvement

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- i) EDSI-9943 Models of Professional Development  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
  
- 2) Department of Leadership and Applied Instruction
  - a) SEED 7288 - Teaching Internship  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
  
- D) College of Social Sciences
  - 1) Department of Psychology
    - a) Doctor of Philosophy with a Major in Psychology: Consciousness and Society  
Request: Modify (Modify time to complete)  
Action: Approved
  
    - b) PSYC-8007 Foundations of Critical Psychology  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
  
  - 2) Department of Sociology
    - a) Program: Master of Arts with a Major in Sociology  
Request: Modify  
Action: Approved
  
    - b) SOCI-5132 Human Life Cycle and Cross-Cultures  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
  
    - c) SOCI-5153 Women and Aging  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
  
    - d) SOCI-5182 Aging Families  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
  
    - e) SOCI-5203 Women in American Society  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
  
    - f) SOCI-5204 Women in American Society  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
  
    - g) SOCI-5513 Comparative Social Psychology  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved

- h) SOCI-5913 Sociology of Everyday Life  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
- i) SOCI-6241 Legal Theories  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
- j) SOCI-6250 The Color of Justice  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved
- k) SOCI-6342 Crisis Intervention  
Request: Delete  
Action: Approved

#### **Committee IV: Academic Policies Committee (Chair, Robert Kilpatrick)**

##### **Action Items:**

- A) The Academic Policies Committee requests that the Faculty Senate approve the following modifications to the language on Transient Student Status in the Undergraduate Catalog.

##### **Current Transient Student Status language:**

Students wishing to attend another college or university and take courses there to count towards their degree at West Georgia must have a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 or higher at West Georgia and must obtain permission of the dean of their major college. Students desiring to be transients elsewhere should also consult with their advisor and, if appropriate, the chair of their department. Transient status is given for one semester at a time, and the student must have the other college send a transcript of the courses taken to the Registrar at West Georgia in order to receive credit for the work.

##### **Proposed New Transient language:**

Students wishing to complete classes at another college or university to count towards their degree at West Georgia must maintain good standing at West Georgia. Prior to taking the course(s), students must complete a [Transient Status Permission Form](#), which includes the signatures of their advisor, the chair of the department in which the credit shall be granted, and the dean/designee of their major college. It is each student's responsibility to consult the [Undergraduate Transfer Course Equivalents link](#), or contact the Registrar's Office to determine if the course will be accepted as transfer credit at UWG and count toward a given degree. Transient status is given for one semester at a time, and students must have the other college send a transcript of the courses taken to the Registrar at West Georgia in order to receive credit for the work. For final term transient status restrictions, see [Graduation Policies](#) in the [Undergraduate Catalog](#).

- B) The Academic Policies Committee requests that the Faculty Senate approve two new 200-minute time slots to be available beginning in the Fall 2012 semester. These slots would also be available for shorter class periods.
  - a. Fridays, 9-12:20
  - b. Fridays, 1-4:20
- C) The Academic Policies Committee requests that the Faculty Senate approve a new External Researcher Policy ([See Addendum VI](#))

**Committee V: Faculty Development Committee (Chair, Gary Schmidt)**

**Action Item:**

- A) The committee request that the Faculty Handbook Section 104.04 (Evaluation of Academic Deans) be replaced ([See Addendum VII](#))
- B) The committee requests that the Faculty Handbook Sections 103.01 to 103.05 (Tenure and Promotion) be replaced ([See Addendum VIII](#)). In addition, the current 103.06 should be deleted up to the beginning of 103.06.01.

**Information Item:**

- A) The Provost has announced that funding for the LRC Faculty Research grants was cut in Spring 2011 and that these grants will not be offered this year. In response, the Faculty Development Committee has requested information from the colleges, the library, and the School of Nursing regarding past grant recipients and scholarly/creative work that resulted from those grants to assess the impact upon the institution of cancelling the grants.

5. New Business

- A) Request for Faculty Senate feedback upon and then endorsement of the white paper developed by the UWG Online Degrees Task Force ([See Addendum IX](#)).

6. Announcements

7. Adjournment

# **Addendum I**

**University of West Georgia  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes—Draft**

**October 14, 2011**

1. The meeting was convened in room 1-303 of the Technology-enhanced Learning Center and called to order by Chair Chris Huff.
2. Roll Call

*Present*

Ashford, Barnhart, Blair, Ogletree (substitute for Bucholz), Chesnut, Cox, Deng, DeNie, Doyle, Gant, Gezon, Halonen-Rollins, Hannaford, Hansen, Hatfield, Hodges, Jenks, Johnson, Johnson, Kassis, Kilpatrick, Kramer, Leach, Mayer, Mitchell, Moffeit, Noori, Packard, Parrish, Penco, Pitzulo, Ponder, Pope, Ringlaben, Rutledge, Sanders, Schmidt, Smith, Thomas, Thompson, Williard,

*Absent*

Banford, Hasbun, Lloyd, Morris, Samples, Snaith, Yeong.

3. Approval of the minutes of the September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting

*With no objection voiced, the minutes were approved by unanimous consent.*

4. Committee Reports

**Committee I: Undergraduate Programs Committee (Chair, Dr. Camilla Gant)**

**Action Items:**

- A) College of Arts and Humanities
  - 1) History Department
    - a) Classical Studies Minor  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, the item was approved by unanimous consent.*

- B) College of Sciences and Mathematics
  - a) CHEM 1211- Principles of Chemistry I  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
  - b) CHEM 1211L – Principles of Chemistry I Lab

Request: Add  
Action: Approved

- c) CHEM 1212- Principles of Chemistry II  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- d) CHEM 1212L – Principles of Chemistry II Lab  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved

*Item B.a-d were changed to information items because they are course modifications that do not require senate action.*

- C) College of Social Sciences
  - 1) Anthropology Department
    - a) ANTH 3110 – Human Osteology  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, the item was approved by unanimous consent.*

- 2) Sociology Department
  - a) Bachelor of Science with a Major in Sociology  
Request: Modify – Delete Pre-major criteria  
Action: Approved
  - b) Bachelor of Science with a Major in Sociology  
Request: Modify – Require minimum grade of “C” for required courses  
Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, items C.2.a-b were approved by unanimous consent.*

**Information Items:**

- A) College of Arts and Humanities
  - 1) English Department
    - a) ENGL 2180 – African American Literature  
Request: Modify title  
Action: Approved
    - b) ENGL 2190 – Literature by Women  
Request: Modify title  
Action: Approved
    - c) ENGL 3200 – Intermediate Creative Writing

Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

d) ENGL 4170 – Studies in African – American Literature  
Request: Modify title  
Action: Approved

e) ENGL 4210 – Advance Creative Writing  
Request: Modify title (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

2) History Department

a) HIST 4467 – Women in American History to 1877  
Request: Modify (title, prerequisite, description)  
Action: Approved

b) HIST 4468 – Women in American History Since 1877  
Request: Modify (title, prerequisite, description)  
Action: Approved

B) College of Sciences and Mathematics

a) CHEM 2411- Organic Chemistry I  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

b) CHEM 3310K – Analytical Chemistry  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

c) CHEM 3510 – Survey of Physical Chemistry  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

d) CHEM 3521 – Quantum Chemistry  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

e) CHEM 3522 – Chemical Thermodynamics  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

f) CHEM 4330K – Instrumental Analysis  
Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

g) CHEM 4711 - Biochemistry

Request: Modify (prerequisite)  
Action: Approved

C) College of Social Sciences

1) Criminology Department

a) CRIM 3240 – Criminological Theory

Request: Modify (prerequisite, description)

Action: Approved

**Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Chair, Susan Ashford)**

**Action Items:**

A) College of Sciences and Mathematics

1) Department of Mathematics

a) Master of Science with a Major in Mathematics

Request: Modify (Change in course requirements)

Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, the item was approved by unanimous consent.*

b) Request: Modify (Remove language requirement)

Action: Approved

*[Items A.1.b, A.2.a, and A.3.a considered together. Action results follow A.3.a.]*

2) Department of Computer Science

a) Master of Science with a Major in Applied Computer Science

Request: Modify (Delete language requirements)

Action: Approved

3) Department of Biology

a) Master of Science with a Major in Biology

Request: Modify (Delete language requirements)

Action: Approved

*Items A.1.b, A.2.a, and A.3.a were approved by voice vote following a discussion on the deletion of language requirements.*

4) Department of Geosciences

a) Geographic Information Systems (CERG)

Request: Modify (Change in course requirements for Post-Baccalaureate Certificate)

Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, item A.4.a was approved by unanimous consent.*

B) College of Social Sciences

1) Psychology Department

- a) Doctor of Philosophy with a Major in Psychology: Consciousness and Society

Request: Modify (Modify time to complete)

Action: Approved

- b) Request: Modify (Changes in response to BOR – catalog description)

Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, items B.1.a-b were approved by unanimous consent.*

C) College of Education

1) Early Learning and Childhood Education

- a) K-5 Mathematics Endorsement - Conversion College

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- b) K-5 Mathematics Endorsement

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- c) K-5 Science Endorsement

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- d) EDME-7271 Elementary Mathematics I

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- e) EDME-7271L Elementary Mathematics I Lab

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- f) EDME-7272 Elementary Mathematics II

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- g) EDME-7272L Elementary Mathematics II Lab

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- h) EDME-7273 Advanced Strategies for Teaching Elementary Mathematics

Request: Add

Action: Approved

- i) EDME-7273L Advanced Strategies for Teaching Elementary Mathematics Lab  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- j) EDME-7274 K-5 Mathematics Endorsement Residency  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- k) EDSE-7271 Life Science For In-Service Elementary Teachers  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- l) EDSE-7272 Physical Science for In-Service Elementary Teachers  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- m) EDSE-7273 Earth and Space Science for In-Service Elementary Teachers  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved
- n) EDSE-7274 Pedagogical Strategies & Residency Requirement for Inquiry-Based Elementary Science Instruction  
Request: Add  
Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, items C.1.a-n were approved by unanimous consent.*

- 2) Leadership and Applied Instruction
  - a) Master of Education with a Major in Secondary Education  
Request: Modify (Placement of “concentration” on the candidate’s transcript)  
Action: Approved

*With no objection voiced, items C.2.a were approved by unanimous consent.*

### **Information Items**

- A) College of Arts and Humanities
  - 1) History Department
    - a) HIST-5467 Women in American History to 1877  
Request: Modify (redesigned/adjusted chronology)  
Action: Approved
    - a) HIST-5468 Women in American History Since 1877

Request: Modify (redesigned/adjusted chronology)  
Action: Approved

**Committee IV: Academic Policies Committee (Chair, Robert Kilpatrick)**

**Action Items:**

- A) The committee requests approval of changes to UWG's grade appeals policies. (See Appendix I)

*With editorial changes and the addition of the Library to the appeals process as intended by the spirit of the motion, the motion was approved by voice vote.*

- B) The committee requests approval of changes to language regarding transient student status in the Undergraduate Catalog.

The Academic Policies Committee requests approval for the following changes to UWG's transient student policy.

**New Transient language for UG catalog is highlighted:**

Students wishing to complete classes at another college or university to count towards their degree at West Georgia must maintain good standing at West Georgia and obtain the permission of their advisor, the appropriate chair, and the dean/designee of their major college prior to taking the course(s). To determine if the course will be accepted as transfer credit at UWG and count toward a given degree, students should consult the link found on the Registrar's Office web page, Undergraduate Transfer Course Equivalents, or contact the Registrar's Office. Transient status is given for one semester at a time, and students must have the other college send a transcript of the courses taken to the Registrar at West Georgia in order to receive credit for the work. For final term transient status restrictions, see Graduation Policies in the Undergraduate Catalog.

*A question was raised as to why the Dean must sign this form if chairs have now approved this. A secondary motion was made and withdrawn to strike the requirement of acquiring the dean's signature. A request was made for a clarification of what is meant by appropriate chair. A concern was expressed that this a needlessly onerous process for the student.*

*The motion was sent back to committee in order to consider concerns and to revise language.*

- C) The committee request approval of new Friday 150-minute class time slots for Spring 2012 only.

**Motion:**

The Academic Policies Committee requests approval of two new time slots on a one-semester trial basis for Spring 2012 scheduling: 1) Friday from 9:00 am - 11:30 am 2) Friday from 1:00 pm - 3:30 pm.

*The motion was approved by voice vote.*

*Committee has been asked to consider some additional time slots.*

**Committee IV: Strategic Planning Committee (Chair, Tommy Cox)**

**Information Items:**

- A) Progress report on the Strategic Planning Committee work. Based on the Strategic Planning committee's duties, the following three sub-committees have been created:
- 1) Assessment/re-statement of the University's Mission and Vision Statements
  - 2) The new QEP (improving undergraduate student writing)
  - 3) SACS Assessment/compliance

**Committee IX: Facilities and Services Committee (Chair, Shelley Smith)**

**Action Item:** (See Appendix II)

- A) University Services Committee recommends to the Faculty Senate the approval of Volunteer Policy (revised September 12, 2011).

*The motion was approved by voice vote.*

**Information Item:**

- A) Jon Anderson reported on an upcoming space utilization study and the possibility of Newnan Campus expansion.
5. New Business
  6. Announcements
  7. Meeting was adjourned at 4:20.

Respectively submitted,

Dawn Harmon McCord  
Executive Secretary of the Faculty  
Senate and General Faculty

# Appendix I

# 207 Academic Honesty/Dishonesty

## Academic Honor at West Georgia

Academic honesty is essential in preserving one's own integrity, the integrity of the institution, and in gaining a true education. The UWG Honor Code states that “we believe that academic and personal integrity are based upon honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.” The code further states that UWG students assume responsibility for upholding the honor code and that they “pledge to refrain from engaging in acts that do not maintain academic and personal integrity. These include, but are not limited to, plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, aid of academic dishonesty, lying, bribery or threats, and stealing.”

Just as complete honesty should be the Professor's standard in his or her presentation of material, this same standard should be demanded from students when they complete assignments (For example, tests, reports, projects, and term papers). Every professor has the responsibility to inculcate in students the ideal of academic honesty and to take all practical precautions against its violation.

Academic dishonesty on the part of the student shall be interpreted to mean cheating, i.e., the obtaining and using of information during an examination by means other than those permitted by the instructor, including the supplying of such information to other students. Academic dishonesty shall also include plagiarism, i.e., the purchase and use of ghost-written papers and reports, or excessive collaboration (incorporating into a report, term theme, research paper, or project, ideas and information obtained from another person without giving credit to the person from whom such information was obtained). Further, inclusion of the published or unpublished writings of another person without duly noting these sources according to normal scholarly procedures shall be considered plagiarism. No material prepared to meet the requirements in one course may be used to fulfill the requirements in another without permission of the instructor. The above definition of academic dishonesty applies equally to improper use of electronic devices and electronic sources of information and opinion (e.g. online translators).

All faculty members should promote academic honesty, not only through their own standards of scholarly conduct, but also by anticipating conditions which may lead to dishonesty on the student's part. Suspicion is not a sound basis for a healthy educational environment, and the professor must judge those instances where his or her trust will encourage responsibility rather than cheating.

**Specific ways in which dishonesty may be discouraged include:**

1. Testing in such a way that cheating is difficult. This may be enhanced by avoiding purely objective tests. Professors should also monitor the classroom during testing. Allowing only school or departmental secretaries to type and duplicate tests. Allowing student assistants to handle testing materials sometimes places them in a compromising position where students intent on cheating exert pressures to supply advance information.
2. Safeguarding tests until the time they are to be administered. Tests should never be left in an unlocked office.
3. Grading of major tests, papers, and final examinations should be done by the professor or designated graduate teaching assistants.
4. Discouraging term papers, research papers, or projects which are merely a re-statement of printed material. Personal interpretation and evaluation should be required.
5. Designing paper assignments in such a way that completion can only be accomplished satisfactorily by reference to material specific to the course.
6. Adequately preparing students to the proper method of adapting source material.
7. Conducting private conferences both before and after written reports are made to insure that the student understands proper procedures and to evaluate the student's assimilation of material.

In cases of obvious or suspected dishonesty, the professor shall confront the student with the evidence and determine and enforce the penalty if a penalty is warranted. The student or the professor has the right to have another faculty member present when the discussion about obvious or suspected dishonesty takes place. The outcome may consist of a change in grade which can range from the lowering of a grade for a particular class project or test to failure for the course. The student may appeal this action to the department chair and through regular administration channels to the Grade Appeals Subcommittee of the Academic Policies and Procedures Committee (please see Section 208 of the Faculty Handbook).

## **208 Procedures Governing the Appointment and Functioning of the Appeals Subcommittee of the Academic Policies Committee**

### **208.01 Confidentiality**

Due to the sensitive nature of any appeals hearing, confidentiality will be respected in a manner consistent with relevant state law and University System of Georgia policy.

### **208.02 Timetable for All Academic Appeals**

All academic appeals, regardless of their nature, shall be initiated no later than the end of the semester following the assignment of the grade.

### **208.03 Academic Based Appeals**

There are two categories of academic appeals. Academic based appeals are defined as student appeals concerning (1) general appeals of merit for admission to the University, (Section 208.04) and (2) academic dishonesty and grade determination appeals. (Section 208.05) The following paragraphs identify the two University Subcommittees of the Academic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate established to hear such appeals and the general processes and procedures that should be followed. Given the variability and uniqueness of individual circumstances, the chairperson of a respective subcommittee may, in consultation with respective parties, suggest alternative actions/processes as issues present themselves.

### **208.04 The Subcommittee for General Appeals**

- A. **Comments.** After a student has petitioned the appropriate administrative officials in the Office of Admissions, he or she has the right to appeal (in writing with supporting evidence) an adverse decision by such officials in cases of (1) admission or (2) other similar matters.
- B. **Subcommittee Membership and Responsibilities.** The chairperson of this subcommittee, in consultation with the chairperson of the Academic Policies Committee, will be responsible for appointing members no later than May of each year. Membership on the subcommittee will run from summer semester through spring semester of the following year. The subcommittee will be comprised of at least three faculty members (one of which should be a member of the Academic Policies Committee), one University official, and one student. Faculty members will serve a term of two years, the University official and student representative will serve a one-year term. Committee members should not be reappointed for consecutive terms. The chairperson of the subcommittee will be responsible, in conjunction with the Office of Admissions, for distributing appropriate materials to committee members, for announcing in advance the time and place of each scheduled appeal(s) hearing, and will convey recommendations of the subcommittee to the Director of Admissions. Any three members of the subcommittee, at least two of which shall be Faculty, shall constitute a quorum.

### **208.05 The Subcommittee for Dishonesty Appeals and Grade Determination Appeals (Referred to below and in Section 207 of the Faculty Handbook as the Grade Appeals Subcommittee)**

- A. **Comments.** Students have the right to appeal a course grade. Grade appeals must be submitted in writing, using the UWG Student Grade Appeal Form available from the Provost's website and following the procedures outlined below.

#### **1. Initiation of Appeal**

Grade determination appeals (see definition in 3b below) must be made during the semester immediately following the semester in which the course grade is assigned. Appeals of grades assigned due to an allegation of Academic Dishonesty (see definition in 3a below) may be made as soon as a grade penalty on the grounds of academic dishonesty has been levied against a student.

## **2. Documentation Required for the Appeal**

A student must submit the form and any supporting paperwork to the Department Chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair, after consultation with the student and the faculty member, to determine whether grade appeal should be considered a Dishonesty Grade Appeal or a Grade Determination Appeal.

## **3. Definitions**

### **a. Dishonesty Grade Appeal.**

If the faculty member assigned the grade due to an allegation of cheating, plagiarism, or some other act of academic dishonesty and the student wishes to pursue the appeal, his or her case should be considered a Dishonesty Grade Appeal

### **b. Grade Determination Appeal.**

If the reasons underlying the appeal are based on policy disagreements or alleged charges of arbitrary or unfair treatment by the involved faculty member, the appeal should be considered a Grade Determination Appeal

## **4. Procedure:** Upon submission of an appeal, determination of the type of appeal, and after examination of the available evidence, the Chair should either grant the appeal and change the grade, or deny the appeal. If the appeal is denied, the Chair should advise the student as to his or her further options for appeal in the following order: the Dean's Office and then the Provost's Office for submission to the Grade Appeals Subcommittee.

In the case of denial of the appeal, at any level, the student may accept the decision and withdraw the appeal. If the student wishes to further appeal the Chair's decision or subsequent decisions at each level, the appeal and all related decisions and documentation is sent to the next level. The appeal is reviewed and a decision is rendered, either granting or denying the appeal. Final resolution (and recommended action/s) at any level is forwarded to the Provost's Office for information, review and any additional action. (For example, change of grade or further judicial sanctions.) Ultimately, final authority for all student appeals rests with the

president of the institution. (See Section 4.7.1 Student Appeals, BOR Manual.)

### **Grade Appeals Subcommittee Review Purpose:**

**a. Dishonesty Grade Appeals.** In cases where there are allegations of academic improprieties, it is assumed that these cases will be related to the classroom. It would be expected that a professor who has noted improprieties would have taken some form of corrective action. The purpose of the Grade Appeals Subcommittee in hearing this type of student complaint is (1) to determine if academic improprieties did take place and (2) to review the appropriateness of the faculty member's corrective action as it relates to final grade assignment-

**b. Grade Determination Appeals.** Educational institutions have the responsibility for evaluating students by standards and a grading system that is publicized and known to faculty and students. The responsibility for determining the grade of each student rests on the faculty member who has responsibility for teaching the course in which the student is enrolled.

Procedures should be established for students who feel unfairly treated by a faculty member in terms of final grade assignment. The purpose of the Grade Appeals Subcommittee hearing this type of student complaint is to review the totality of the student's performance in relationship to his or her final grade.

**5. Faculty Availability.** If a faculty member is permanently unavailable for a grade appeals hearing because he or she is no longer employed by the University, the Department Chair is responsible for the grade and will attend the hearings. In such a case, the Department Chair is acting in the stead of the faculty member who assigned the grade.

If a faculty member is temporarily unavailable, for example, on temporary leave, out of the country, or ill, and the outcome of the hearing *does not* affect a student's continued enrollment, financial aid, or graduation, the grade appeal hearing will be delayed until the faculty member returns.

However, if a faculty member is temporarily unavailable and the outcome of the hearing *does* affect a student's continued enrollment, financial aid, or graduation, the grade appeal hearing will not be delayed. Under such circumstances, the faculty member will be represented by his or her college Dean (or Dean's designee), rather than the department chair. The Chairperson of the Grade Appeals Subcommittee shall schedule an appropriately timed

hearing with the Dean or his or her designee. Given these circumstances, and in the event of finding for the involved student, the Dean or his or her designee is authorized to make the appropriate grade change or other remedies congruent with the appeal finding.

**B. Committee Membership.** Faculty membership of the Grade Appeals Subcommittee will be determined no later than May of each year by the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee, and shall consist of one representative from each college, one from the Library, and from the School of Nursing. In addition, the Chair of the Academic Policies Committee will appoint one additional University official and a student representative to serve. The length of service on this committee shall be for one full year starting with summer semester. Any five members of the subcommittee, at least three of whom are faculty, shall constitute a quorum. For Academic Dishonesty Appeals, the Chief Judicial Officer of the University will be invited to sit on the committee to ensure that all due process requirements are met.

**C. Fairness and Procedural Safeguards Governing Cases of Academic Dishonesty**

In order to guarantee fairness and proper procedural safeguards for all concerned, the subcommittee shall be guided by the following procedures:

1. The subcommittee will hear a case only if the student has exhausted all administrative remedies through the appropriate department chair and his or her college dean
2. The subcommittee chairperson will consult with both the faculty member and student concerning the hearing procedures, the time, date, and place of the hearing and will ensure relevant materials reach all parties in a timely fashion.
3. The burden of demonstrating a preponderance of evidence shall rest upon the officials or faculty member who originated an action against a student or assigned for cause a particular grade.
4. The student appearing before the committee shall have the right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice.
5. During the hearing the student shall have the opportunity to testify and to present evidence and witnesses on his or her behalf. He or she shall have opportunity to hear and question adverse witnesses. In no case shall the subcommittee consider statements against a student unless the student has been given an opportunity to rebut unfavorable inferences that might otherwise be drawn.
6. All matters upon which a decision will be based must be introduced at the proceeding before the subcommittee. Any conclusions drawn by the subcommittee shall be based solely upon such evidence.
7. In the absence of a transcript, an audio recording of the hearing shall be made.

8. Appellants who fail to appear after proper notice will have their cases heard in absentia.
9. The chairperson of the subcommittee will submit in writing conclusions and recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**D. Fairness and Procedural Safeguards Governing Grade Determination Appeals.**

In order to guarantee procedural fairness to both the student and the faculty member involved, the following procedures shall guide such hearings:

1. The subcommittee will hear the case only if the student has exhausted all administrative remedies through the appropriate department chair and his or her college dean.
2. The subcommittee chairperson will consult with both the faculty member and student concerning the hearing procedures, the time, date, and place of the hearing and will ensure relevant materials reach all parties in a timely fashion.
3. The burden of demonstrating a preponderance of evidence of arbitrary or unfair grading rests on the student. The student should realize such a charge is a serious one and refrain from taking capricious action.
4. Both the student and faculty member shall be given an opportunity to present his or her case and to refute the case presented by the other.
5. All matters upon which a recommendation will be based must be introduced during the hearing before the Subcommittee. Recommendations shall be based solely upon such evidence.
6. Appellants who fail to appear after proper notice will have their cases heard in absentia.
7. The chairperson of the subcommittee will submit in writing conclusions and recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

# Appendix II

## **University of West Georgia Policy on Volunteers**

The university benefits from the efforts of non-paid persons who contribute to the overall success of the institution. The Georgia Tort-Claims Act only extends liability coverage to non-paid agents if they are part of a structured volunteer program. Employing non-paid agents without a structured program represents an uninsured financial risk to both the university and the individual.

### **Purpose**

This purpose of this policy is to simultaneously protect the university and our non-paid persons by providing the structure required under the Georgia Tort-Claims Act.

### **Definitions**

*Community-service worker:* An individual who is referred by the court or by the student judicial process and ordered to perform work as part of a disciplinary sanction or restitution.

*Non-paid intern:* A person who works without pay to gain practical experience as part of an academic curriculum. In reference to this policy, an individual is only considered a non-paid intern if (1) he or she conducts university business, and (2) is not paid for this work.

*Non-paid person:* Any community-service worker, intern, or volunteer who works for or represents the university without monetary compensation.

*University business:* Activities which are endorsed by an individual's chain-of-command, and:

- Are defined in an individual's job description, or;
- Accomplish departmental objectives, or;
- Help support university or divisional missions, or;
- Contribute to efforts that are specifically identified by USG or the State of Georgia.

*University employee:* Any individual who performs work for, and receives a paycheck from, the university, including student assistants, graduate assistants, paid interns, and those who are enrolled in a contracted-employment program.

*Volunteer:* A person who voluntarily offers himself or herself for a service or undertaking without pay.

### **Text**

Departments are permitted to engage the services of non-paid persons (community service workers, volunteers, non-paid interns) for efforts provided the following conditions are met:

- The efforts of the non-paid person(s) will support or accomplish university business, and;
- The effort or work is coordinated or supervised by a university employee, and;
- The effort or work is in compliance with all applicable laws, codes, and regulations, including USG and UWG policies, and the Fair Labor Standards Act, and;
- The department/unit has notified Risk Management/EHS (RM/EHS) of the effort, and has complied with all requirements identified by RM/EHS.

Oversight of this policy is the responsibility of the Division of Business & Finance.

# **Addendum II**

## Program View Request (Read-Only)

## Originator

College of Arts and Humanities  
CollegeForeign Languages Department  
DepartmentSchmidt, Gary  
Originator

## Action

 Add   
  Modify   
  Deactivate   
  Terminate   
  Reactivate

## Modifications

| Program Name | Program Description | Degree Name | See Modification Details |
|--------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|
|--------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------------|

## Program Selection

College of Arts and Humanities  
CollegeForeign Languages Department  
DepartmentMinor in Gender and Sexuality Studies  
Program NameOn Campus  
Program LocationUndergraduate  
Degree Levelundergraduate minor  
Degree NameSummer 2011  
Effective Semester/Year

## Modification Details

(Max 4000 characters)

## Rationale

The proposed interdisciplinary program in Gender and Sexuality Studies will provide an academic forum for the examination of gender and sexuality in contemporary and historical global cultures. It aims to fill a gap at UWG in the

(Max 4000 characters)

## Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 50

## Comments

Please see attached program proposal, which includes learning outcomes and relevance to UWG Mission, COAH Mission, UWG Strategic Plan, and program requirements.

(Max 4000 characters)

## Document To Upload

Choose File    No file chosen

(e.g. syllabi, other supporting documentation)

## College Approvals

Felix Tweraser [APPROVED 2011-10-14]

Chair, Course Department

Denise Overfield [APPROVED 2011-10-14]

Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

## Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

## Other Approvals

Camilla Gant [APPROVED 2011-11-04]

Chair, Undergraduate Academic Programs Committee

## Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

## **Proposal for Minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies:**

**Submitted by the following faculty members of the College of Arts and Humanities, Fall Semester 2011:**

- Lynn Anderson
- John Blair
- Lisa Connell
- Muriel Cormican
- Lisa Crafton
- Eilis Crean
- Amy Cuomo
- Janet Donohoe
- Rebecca Harrison
- Emily Hipchen
- Aran MacKinnon
- Laura Miller
- Carrie Pitzulo
- Gary Schmidt
- Rita Tekippe

### **I. Program Title:**

Minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies

### **II. Rationale for Proposal**

The proposed interdisciplinary program in Gender and Sexuality Studies will provide an academic forum for the examination of gender and sexuality in contemporary and historical global cultures. It aims to fill a gap at UWG in the academic study not only of sexual diversity but also of masculinity and femininity as culturally and historically contingent

phenomena. As such, it has the potential to appeal to an increasingly diverse student population, including members of the GLBTQ community, who actively seek a comfortable, healthy, academic environment to examine and discuss issues relevant to their self-definition and everyday lives. The minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies also creates a broad and formalized academic forum for educating the entire student population and the greater Carrollton community about diversity in gender identity and sexual orientation.

The College of Arts and Humanities is home to a number of faculty members who are highly qualified in Gender and Sexuality Studies. The college and university have a unique opportunity to develop a niche in this area. Much of the important theoretical contributions to Gender and Sexuality Studies were undertaken by Humanities scholars who engaged in feminist literary analysis, global cultural studies, masculinity studies, film studies, queer theory, and GLBTQ studies. What almost all these scholars hold in common is their intense awareness of and interest in visual and linguistic sign systems. Human self-definitions, categories of identity, and the attribution of meaning are all mediated through deep semiotic structures that are reflected in but also interrogated by cultural productions in the Humanities and the discourses that examine these productions. The Humanities thus have a unique and crucial perspective to offer to the study of gender and sexuality in preparing students to think critically, to cultivate their imaginations, to understand divergent and contingent viewpoints, and to respect and understand cultural differences. In this regard, the proposed program follows the example of leading research universities such as Indiana University, The University of Chicago, Northwestern University, Washington University in St. Louis, and Vanderbilt University.

The creation of this new interdisciplinary minor requires no additional resource allocation at the current time because it makes use of existing faculty expertise in this area. It also makes use of existing institutional structures facilitating interdisciplinary study (e.g. the XIDS course designation). It offers the potential of attracting students who are interested in alternatives to traditional discipline-specific minors or who seek to supplement traditional disciplinary majors with a minor that offers immediate relevance to the understanding of themselves and others.

A minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies has the potential to enrich the educational experience of students in a variety of fields, both with COAH and in the greater UWG community. The program promotes an awareness and understanding of the diversity of human experience in global cultures that will benefit students seeking to enter a wide range of fields, including medical, educational, legal, and business-related professions. A number of majors offered at UWG either require a minor or offer it as an option. Programs requiring minors include Theater, Psychology, Political Science (B.A.), Mass Communications, History, and Studio Art. In addition, Anthropology, English, Geology, Geography, Philosophy, and Sociology allow minors as an option. Finally, programs in Economics, International Economic Affairs, Math, Political Science (B.S.), and Biology have enough electives built into their programs to allow students to pursue a minor.

### **III. Learning Outcomes**

Students will

1. Identify and describe how gendered and sexual codes are utilized in cultural texts.
2. Demonstrate the ability to use critical thinking skills to interrogate cultural assumptions regarding gender and sexuality.
3. Describe and evaluate, orally and in writing, the role of cultural differences on literary, cinematic, theatrical, and artistic portrayals of gender and sexuality.
4. Describe and evaluate, orally and in writing, contemporary attitudes and representations of gender and sexuality in a broader historical context.
5. Demonstrate an awareness of prevailing theories used to analyze gender and sexuality in the Humanities.
6. Analyze and evaluate, orally and in writing, gendered and sexual codes through a diverse set of lenses, including race, class, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.

### **IV. Contribution to University Mission**

The proposed minor in Gender and Sexuality conforms to the values outlined in the University Mission Statement in the following ways:

- The content and methodology is “grounded in a strong liberal arts curriculum,” being drawn from the disciplinary areas of the College of Arts and Humanities and open to further inclusion from departments in other colleges.
- The program’s emphasis on the identity-formative elements of gender and sexuality, the importance of intercultural analysis, and respect for human diversity bring to the students and community “broad knowledge and foster critical understanding needed for intellectual growth, personal and social responsibility, cultural and global literacy and lifelong learning” and promote the “[a]ffirmation of the equal dignity of each person by valuing cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in students, faculty, and staff.”
- The learning outcomes of the program, which emphasize oral and written communication and the application of analytic methodologies grounded in the Humanities to contemporary social issues “foster the development of effectiveness in communication, critical and independent thinking, problem solving” and nurture “practices that embody the ideals of an open democratic society and that cultivate an environment of collegiality.”

#### **IV. Contribution to UWG Strategic Plan**

- **Academic Programs Balancing Liberal Arts with Professional Preparation:** Through the study of diversity in gender and sexuality students will be better prepared to interact with diverse coworkers and clients, demonstrating greater sensitivity and respect. Further, the intercultural emphasis of the program prepares “students to be ethically responsible and civically engaged professionals in the global economy of the 21<sup>st</sup> century” (Goal 1).
- **A Campus that is Safe, Engaging, and Exciting:** An overall campus culture that recognizes the study of gender diversity and sexual diversity in official academic programs sends a message of respect and inclusion that promotes, for example, the safety of students from the GLBTQ community, and offers this community more opportunities for meaningful engagement with the broader university.

- **Meaningful Engagement with Off-campus Communities:** As mentioned above, an important aim of the program is to create an environment in which faculty, staff, and students can better educate the off-campus community in issues of gender and sexuality.

**V. Contribution to Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP):** The emphasis on advanced writing skills in Learning Outcomes 3, 4, and 6 contributes to the improvement of undergraduate writing that is the goal of the QEP.

**VI. Contribution to College of Arts and Humanities Mission:**

The proposed minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies supports all of the core values outlined in the “COAH Guiding Principles and Procedures.” However, it contributes in particular to the following:

- cultivating a rich, multi-faceted liberal arts curriculum;
- encouraging creative and scholarly collaboration across disciplinary boundaries;
- imparting the broad knowledge and fostering the critical understanding needed for intellectual growth, personal and social responsibility, cultural and global literacy and lifelong learning;
- emphasizing disciplinary rigor;
- fostering effectiveness in communication, critical and independent thinking, problem solving, and the use of information resources and technology;
- creating a learning community dedicated to instructional excellence in which close student-faculty interaction enhances both teaching and learning for a diverse and academically well-prepared student body;
- affirming the equal dignity of each person by valuing cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in students, faculty, and staff, thereby promoting practices that embody the ideals of an open democratic society.

**VII. Required Courses:**

The proposed minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies is interdisciplinary in that it requires students to complete coursework in multiple fields in the Humanities that apply an analytical framework from Gender Studies.

The minor requires 15 credit hours, of which no more than 6 hours can be at the 2000 level and of which at least 3 hours must be at the 4000 level. Required Course: XIDS 2100: Introduction to Gender Studies (3 hours)

Electives – 12 hours (four of these must be taken in AT LEAST two different disciplines).

Electives must be approved by the program director.

**Sample of Existing Courses that Potentially Fulfill Elective Requirement:**

ENGL 2190/4185: Studies in Literature by Women

ENGL 4385: Special Topics

XIDS 2100: Arts and Ideas

FORL 2300 - Topics in National Literatures

FORL 4185 - Topics in Lang and Literature

FREN 4785 - Special Topics in French

SPAN 4785 – Special Topics in Spanish

GRMN 4785 - Special Topics in German

FORL 3111 - World Film

FORL 4485 - Topics in National Film Traditions

THEA 4485 – Special Topics in Theater

HIST 4423 - Women & Gender in Ancient World

HIST 4467 - Women in American History to 1890

HIST 4468 - Women in American History Since 1890

HIST – Special topics?

PHIL 4130 – Feminist Philosophy

PHIL 4240 - Philosophy of Friendship/Love

Coursework outside the College of Arts and Humanities may be petitioned for credit towards the minor in Gender and Sexuality Studies as long as there is significant content and/or methodology related to the Humanities and/or Fine Arts.

Program View Request (Read-Only)

Originator

College of Education      Leadership and Applied Instruction      Butts, Frank  
 College      Department      Originator

Action

Add   Modify    Deactivate   Terminate   Reactivate

Modifications

Program Name   Program Description   Degree Name   See Modification Details

Program Selection

College of Education      Post-baccalaureate Initial Certification in Middle Grades Education  
 College      Program  
 Post-baccalaureate Initial Certification in Middle Grades Education      Location      Graduate  
 Program Name      Program Location      Degree Level  
 Non-degree initial Certification      Spring      2013  
 Degree Name      Effective Semester/Year

Modification Details

No new students to be admitted after fall, 2012.  
 (Max 4000 characters)

Rationale

Market demand is for candidates not only for a candidate with certification, but with a Master of Education degree and more content specialization than the middle-degree certification alone provides. Students will be encouraged to  
 (Max 4000 characters)

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
 Library Resources Need Enhancement  
 Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 14

Comments

(Max 4000 characters)

Document To Upload

Choose File   No file chosen  
 (e.g. syllabi, other supporting documentation)

College Approvals

Frank Butts   [APPROVED 2011-09-21]  
 Chair, Course Department  
 Dianne Hoff   [APPROVED 2011-10-08]  
 Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross Listing Approvals

N/A  
 Chair, Cross Listed Department  
 N/A  
 Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Camilla Gant   [APPROVED 2011-11-04]  
 Chair, Undergraduate Academic Programs Committee

Final Approval

Jon Anderson   [REQUIRED]  
 Chair, Faculty Senate

# **Addendum III**

**XIDS Core Review Committee recommendations to the Senate UPC regarding planning for the Senate/UPC XIDS Core Course Review Committee.** Consistent with the charge of the Vice President for Academic Affairs Office, and the restructuring of the University of West Georgia Faculty Senate, the XIDS Core Review Committee would like to recommend the following for consideration in framing the structures of a new XIDS Core Course Review Subcommittee of UPC.

**I Recommendations for continuity and consistency:**

1. That the new structure be analogous to the existing committee with expanded membership to reflect campus-wide representation.
2. That the new structure take advantage of institutional memory and the knowledge base of the current committee and its membership to ensure continuity and consistency with past practices.
3. That the new structure reflect the spirit and practice of the current committee through representation from the appropriate disciplines that support the extant range of XIDS course rubrics and with a membership that has a deep and abiding interest in supporting inter-disciplinary studies at UWG and, where possible a background in interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and scholarship.
4. That the new structure take advantage of the current framework and templates for new course proposals and iterations of extant courses template on the XIDS Course website to ensure continuity and consistency.

**II Recommendations for committee representation:**

- A. Two elected representatives from among disciplines which support the XIDS 2001/2002 rubric for Area B2 of the Core: What Do You Really Know About...?(one or two credit hour courses) such as content areas in the Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Sciences and Math.
- B. Two elected representatives from among the Arts and Humanities disciplines which support the XIDS 2100 Arts and Ideas rubric.
- C. Two elected representatives from among the Social Sciences disciplines which support the XIDS 2300 Social Sciences rubric.
- D. One representative from the College of Business.
- E. One representative from the College of Education.
- F. One representative from the College of Nursing.
- G. One representative from the Library.
- H. One appointed representative from the Senate UPC.
- I. The Director of the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies to remain as ex –officio member.
- J. That there be no more than one representative per academic department.

A further recommendation is to provide for continuity and institutional memory with the new structure by allowing for current members of the extant committee to continue to serve out their terms, and be replaced on a rolling election cycle; two to be replaced each year until the current complement of six members is replaced.

Respectfully submitted, Dr. Aran MacKinnon on behalf of the XIDS Core Review Subcommittee.

## **1. Oversight of XIDS Core Courses**

XIDS courses are an essential part of the Core Curriculum, as they meet and support University and College learning outcomes required in the Core. XIDS courses can be team-taught or taught by a single professor. The purpose is to offer, through special topics, an integrative learning experience that results in a new and enhanced academic perspective. Three XIDS courses in the Core are templates for creating a variety of new, topic-driven sections. These include in Core Area B2, XIDS 2001 and XIDS 2002 ('What do you really know about [special topics]?'; in Area C1, XIDS 2100 (Arts and Ideas Special Topics) and in Core Area E4, XIDS 2300 (Interdisciplinary Studies in the Social Sciences). For examples and further information, please see the XIDS Core website at: [http://www.westga.edu/xids/index\\_4036.php](http://www.westga.edu/xids/index_4036.php)

In order to ensure the integrity of these Core courses and to assist in the respective faculty members' responsibilities to comply with ensuring that the stated learning outcomes in the Core are articulated and met and assessment practices, it is essential that each new iteration of any template course be reviewed and approved by the XIDS Course Review Committee (soon to be a sub-committee of the Senate UPC).

The Center for IDS can help facilitate this process through the XIDS Core course template submission systems found at: [http://www.westga.edu/xids/index\\_4036.php](http://www.westga.edu/xids/index_4036.php)

Chairs and Deans are requested to help ensure these guidelines are followed for each department and each new iteration of a course where the syllabus and/or course instructor changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Aran MacKinnon

Director, Center for Interdisciplinary Studies

**1. Draft of proposals for Faculty Senate Interdisciplinary Programs Committee  
Faculty Senate Interdisciplinary Curriculum Review Committee are in process:**

**A. The Faculty Senate IDS Programs Committee**

Purpose: The IDS Committee serves the University of West Georgia, Faculty Senate and the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies by promoting and vetting IDS programs for recommendation to the structures of senate, and by formulating recommendations for policy concerning course offerings appropriate to IDS programs in conjunction with the IDS Curriculum Review Committee. The committee shall endeavor to encourage extensive interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary cooperation, especially team-taught courses, and to promote IDS programs while recognizing the curricular needs of more traditional programs and departments.

The committee sees Interdisciplinary Studies in broad terms, allowing for its intersection with service learning, international and overseas, as well as environmental, global, Africana, American, Canadian, classical, film, Latin-American, and women's studies. It envisions a common field of study that combines the visionary and exploratory with the pragmatic, and encourages self-reflexive and analytical methodologies that foster and promote ethical, empathic, cosmopolitan, trans-cultural and wide-ranging critical perspectives.

IDS serve the global community in a time of rapid change by helping to produce global citizens with increasingly necessary flexible skills and broad perspectives.

1. Operation: Advise on the coordination, development and oversight of IDS programs and act as a consultative and recommending body to faculty senate and the director of the center for IDS. To establish and coordinate firm and transparent processes for making recommendations for the appointment of IDS faculty program directors and for the development of new IDS programs.
2. Structure: The IDS committee shall consist of all of the directors/coordinators of the IDS major, minor and certificate programs plus one representative from each of the COSS, COSM, COAH, SON, COE and RCOB and one member of senate. The director of the center for IDS and a representative from the Provost's Office shall be ex-officio members. IDS directors shall continue to serve for the duration of their role as director, college and senate representatives shall serve for a limited consistent with the rules of the Faculty Senate.

**XIDS Curriculum Review Committee**

The XIDS Curriculum Committee serves the University of West Georgia and the Center for Interdisciplinary Studies by promoting and vetting XIDS courses, and by formulating policy concerning XIDS course offerings. The committee shall endeavor to encourage extensive

interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary cooperation, especially team-taught courses, and to promote XIDS programs while recognizing the curricular needs of more traditional programs and departments.

The committee sees Interdisciplinary Studies in broad terms, allowing for its intersection with service learning, international and overseas, as well as environmental, global, Africana, American, Canadian, classical, film, Latin-American and women's studies. It envisions a common field of study that combines the visionary and exploratory with the pragmatic, and encourages self-reflexive and analytical methodologies that foster and promote ethical, empathic, cosmopolitan, trans-cultural and wide-ranging critical perspectives.

XIDS serves the global community in a time of rapid change by helping to produce global citizens with increasingly necessary flexible skills and broad perspectives.

**Structure and formation:** This committee shall consist of eleven members elected by the faculty of each of the colleges with one each from the School of Nursing, the Richards College of Business, and the College of Education; and two each from the College of Math and Sciences, the College of Social Sciences, and the College of Arts and Humanities. These members should have a vital and enduring interest in interdisciplinary studies and will serve terms of three years. The chair shall be elected from within the committee and has a term of two years. The director of Interdisciplinary Studies may attend as a non-voting member.

# **Addendum IV**

## **ACADEMIC STANDARDS**

### **General Academic Standards**

Graduate students must maintain a cumulative grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher to remain in Good Academic Standing. The cumulative GPA of 3.0 also applies to undergraduate courses which are sometimes taken during a student's graduate program. Students must be in Good Academic Standing to be eligible for graduation and admission to Doctoral Candidacy.

### *GRADING SYSTEM*

The quality of work for most courses in a graduate program is indicated by the grades of A, B, C, and F. The quality of work for a dissertation, thesis, practicum, and/or internship is indicated by the grades of S (Satisfactory) and U (Unsatisfactory). The grade of IP (In Progress) is reserved for courses that require a continuation of work beyond the term for which the student enrolled in the course. IP is approved for dissertation and thesis hours and project courses.

Other grades which may be used in graduate programs include I (Incomplete), W (Withdrew without Penalty), WF (Withdrew, Failing), WM (Withdrew for Military Service), and V (Audited).

Grades of F, U, I, W, WF, WM, and V will not be accepted toward the program of study in any graduate program. Some departments and programs will not accept C's as part of a graduate plan of study. See the College, Department, or Program-Specific Academic Standards following the section on Academic Dismissal for additional information.

### *ACADEMIC STANDING*

Graduate students are expected to maintain Good Academic Standing as they progress toward completing their programs. Students will be evaluated each term on the basis of the cumulative GPA. The academic standing of graduate students is classified as follows:

1. Good Academic Standing
2. Academic Probation
3. Academic Suspension
4. Academic Dismissal

#### *Good Academic Standing*

Good Academic Standing is defined for graduate students as a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher.

#### *Academic Probation*

A student whose cumulative GPA drops below 3.0 will begin the next term on Academic Probation. A student must earn a term GPA of 3.0 or higher each term while on Academic Probation. One of three possible actions will be implemented for a student on Academic Probation at the end of each term of enrollment:

1. A student who earns a term GPA of 3.0 or higher and raises his or her cumulative GPA to 3.0 or higher will return to Good Academic Standing.

2. If a student's term GPA is 3.0 or higher, but the cumulative GPA remains below 3.0, he or she will remain on Academic Probation.
3. If a student earns a term GPA below 3.0 while on Academic Probation, regardless of the cumulative GPA, he or she will be suspended for one term.

### *Academic Suspension*

A student on Academic Probation who earns a term GPA below 3.0 will be suspended from the University for one term. One term is defined as the Fall, Spring, or Summer term. The Summer term includes all sessions; thus, a suspended student is required to sit out all sessions that comprise the Summer term.

The student on Academic Suspension is not guaranteed the opportunity to return to the University. The suspended student must apply for reinstatement to return to the University and program after the one term absence. Reinstatement criteria are established by the college or school which houses the student's graduate program and are listed in the Reinstatement Procedures section which follows the College, Department, or Program-Specific Standards section of this policy.

If a student's request for reinstatement is approved, the student returns to the University on Academic Probation. One of three possible actions will be implemented for a reinstated student on Academic Probation at the end of each term of enrollment:

1. A reinstated student who earns a term GPA of 3.0 or higher and raises his or her cumulative GPA to 3.0 or higher will return to Good Academic Standing.
2. If a reinstated student's term GPA is 3.0 or higher, but the cumulative GPA remains below 3.0, he or she will remain on Academic Probation.
3. If a reinstated student earns a term GPA below 3.0 while on Academic Probation, regardless of the cumulative GPA, he or she will be academically dismissed from the University.

### *Academic Dismissal*

If a student's application for reinstatement following a term suspension is denied by the college or school which houses the student's graduate program, the student will be academically dismissed from the University.

A reinstated student on Academic Probation who earns a term GPA below 3.0 will be academically dismissed from the University.

### **College, Department, or Program-Specific Academic Standards**

General Academic Standards apply to all graduate programs, which include both degree and certification programs. Some colleges/school, departments, or programs have additional and/or different academic standards which govern a student's progress toward program completion. Additional and/or different college/school, department, or program-specific academic standards are listed in this section.

### College of Arts and Humanities

Good Academic Standing for a student enrolled in a Non-Degree Initial Certification Program for teacher certification (Art, Foreign Languages, Music) is defined as a cumulative GPA of 2.7 or higher.

The following programs do not accept letter grades of C as part of a program of study in the College of Arts and Humanities. A student will be dismissed from the program if he or she earns two C's or one F.

- M.A. in English
- M.A. in History
- Certification in Museum Studies and Public History

### College of Education

Good Academic Standing for a student enrolled in a Non-Degree Initial Certification Program for teacher certification is defined as a cumulative GPA of 2.7 or higher.

A student will be dismissed from the following two programs if he or she earns two C's or one F.

- Ed.D. in School Improvement
- Ed.D. in Professional Counseling and Supervision

### College of Science and Mathematics

The following information applies to the M.S. in Applied Computer Science program.

1. Students earning a second grade of C or one F will be reviewed for dismissal.
2. Only one C in all courses can be applied toward the degree.
3. Students must complete:
  - a. CS 6910 (Project I) by earning a grade of "S"
  - b. CS 6920 (Project II) by earning a grade of "S" and participate in an exit interview with computer science graduate faculty

### College of Social Sciences

A student will be dismissed from the following programs if he or she earns two C's or one F.

- M.A. in Criminology
- M.A. in Psychology
- M.A. in Sociology
- Ph.D. in Psychology: Consciousness and Society

### Richards College of Business

No requirements beyond the General Academic Standards are applicable to RCOB graduate programs.

### School of Nursing

A minimum grade of B is required in all courses in the Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) program. Students who earn a grade of C, WF, or U in any two courses, or who earn an F in any one course, will be dismissed from the program. Students who earn a C, WF, or U may repeat that course one time only.

### **REINSTATEMENT PROCEDURES**

If a student is suspended from a graduate program for academic reasons, he or she may apply for reinstatement after an absence of one term. Reinstatement is not guaranteed. Because each college or school follows slightly different reinstatement procedures, the student should follow the procedures for the college or school which houses his or her graduate program.

#### College of Arts and Humanities

1. The student should submit a letter to the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities indicating the justification for reinstatement.
2. The Dean will solicit the advice and recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and will review the materials submitted.
3. Upon positive recommendation from the Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue his or her coursework, with any provisions established in conjunction with the department.

#### College of Education

1. The student should submit a letter to the Director of Graduate Programs indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The Director of Graduate Programs then consults with the Department Chair or Appeals Committee.
3. With a positive recommendation from the Director of Graduate Programs, the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue coursework, with provisions established by the department.

#### College of Science and Mathematics

##### M.S. in Applied Computer Science

1. The student should submit a letter to the Chair of the Department of Computer Science indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The Department Chair, in consultation with the graduate faculty of the department, will make the final decision in regard to the reinstatement.
3. In the event the student is reinstated, the student will be allowed to continue his or her coursework, subject to the prevailing course schedule and all provisions established by the Department Chair.

## M.S. in Biology

## M.S. in Mathematics

1. The student should submit a letter to the Director of Graduate Studies indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The Director of Graduate Studies will solicit the advice and recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and will review the materials submitted.
3. Upon positive recommendation from the Director of Graduate Studies, the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue his or her coursework, with any provisions established in conjunction with the department.

## College of Social Sciences

1. The student should submit a letter to the Director of Graduate Studies indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The Director of Graduate Studies will solicit the advice and recommendation of the appropriate academic unit and will review the materials submitted.
3. Upon positive recommendation from the Director of Graduate Studies, the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue his or her coursework, with any provisions established in conjunction with the department.

## Richards College of Business

1. The student should submit a letter to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies may solicit the advice and recommendation of other appropriate academic unit(s) and will review the materials submitted.
3. Upon a positive recommendation from the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue his or her coursework with potential additional provisions.

## School of Nursing

1. The student should submit a letter to the SON Associate Dean of Graduate Studies indicating justification for reinstatement.
2. The SON Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and the graduate faculty will review the submitted materials.
3. Upon positive recommendation from the Associate Dean and Graduate Faculty Committee, the student will be reinstated and allowed to continue his or her coursework, with any established SON provisions.

## **Old Graduate Catalog Policy**

### **Academic Standards and Probation Policy**

Graduate students must meet the following academic standards:

1. To be eligible for admission to candidacy, graduation, and to take comprehensive examinations, a student must maintain a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or higher. No grade below C will be accepted as part of a program of study for a graduate degree. No course in which a student receives a C grade can be applied to education (Ed.D.) or psychology (Psy.D.) doctoral degree programs of study. A student receiving an F in any graduate course for any graduate program will be dismissed from the Graduate School.
  2. The Graduate School will place on probation any student whose cumulative graduate grade point average falls below 3.0 after nine (9) hours of credit completed (without an F grade). If the grade point average remains below 3.0 after the completion of another nine (9) hours of credit completed, the student will be dismissed from the Graduate School. In certain departments and programs, earning two C grades in graduate courses may result in dismissal from the Graduate School.
- To be removed from probation, students must obtain a 3.0 grade point average or better for the next nine (9) hours completed. In addition to these minimum academic standards, students must also meet all academic standards and retention policies that have been adopted by departments and reported to the Graduate School. Please see individual departments and programs for their specific academic requirements.

### **Reinstatement**

Students dismissed from the Graduate School for academic reasons may apply for reinstatement after a period of no less than one Term. To apply for reinstatement, the student must present to the Graduate School a letter indicating the justification for reinstatement. The Graduate School will solicit the advice and recommendation of the appropriate department chair or appeals committee and will review the materials submitted. Upon positive recommendation from the Dean of the Graduate School, the student will be allowed to continue his/her course work, with any provisions established in conjunction with the department.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **OLD COGS Handbook**

### **Probation and Dismissal Policies:**

#### Academic Standards:

Graduate students must meet the following academic standards:

1. To be eligible for admission to candidacy and graduation, a student must maintain a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher on all graduate and undergraduate courses. No grade below C will be accepted as part of a program of study for a graduate degree. Some departments and programs will not accept Cs as part of a graduate plan of study (see below).
2. The Graduate School will place students on academic probation with a cumulative GPA below 3.0 for two consecutive Terms. Then, they must make a 3.0 or higher Term GPA each succeeding Term that their overall cumulative GPA is below 3.0. These students are no longer on probation when their cumulative GPA is 3.0 or above.

If they fail to make a 3.0 Term GPA while on probation, they are dismissed from the Graduate School. Students on academic probation **may not** apply for candidacy, take comprehensive examinations, nor may they obtain a graduate degree.

In addition to these minimum academic standards, students must also meet all academic standards and retention policies that have been adopted by the department and reported to the Graduate School. Please see individual departments and programs for their specific academic requirements.

Department policies: **(Please advise the Graduate School and COGS of any proposed changes here)**

#### **Arts and Sciences:**

- **Applied Computer Science** [no additional requirements]
- **Biology** [no additional requirements]
- **Criminology** [no additional requirements]
- **English** [C grades do not count toward degree; 2 C's or F and student is dismissed from program]
- **History** [C grades do not count toward degree; 2 C's or F and student is dismissed from program]
- **Mathematics** [no additional requirements]
- **Music** [no additional requirements]
- **Psychology M.A.** [no additional requirements]
- **Public Administration** [no additional requirements]
- **Rural and Small Town Planning** [no additional requirements]
- **Psych. Doc.** [two C's result in dismissal from the program]

#### **College of Business**

- **Business Education** [no additional requirements]
- **M.B.A.** [no additional requirements]
- **Professional Accounting** [no additional requirements]
- **Web M.B.A.** [no additional requirements]

#### **College of Education**

- **Ed.Doc.** [two C's may result in dismissal from the program]
- **Early Childhood** [no additional requirements]
- **Ed. Leadership** [no additional requirements]
- **Guidance and Counseling** [dismissed with two C's or an F or a U]
- **Media:** Any student who earns a grade of C in a course, or whose cumulative graduate GPA falls below 3.0 after completing nine (9) hours of credit will be placed on probation. To be removed from probation, students must maintain a 3.0 GPA for the next nine (9) hours completed. The student will only be allowed to take one course the first Term on probation. At the completion of the course, the department will reassess the student's status to determine whether or not the student would be allowed to take one or two courses the next Term. If the student's GPA

remains below 3.0 after the completion of another nine (9) hours of credit completed or if a second grade of C is earned, the student will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

- ~~**Middle Grades** [no additional requirements]~~
- ~~**PER** [no additional requirements]~~
- ~~**Reading Ed.** [no additional requirements]~~
- ~~**Secondary Ed.** [no additional requirements]~~
- ~~**Speech Path.** [two C's or an F reviewed for dismissal]~~
- ~~All non-degree initial cert. [C's do not count on grad. level courses and cannot be transferred to M.Ed. program; undergrad courses below a C may result in dismissal]~~

### **School of Nursing**

- ~~**Nursing** [no additional requirements]~~

The Graduate School automatically will dismiss students currently on academic probation for any program, who fail to maintain a 3.0 for two consecutive Terms.

### **Reinstatement**

Students dismissed from the Graduate School for academic reasons may apply for reinstatement after a period of no less than one Term. To apply for reinstatement, the student must present to the Graduate School a letter indicating the justification for reinstatement. The Graduate School will solicit the advice and recommendation of the appropriate department Chair or appeals committee and will review the materials submitted. Upon positive recommendation from the Dean of the Graduate School, the student will be allowed to continue his/her coursework, with any provisions established in conjunction with the department.

# **Addendum V**

Program View Request (Read-Only)

Originator

College of Education  
College

COE Doctoral  
Department

Parrish, Margaret  
Originator

Action

Add   Modify   Deactivate   Terminate   Reactivate

Modifications

Program Name   Program Description   Degree Name   See Modification Details

Program Selection

College of Education  
College

Doctor of Education with a Major in School Improvement  
Program

Doctor of Education with a Major in School Improvement  
Program Name

On Campus  
Program Location

Graduate  
Degree Level

Doctor of Education  
Degree Name

Fall   2012  
Effective Semester/Year

Modification Details

see attached memorandum  
see course section of catalog submission system for  
course additions  
(Max 4000 characters)

Rationale

see attached memorandum  
(Max 4000 characters)

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
Library Resources Need Enhancement  
Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

(Max 4000 characters)

Document To Upload

Choose File   No file chosen

(e.g. syllabi, other supporting documentation)

College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

## Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

Current Plan of Study

| Year 1   |   | Year 2   |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| Summer   | Fall  | Spring   | Summer   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ORIENTATION</u> -- On Campus</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9960</u> (School Improvement Through Data-Driven Decision Making) --</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9901</u> Dissertation Mentoring I -- Online [1]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9941</u> (Models of School Improvement and Reform) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9961</u> (Quantitative Methods in School Improvement) -- Online</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9902</u> Dissertation Mentoring II -- Online [1]</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9962</u> (Qualitative Methods in School Improvement) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9903</u> Dissertation Mentoring III -- Online [1]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9925</u> (Policy Analysis for School Improvement) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9963</u> (Action Research for Change I) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• (Dissertation Prep Summer Institute) -- On Campus</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> |
|  |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9963</u> (Action Research for Change II) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul>  |
|  |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9943</u> (Instructional Leadership that Facilitates School Improvement) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9998</u></li> <li>• (Diss. Research) [3]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul>   |
| Year 3   |   | Year 4   |  |
| Summer   | Fall  | Spring   | Summer/Fall/Spring   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9943</u></li> <li>• (Models of Professional Development) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9998</u></li> <li>• (Diss. Research) [3]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9933</u> (Leadership for Change) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9998</u></li> <li>• (Diss. Research) [3]</li> <li>• <u>AoE Course</u> (?)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9923</u></li> <li>• (Leadership for Diversity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century) -- Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDUC 9998</u></li> <li>• (Diss. Research) [3]</li> </ul>                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDUC 9998</u> (Diss. Research) [1]</li> </ul>  |

# Proposed Plan of Study

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Teaching and Learning<br/>(3 courses; 9 hours)</p>   | <p>Leadership for School Improvement<br/>(3 courses; 9 hours)</p>   | <p>Research and the Effective Use of Data<br/>(5 courses; 15 hours)</p>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9941 (Models of School Improvement and Reform)[3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9942 (Instructional Leadership that Facilitates School Improvement) [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9943 (Models of Professional Development) [3 hrs.]</li> </ul>                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>EDSI 9923 (Leadership for Diversity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century)</u> [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>EDSI 9925 (Policy Analysis for School Improvement)</u> [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>EDSI 9933 (Leadership for Change)</u> [3 hrs.]</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9960 (School Improvement Through Data-Driven Decision Making) [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9961 (Quantitative Research Methods) – [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9962 (Qualitative Research Methods)[3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9963 (Action Research for Change I) [3 hrs.]</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> EDSI 9964 (Action Research for Change II)[3 hrs.]</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>EDSI 9901/9902/9903 (Dissertation Mentoring I, II, III) – [2 hrs. each; 6 hrs. total]</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ORIENTATION – On Campus [no credit]</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>DISSERTATION PREP SUMMER INSTITUTE – On Campus [no credit]</u></li> </ul> |   |  |

| Year 3   |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Summer   | Fall  | Spring  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9943</u> (<i>Models of Professional Development</i>) – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998</u> (<i>Research for Doctoral Dissertation</i>) [2]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9923</u> (<i>Leadership for Diversity in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i>) – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998</u> (<i>Research for Doctoral Dissertation</i>) [2]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9933</u> (<i>Leadership for Change</i>) – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998</u> (<i>Research for Doctoral Dissertation</i>) [1]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course</u> (?)</li> </ul> |

| Year 4 (If Needed)   |
|--|
| Summer/Fall/Spring<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998</u><br/>(<i>Research for Doctoral Dissertation</i>) [1]</li> </ul> |

| Year 1   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| Summer   | Fall   | Spring   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Summer</u></li> <li>• <u>SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ORIENTATION</u> – On Campus</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9960 (School Improvement Through Data-Driven Decision Making)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9901 Dissertation Mentoring I</u> – Online [2]</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Fall</u></li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9941 (Models of School Improvement and Reform)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9961 (Quantitative Research Methods)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9902 Dissertation Mentoring II</u> – Online [2]</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Spring</u></li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9962 (Qualitative Research Methods)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9903 Dissertation Mentoring III</u> – Online [2]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course (?)</u></li> </ul> |

| Year 2  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Summer  | Fall  | Spring   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9925 (Policy Analysis for School Improvement)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9963 (Action Research for Change I)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>Dissertation Prep Summer Institute</u> – On Campus</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9964 (Action Research for Change II)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998 (Research for Doctoral Dissertation)</u> [2]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course (?)</u></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>EDSI 9942 (Instructional Leadership that Facilitates School Improvement)</u> – Online [3]</li> <li>• <u>EDSI 9998 (Research for Doctoral Dissertation)</u> [2]</li> <li>• <u>AoC Course (?)</u></li> </ul> |

**Core Competencies  
Doctor of School Improvement Degree  
Keyed to Courses**

**STRAND 1: School Improvement and Reform**

Definition: *Moving schools and stakeholders in directions that enhance student learning and social development and ultimately benefit society*

Knowledge

- a) Differentiate among whole school and content area renewal, restructuring, and reform (9942)
- b) Articulate the roles of the legal system, policy, power, and ethics for key stakeholders in school improvement and reform (9923, 9941, 9933, 9925, 9941)
- c) Describe trends, issues, and barriers to school improvement and reform (9942, 9923)
- d) Describe the roles of a change agent in the school culture (9923, 9933)
- e) Articulate how the legal system recognizes and protects the legal and ethical rights of all stakeholders in school improvement and reform, including special populations (9923, 9925)

Skills

- a) Strategically plan to remove or circumvent barriers to school improvement and reform (9942, 9923, 9933)
- b) Collaboratively unify stakeholders committed to school improvement and reform (9923, 9933)
- c) Collaboratively design, implement, and document school improvement plans (9923, 9933)
- d) Act as a change agent to remove barriers within the social and political contexts of schooling (9933)

Dispositions

- a) Recognize, with proper perspective, the need for school improvement and reform (9923, 9941, 9933)
- b) Value the involvement and engagement of key stakeholders as well as representatives of underserved populations in school improvement efforts (9963, 9964, 9923, 9941, 9942)
- c) Develop a personal vision of and commitment to school improvement and reform (9923, 9941, 9942, 9933)
- d) Recognize the power of group consensus over individual action (9923, 9961)
- e) Value legal and ethical professional relationships among all stakeholders as an integral part of the school reform process (9925, 9923)

## **STRAND 2: Leadership**

**Definition:** *Influencing others toward a shared commitment to a common purpose.*

### **Knowledge**

- a) Articulate principles of organizational development, including mission statements, the process of monitoring quality, and core values of an organization (9942)
- b) Describe the change process, including how to organize and prepare an individual, group, or organization for change (9923, 9933)
- c) Identify personality styles, including how to observe and assess interpersonal dynamics between self and others, and individuals within a group to strategically influence others (9942)
- d) Articulate leadership theories and strategies and how to apply them to diverse situations (9942, 9923)
- e) Identify and describe communication and interaction styles and issues in diverse populations, and how they impact group efforts and organizations (9923)

### **Skills**

- a) Prioritize and focus organizational work (9933)
- b) Move groups through an agenda (9933)
- c) Facilitate groups and achieve consensus (9942)
- d) Reflect on and change self (9923, 9941, 9961, 9942)
- e) Analyze human behavior (9923, 9961, 9942)
- f) Identify the areas in which group members need development and provide needed training (9933, 9943, 9942)
- g) Identify impediments that are peculiar to a school setting and help members recognize and overcome them (9943)
- h) Create networks within and outside an organization whereby members can interact with their peers and with key stakeholders (9925)
- i) Strategically gain and use political power (9925)
- j) Identify and correct an unjust and/or inequitable situation (9925)
- k) Appropriately use leadership strategies in diverse situations (9923, 9925)

### **Dispositions**

- a) Affirm differences among individuals (9923)
- b) Value optimum academic achievement and social development of all students (9923, 9942)
- c) Value integrity and trust (9933)
- d) Value risk-taking (9933)

### **STRAND 3: Teaching and Learning**

Definition: *Understanding and using the knowledge base on effective teaching and learning to initiate teacher development and school improvement.*

#### Knowledge

- a) Synthesize recent research and practice in the areas of teaching, learning, curriculum, and assessment (9923, 9960, 9942)
- b) Describe the role of teachers, both individually and collectively, in school improvement (9963, 9964, 9942, 9923)
- c) Become cognizant of the historical, philosophical, socio-cultural, and theoretical development of education (9941)
- d) Identify and discuss socio-affective, cognitive, and interactional characteristics and needs of diverse groups (9923)

#### Skills

- a) Effectively use the knowledge base to bring about change for increased student academic learning and social development (9963, 9964, 9923, 9960, 9942)
- b) Effectively use the knowledge base to bring about change that empowers educators to enhance their effectiveness (9963, 9964, 9923, 9960, 9943, 9942)
- c) Lead teachers and other educators to develop needs-specific instructional strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse student groups (9923)
- d) Discriminate between sound and unsound reports, research, and instructional practice (9963, 9964, 9923, 9960, 9961, 9942)

#### Dispositions

- a) Value providing equitable and appropriate educational access to all students (9942, 9923)
- b) Value research and the knowledge base about effective teaching and learning as useful in educational reform (9923, 9960, 9942)
- c) Prioritize student learning over political problems (9941)

### **STRAND 4: Research and the Effective Use of Data**

Definition: *Understanding, conducting, and applying impactful research in school improvement and reform*

#### Knowledge

- a) Describe forms of research used in education including traditional, school-based, and program evaluation (9923, 9962, 9901, 9902, 9960, 9961, 9998)

- b) Interpret and communicate various forms of data including graphic presentations, descriptive statistics, and effect size (9962, 9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9960, 9961)
- c) Outline the research cycle as it applies to school-based research and program evaluation (9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9960, 9961, 9962, 9998)
- d) Describe the importance of validity, reliability, credibility, and generalizability in the research process (9962, 9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9960, 9961)
- e) Demonstrate the effective use of standardized test data (9923, 9960)
- f) Describe how to use program evaluation to improve schools (9960, 9923, 9962)
- g) Articulate how to guide others through the program evaluation cycle (9962, 9963, 9964, 9960)
- h) Outline how to lead others to conduct school-based research (9963, 9964, 9960, 9961, 9962)

### Skills

- a) Use reflective and proactive processes of inquiry to identify a research focus for school improvement (9942, 9963, 9964, 9962, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9960, 9961, 9998)
- b) Evaluate, synthesize, and use professional literature to build a theoretical base for a research focus (9962, 9963, 9964, 9942, 9943, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9960, 9961, 9998)
- c) Generate research questions which develop a research focus (9962, 9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9961, 9998)
- d) Develop and implement a theoretically-based intervention or innovation for outcomes-based research studies (9962, 9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9998)
- e) Create a systematic data collection plan aligned with the research focus (9962, 9963, 9964, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9960, 9961, 9998)
- f) Collect and analyze multiple forms of data using data analysis consultants if necessary (9963, 9964, 9960, 9962, 9998)
- g) Draw credible, valid conclusions based on the analysis of data (9963, 9964, 9960, 9961, 9998)
- h) Use research results for continuous school improvement (9963, 9964, 9960, 9961, 9942, 9998)
- i) Interpret and communicate research results effectively to both professional and lay audiences (9963, 9964, 9960, 9961, 9942, 9998)

### Dispositions

- a) Value data-based decision making as an integral part of school improvement (9923, 9961, 9960, 9962, 9998)
- b) Value dissemination of research findings to advocate for school improvement (9963, 9964, 9923, 9960, 9961, 9962, 9943, 9942, 9998)

## **STRAND 5: Scholarly Persuasion**

**Definition:** *Engaging in rational discussion informed by and grounded in the knowledge base and research in education and school improvement*

### Knowledge

- a) Demonstrate different oral and written communication styles and their effective use (9923, 9941, 9960)
- b) Identify and interpret nonverbal signals in different language systems (9942, 9923)

### Skills

- a) Draw from the knowledge base in education and school improvement to construct scholarly defensible positions (9963, 9964, 9923, 9941, 9942, 9943, 9960)
- b) Effectively communicate educational issues using oral and written communication to diverse professional and lay audience (9923, 9963, 9963, 9943, 9942, 9901, 9902, 9903, 9941, 9960, 9961, 9998)
- c) Recognize networks and pathways appropriate for disseminating information, positions, and decisions regarding education (9963, 9964, 9923, 9942, 9960)
- d) Communicate in a logical, scholarly style using the format prescribed by the American Psychological Association (APA) (9942, 9963, 9964, 9923, 9960, 9998)

### Dispositions

- a) Prefer scholarly and rational discourse over emotional arguments that lack sound reasoning (9923, 9943, 9942, 9998)
- b) Value proactive and effective communication (9923, 9960, 9943, 9942)
- c) Value contributing to the knowledge base in school improvement (9963, 9964, 9960, 9943, 9942)

## **STRAND 6: Technology**

**Definition:** *Developing sound technological literacy that impacts professional competence and school improvement*

### Knowledge

- a) Articulate principles of effective electronic communication (embedded in all courses)
- b) Identify past, existing, and emerging technology resources used in education and match technology resources to teaching, learning, and school administrative needs (9943)
- c) Describe how information is organized in electronic media in contrast to print media (9943)

### Skills

- a) Use technology resources to exchange information and ideas with others, including email, list serves, and electronic dialogues (9963, 9964, 9961, 9901, 9902, 9903)
- b) Conduct electronic searches and access other electronic resources (9942, 9963, 9964, 9961, 9901, 9902, 9903)
- c) Navigate and create websites (9961, 9901, 9902, 9903)
- d) Prepare and transmit professional quality documents electronically (9942, 9963, 9964, 9961, 9901, 9902, 9903)
- e) Model social, legal, and ethical practices to promote responsible use of technology (9961, 9901, 9902, 9903)

### Dispositions

- a) Value effective preparation and use of multiple media to communicate with professional and lay audiences (9942)
- b) Value the potential of new and emerging technology to shape school improvement strategies and initiatives (9941)
- c) Value participation in an electronic network with others in the educational community (9963, 9964, 9923)

## Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

**Originator**

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

**Action**

Add    Modify    Delete

**Modifications**

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

**Course Details**

EDSI    9923    Leadership for Diversity in the 21st Century

Prefix    Number    Course Title

This course will encourage a culturally pluralistic and global perspective on the equitable education of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. Students in this course will investigate the philosophical, theoretical, and historical foundations of multicultural education; the values inherent in cross-cultural communication; and relationships between verbal and nonverbal communication systems. Interpersonal skills for encouraging harmony between the dominant culture and culturally and linguistically diverse populations will be topics for investigation.

Course Catalog Description

3    0    3    Spring - 2012    Yearly    Letter Grade  
 Lec Hrs    Lab Hrs    Credit Hrs    Effective Term    Frequency    Grading

**Prerequisites**

**Corequisites**

**Rationale**

see attached

**Planning Info**

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

**Comments**

**College Approvals**

**Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]**

Chair, Course Department

**Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]**

Associate Dean, College of Education

**Cross Listing Approvals**

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

**Other Approvals**

**Final Approval**

**Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]**

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

**Leadership for Diversity in the 21<sup>ST</sup> Century EDSI 9923****Semester Hours**      3**Semester/Year****Time/Location****Instructor****Office Location****Office Hours****Online Hours****Telephone**      Direct Line:  
Department Line:**Email****Fax****Online Support****CourseDen Home Page**  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>**CourseDen Help & Troubleshooting**  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>**UWG Distance Learning**  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>**UWG On-Line Connection**  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>**Distance Learning Library Services**  
<http://westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/>**Ingram Library Services**  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>**University Bookstore**  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course will encourage a culturally pluralistic and global perspective on the equitable education of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. Students in this course will investigate the philosophical, theoretical, and historical foundations of multicultural education; the values inherent in cross-cultural communication; and relationships between verbal and nonverbal communication systems. Interpersonal skills for encouraging harmony between the dominant culture and culturally and linguistically diverse populations will be topics for investigation.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors, clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence [knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive]; (b) Field-Based Inquiry [decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading]; and (c) the Betterment of Society [collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic]. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and the program's core competencies.

## **APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION**

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

The learning outcomes are derived directly from the Core Competencies of the doctoral program in school improvement and from the conceptual framework descriptors for the College of Education as indicated in parentheses below:

The student will:

1. become cognizant of historical, philosophical, sociocultural, and theoretical development of multicultural education (Banks, 1994; Bennett, 2006; Hernandez, 1989);

*(D4 Adaptive, D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competency 1Kc, 1Da, 1Dc, 3Ka, 3Kd, 3Sd, 4Ka; ELCC 4, 5, 6)*

2. begin to formulate a teaching philosophy and leadership strategies to serve culturally and linguistically diverse student populations and their communities (Cary, 2007; Foucalt; Freire and Ramos, 2004; O'Connor, 2001; Shipler, 2004);

*(D4 Adaptive, D6 Culturally Sensitive, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Kd, 1Sa, 2Kb, 2Kd, 2Sd, 2Db, 3Sb, 3Da, 5Sa, 5Da; ELCC 4, 6)*

3. identify and discuss socio-affective, cognitive, and interactional characteristics and needs of diverse student groups and develop needs-specific instructional strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse student groups (Floden, 1991; Ovando & Collier, 1985; Scarcella, 1990; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001);

*(D1 Decision Maker, D4 Adaptive, D6 Culturally Sensitive, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Kd, 3Sc, 4Ke, 4Kf, 4Da; ELCC 4, 6)*

4. understand and interpret oral and written communication as well as nonverbal signals in different language systems and identify and describe communication and interaction styles and issues in diverse populations, and how they impact group efforts and organizations (Miller, 1988; Scarcella, 1990; Trueba, 1989);

*(D1 Decision maker, D6 Culturally Sensitive, D7 Empathetic, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 2Se, 5Ka, 5Kb, 5Sd, 5Db; ELCC 4)*

5. understand, appreciate, and incorporate into classroom learning activities information about minority groups' contemporary lifestyles in the United States (Anderson, 1991; Baruth & Manning, 1992; Scarcella, 1990; Tiedt & Tiedt, 1994);

*(D1 Decision Makers, D6 Culturally Sensitive, D7 Empathetic, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Kc, 2Sk, 3Sa; ELCC 4)*

6. develop interpersonal skills needed for encouraging harmony between minority and majority cultural communities (Baruth & Manning, 1992; Kessler, 1992; Scarcella, 1990);

*(D2 Leaders, D3 Lifelong Learners, D6 Culturally Sensitive, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Sc, 1Db, 2Kb; ELCC 4)*

7. design learning activities which, through the use of information on various ethnic and cultural groups in the U.S., and help develop these interpersonal skills in students (Baruth & Manning, 1992; Bennett, 1990; Kenneddy, 1990; Scarcella, 1990);

*(D3 Lifelong Learners, D4 Adaptive, D5 Collaborative, D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competency 1Sc, 2Da, 3Sa, 4Dc; ELCC 4)*

8. discuss the effects of mass media and other technology on the attitude of audiences toward minority groups (Bennett, 1990; Ovando & Collier, 1985);

*(D6 Culturally Sensitive, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Db, 3Db, 5Sc, 6Dc; ELCC 4)*

9. examine the teacher's role in working with families and multicultural communities and fostering parent involvement in education (Ovando & Collier, 1985; Violand-Sanchez, Sutton & Ware, 1991);

*(D6 Culturally Sensitive, D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competency 1Kd, 1Sb, 1Dd, 3Kb, 4Db, 5Sb; ELCC 4)*

10. demonstrate an awareness of the implications of federal regulations, litigation, and linguistic theory for the testing of diverse student populations (Bennett, 1990; Ovando & Collier, 1985; Trueba, 1989; Underhill, 1990; U.S. Dept. Ed., 1992);

*(D1 Decision Maker, D4 Adaptive, D6 Culturally Sensitive; D8 Knowledgeable, D9 Proactive; Core Competency 1Kb, 1Ke, 1Sa, 1Da, 1De; ELCC 4, 5, 6)*

## **TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES**

### Required Text:

Freire, P. and Ramos, M. B. (2004). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Payne, R. (2005). *A Framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, TX: aha Process, Inc.

### **REFERENCES:**

Akbar, N. (1996). *Breaking the chains of psychological slavery*. Tallahassee, FL: Mind Productions.

Anderson, R. (2008). *Religion and teaching*. New York: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bennett, C. (2000). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Necedham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

- Fiol-Matta, L, & Chamberlain, M. K. (Eds.). (1994). *Women of color and the multicultural curriculum*. NY: Feminist Press.
- Gay, G. (2001). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Genesee, F. (Ed.). (1995). *Educating second language children*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Hollins, E. R. (2008). *Culture in school learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Howard, L. (1992). *How schools shortchange girls. American Association of University Women Report*. Washington, DC: NEA.
- Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1997). *The Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Longman.
- O'Connor, A. (2001). *Poverty knowledge: Social Science, social policy, and the poor in twentieth-century U.S. History (Politics and society in twentieth century America)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rank, M. (2005). *One nation, underprivileged: Why American poverty affects us all*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schultz, F. (2007). *Annual editions: Multicultural education 2007*. Guilford, CT: McGraw-Hill/Dushkin.
- Shipler, D. (2005). *The working poor: Invisible in America*. New York: Vintage.
- Suarez-Orozco, C. and Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany: State University of New York.

## ACTIVITIES AND ASSESSMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING POLICY

### EVALUATION PROCEDURES

|                               |      |
|-------------------------------|------|
| Attendance and Participation  | 8%   |
| Weekly Response Paper (4 x 6) | 24%  |
| Journal (3 x 6)               | 18%  |
| Research Paper                | 30%  |
| Research Presentation         | 20%  |
| Total                         | 100% |

#### Grading Policy:

A = 90 - 100%; B = 80 - 89%; C = 70 - 79%; F = below 70%

### CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

## CLASS OUTLINE

### Central theme

**POWER** – This is the word and concept that will drive (no pun intended) our discussions and analysis throughout this term. As you read, ponder, discuss and debate, consider questions such as:

- How is *power* defined and by whom? How is it embodied?
- What forces and factors act to create power differentials?
- Who has the power?
- Who is the oppressed/oppressor?
- Has the power differential changed over a period of time? If so, how? If not, why not?
- How does education contribute to the locus, status and state of power?
- What is your responsibility in this power play?
- What scenes and scenarios would you enact and direct to redress the imbalance of power locally, globally and glocally?

### Features and Issues of Diversity

#### Required Reading:

Foucault - *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*.

Fischman, G., McLaren, P., Sünker, H. & Lankshear, C. *Critical theories, radical pedagogies, and global conflicts*. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2005. pp. 3-22.

Giroux, H. A. (1985). Teachers as Transformative Intellectuals. *Social Education*, 49(5),376-79.  
[http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=sgH97wbGEVAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA205&ots=G1kPs1oZ0Q&sig=PqE2xzVkelzqovjF1Lx\\_nlj90BA#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=sgH97wbGEVAC&oi=fnd&pg=PA205&ots=G1kPs1oZ0Q&sig=PqE2xzVkelzqovjF1Lx_nlj90BA#v=onepage&q&f=false)

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping – Introductions/ plan for the day | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion – Syllabus and Assignments          | 60 mins  |
| 4:30 | Simulation and Analysis                        | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner                                 | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour                           | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion - Freire and Ramos                  | 120 mins |
| 8:30 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:40 | Movie: <i>2 Million Minutes</i>                | 60 mins  |
| 9:35 | Exit Notes                                     | 5 mins   |
| 9:40 | Ciao!  |          |

### Issues of Race

#### Required Reading:

Freire, P. and Ramos, M. B. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Chapters 1 and 2.

McIntosh, P. *White Privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack*. Retrieved 2-13-2008.  
[http://justworld.typepad.com/perspectives/2005/11/peggy\\_mcintosh.html](http://justworld.typepad.com/perspectives/2005/11/peggy_mcintosh.html)

Prashad, V. (2000). *The karma of Brown folk*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press. Pp. 109-132

Espinoza-Herold, M. (2002). *Issues in Latino education: Race, school culture and the politics of academic success*. New York: Allyn and Bacon. Pp. 95- 115.

Horvat, E. M. & Lewis, K. S. (2003). Reassessing the "Burden of 'Acting White'": The importance of peer groups in managing academic success. *Sociology of Education*, 76, 265-280.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press. Pp. 21-47.

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion - Fischman, McLaren, Stünker, & Lankshear                 | 60 mins  |
| 4:30 | Discussion- McIntosh; Fordham (Horvat & Lewis; Mickelson; Delpit)    | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner   | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour   | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion – Prashad; Espinoza-Herold                                | 120 mins |
| 8:15 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Educational practices and the Philosophical bases of these practices | 45 mins  |
| 9:10 | Discussion – SEE-ME / SEE-ELL  | 15 mins  |
| 9:25 | Literature Circles & Exit Notes                                      | 15 mins  |
| 9:40 | Khuda Hafiz!   |          |

### **Ethnicity, Religion and Multilingualism**

Draft Instruments for Final Project

#### *Required Reading:*

Crawford, J. *Loose ends in a tattered fabric: The inconsistency of language rights in the United States*. Retrieved on March 24, 2008 from

[http://users.rcn.com/crawj/langpol/Crawford\\_U.S.\\_Language\\_Rights.pdf](http://users.rcn.com/crawj/langpol/Crawford_U.S._Language_Rights.pdf)

Joshi, K.

Harklau, L.

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion - Ethnicity   | 60 mins  |
| 4:30 | Discussion- Religion   | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner   | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour   | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion – Language issues   | 120 mins |
| 8:15 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Educational practices and the Philosophical bases of these practices | 30 mins  |
| 8:55 | Drafting SEE-ME / SEE-ELL  | 45 mins  |
| 9:25 | Literature Circles & Exit Notes                                      | 15 mins  |
| 9:40 | As Salam Alaikum!  |          |

**Issues of Poverty***Required Reading:*

- Payne, R. (2005). *A Framework for understanding poverty*.
- O'Connor, A. (2001). *Poverty knowledge: Social Science, social policy, and the poor in twentieth-century U.S. History (Politics and society in twentieth century America)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp. 242-283.
- Gorski, P. (2001). Savage Unrealities: Classism and Racism abound in Ruby Payne's Framework. *Rethinking Schools*. (21)2. Retrieved on March 24, 2008 from <http://academic.evergreen.edu/a/ahecat22/S07Payne.html>
- Bohn, A. (2001). A Framework for understanding Ruby Payne. *Rethinking Schools*. (21)2. Retrieved on March 24, 2008 from <http://academic.evergreen.edu/a/ahecat22/S07Payne.html>

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion - O'Connor  | 60 mins  |
| 4:30 | Discussion- Payne  | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner   | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour   | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion – Gorski and Bohn   | 120 mins |
| 8:15 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Educational practices and the Philosophical bases of these practices | 50 mins  |
| 9:15 | Drafting SEE-ME / SEE-ELL  | 15 mins  |
| 9:30 | Literature Circles & Exit Notes                                      | 10 mins  |
| 9:40 | Selamat Malam!   |          |

**Issues of Gender**

Finalize Instruments for Final Project

*Required Reading:*

- Kishwar, M. (2004). A horror of 'isms': Why I do not call myself a feminist. In M. Chaudhuri (ed.) *Feminism in India*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- John, M. E. (2004). Feminism in India and the West: Recasting a relationship. In M. Chaudhuri (ed.) *Feminism in India*. New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. Pp. 5-23.
- Goleman, D. Emotional Intelligence

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion – Kishwar and John  | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner   | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour   | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion – Gilligan  | 120 mins |
| 8:15 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Educational practices and the Philosophical bases of these practices | 50 mins  |
| 9:15 | Drafting SEE-ME / SEE-ELL  | 15 mins  |

|      |                                 |         |
|------|---------------------------------|---------|
| 9:30 | Literature Circles & Exit Notes | 10 mins |
| 9:40 | Senru Varugirom!                |         |

### Professional and Personal Beliefs

#### Required Reading:

- Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' Beliefs and Educational Research: Cleaning up a Messy Construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.
- Ramanathan, H. (2007). Teacher beliefs and teacher decision-making. *SPELT*.
- Karabenick, S., and Noda, P. (2004). Professional Development Implications of Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes toward English Language Learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*. 28(1), 55-75.

|      |  |          |
|------|--|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Discussion – Pajares; Ramanathan; Karabenick and Noda                | 60 mins  |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner   | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Question (half) hour   | 30 mins  |
| 6:15 | Discussion Day – Literature Circles                                  | 120 mins |
| 8:15 | Break  | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Educational practices and the Philosophical bases of these practices | 60 mins  |
| 9:25 | Final project – Finalize MC instrument                               | 15 mins  |
| 9:40 | To Hum Chalte Hain!  |          |

### Class Presentations –

|      |                                |          |
|------|--------------------------------|----------|
| 3:20 | Housekeeping                   | 10 mins  |
| 3:30 | Presentations – Final projects | 120 mins |
| 5:30 | Pick up dinner                 | 15 mins  |
| 5:45 | Presentations – Final projects | 150 mins |
| 8:15 | Break                          | 10 mins  |
| 8:25 | Presentations – Final projects | 55 mins  |
| 9:30 | Wrap Up                        | 10 mins  |
| 9:40 | May the Force Be With You!     |          |

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

|                   |                      |                   |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Originator</b> |                      |                   |
| COE Doctoral      | College of Education | Parrish, Margaret |
| Department        | College              | Originator        |

|               |        |                      |               |             |       |        |              |
|---------------|--------|----------------------|---------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------------|
| <b>Action</b> |        | <b>Modifications</b> |               |             |       |        |              |
| Add           | Modify | Delete               | Prerequisites | Description | Title | Credit | See Comments |

|  |         |  |                |           |              |
|--|---------|--|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| <b>Course Details</b>  |         |  |                |           |              |
| EDSI   | 9925    | Policy Analysis for School Improvement |                |           |              |
| Prefix   | Number  | Course Title                           |                |           |              |
| <p>This course is an advanced study of policy and its impact on the field of education broadly, and school improvement specifically. There is a specific emphasis on policy development and analysis. The course is designed to enable educators to become knowledgeable, effective, and responsible actors within the political and policy arenas of schooling.</p> <p>Course Catalog Description</p> |         |  |                |           |              |
| 3  | 0       | 3                                      | Spring - 2012  | Yearly    | Letter Grade |
| Lec Hrs  | Lab Hrs | Credit Hrs                             | Effective Term | Frequency | Grading      |

|                      |                     |
|----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Prerequisites</b> | <b>Corequisites</b> |
| <br><br>             | <br><br>            |

|                  |
|------------------|
| <b>Rationale</b> |
| see attached     |

|  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>Planning Info</b>   | <b>Comments</b> |
| Library Resources are Adequate<br>Library Resources Need Enhancement<br>Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30 | <br><br>        |

|   |
|---|
| <b>College Approvals</b>  |
| Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]<br><hr/> Chair, Course Department<br><br>Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]<br><hr/> Associate Dean, College of Education |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Cross-Listing Approvals</b>   |
| N/A<br><hr/> Chair, Cross Listed Department<br><br>N/A<br><hr/> Associate Dean, Cross Listed College |

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <b>Other Approvals</b> |
| <br><br>               |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Final Approval</b>                                  |
| Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]<br><hr/> Chair, Faculty Senate |

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Policy Analysis for School Improvement EDSI 9925**

**Semester Hours:** 3

**Semester/Year**

**Time/Location  
Instructor**

**Office Location**

**Office Hours**

**Telephone**

**Email**

**Fax**

**Online Support**      CourseDen Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

CourseDen Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course is an advanced study of policy and its impact on the field of education broadly, and school improvement specifically. There is a specific emphasis on policy development and analysis. The course is designed to enable educators to become knowledgeable, effective, and responsible actors within the political and policy arenas of schooling.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors (knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive, decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading, collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic), clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence; (b) Field-Based Inquiry; and (c) the Betterment of Society. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. National ELLC Standards and Georgia PSC standards are

incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

Upon completion of EDSI 9925 students are expected to have developed:

1. Understanding of the links between law, ethics, and policy in education (Alexander & Alexander, 2009; Johnson, 2006; Kingdon, 2003; Spring, 2004);

*ELCC Standards 3.2c, 4.2c, 4.2d, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1a, 6.1b, 6.1d, and  
COE Conceptual Framework, theme #1 "Professional Excellence"  
Core Competencies 1Kb, e*

2. Comprehension of policy theory and its relevance to education (Fowler, 2009; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2008; Johnson, 2006; Kingdon, 2003);

*ELCC Standards 6.1a, 6.1b, 6.1c, 6.1d, and COE Conceptual Framework, theme #1  
"Professional Excellence" and #2 "Betterment of Society"*

3. Knowledge of how policy is developed at the federal, state, and local levels (Fowler, 2003; Johnson, 2006; Kingdon, 2003; Spring, 2004);

*ELCC Standards 6.1a, 6.1d, and  
COE Conceptual Framework, theme #3 "Field-based Inquiry"  
Core Competency 2Si*

4. Insight into the variables and competing interests that have a positive and/or negative impact on policy formulation and implementation (Goodwin & Kemerer, 2002; Hoy & Miskel, 2006; Spring, 2004);

*ELCC Standards 6.1a, 6.1b, and COE Conceptual Framework, theme #1  
"Professional Excellence" and #2 "Betterment of Society"*

5. Skill in analyzing educational policy (Alexander & Alexander, 2009; Fowler, 2009; Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2011; State of Georgia Official Code, 2011);

*ELCC Standards 6.1a, 6.3a, and  
COE Conceptual Framework, theme 1 "Professional Excellence"*

6. Awareness of the equity and social justice implications within educational policy (Goodwin & Kemerer, 2002; Kingdon, 2003);

*ELCC Standards 4.2a, 4.2c, 4.2d, 5.2a, 6.1c, 6.1d, 6.1g, and  
COE Conceptual Framework, theme #1 "Professional Excellence"  
Core Competency 2Sj, k*

7. Strategies necessary to act effectively on this knowledge and shape responsible political action (Elmore, 2004; Kingdon, 2003; Johnson, 2006; Wolk, 2011)

*ELCC Standards 4.1c, 4.1d, 4.1e, 4.3c, 5.1a, 5.2c, 6.3a, 6.3b, 6.3c, and  
COE Conceptual Framework, theme #1 "Professional Excellence," #2 Field-based  
Inquiry" and #3 "Betterment of Society"  
Core Competency 1De; 2Sh,*

#### **TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES**

**Required Text(s):** Kingdon, J. W. (2003). *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*. New York: Longman Press.

#### **References:**

Alexander, K. & Alexander, M.D. (2009). *American Public School Law (7th edition)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Elmore, R. (2004). *School reform from inside out: Policy, practice, and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Fowler, F. (2009). *Policy Studies for Educational Leaders (3rd edition)*. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Gay L. R., Mills, G. E., Airasian, P. W. (2008). *Educational Research (9th edition)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Georgia Professional Standards Commission (2011). *The Code of Ethics for Educators*. Available online: <http://www.gapsc.com/Rules/Current/Ethics/505-6-.01.pdf>

Goodwin, R., & Kemerer, F. (2002). *School choice tradeoffs: Liberty, equity, and diversity*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (Eds.). (2006). *Contemporary issues in educational policy and school outcomes*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Johnson, A. G. (2006). *Privilege, Power, and Difference (2nd edition)*.

New York: McGraw Hill.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002). *Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (ELCC)*. Available online:  
[http://www.npbca.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20\\_5-02.pdf](http://www.npbca.org/ELCC/ELCCStandards%20_5-02.pdf)

Spring, J. (2004). *Conflict of Interest: The Politics of American Education*. New York: McGraw Hill.

State of Georgia. (1982-2011). *Official Code of Georgia*. Available online:  
<http://w3.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/gacode/Default.asp?loggedIn=done>

Wolk, R. (2011). *Wasting minds: Why our education system is failing and what we can do about it*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

**ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING**

*This is a draft. The professor may modify due dates in response to course pacing.*

**Assignments :**

| <b>Assignment</b>                            | <b>Task</b>  | <b>Due Date</b> |
|--|--|-----------------|
| 1. Policy Identification                     | Submit a 1 page paper that describes the policy chosen, the legal implications of the policy and the specific problem the policy was designed to address, and why you are choosing this policy for analysis.   | (on Course Den) |
| 2. Interview Protocol                        | Submit a 1 page paper that names whom you plan to interview, the relationship of this person to the policy, and includes the interview protocol you plan to use.   | (on Course Den) |
| 3. Policy Analysis<br><i>Draft of Part 1</i> | Submit a solid draft of Part 1 of the Policy Paper. Refer to the handout in Course Den called <i>Policy Analysis Guidelines</i> , which can be found under the Media Library tab and within the <i>Activities and Instructions Collection</i> .                            | (on Course Den) |
| 4. Analysis of Interview                     | Your interviews should be completed. Submit an analysis of the interview.  | (on Course Den) |
| 5. Policy Analysis<br><i>Full Document</i>   | Submit your full Policy Analysis paper, with revisions already made to Part 1. Refer to the handout in Course Den called <i>Policy Analysis Guidelines</i> , which can be found under the Media Library tab and within the <i>Activities and Instructions Collection</i> . | (on Course Den) |
| 6. Presentation                              | Prepare a 6-6 Presentation of your Policy Analysis for the class (on PowerPoint – saved to a flash drive). You have no more than 6 slides and 6 minutes to present the key elements!   |                 |
| 7. Policy Analysis<br>Rewrites (if needed)   | Rewrite the paper, or sections thereof, only if needed.  | (on Course Den) |

**Evaluation Procedures:**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Class Attendance and Contribution                                 | 25% |
| Policy Identification, Interview Protocol, and Interview Analysis | 20% |
| Policy Analysis   | 40% |
| Policy Presentation   | 15% |

**Grading Scale:**

The following scale will determine a student's grade for the course:

A = 90 - 100%, B = 80 - 89%, C = 70 - 79%, and F = Below 70%.

**CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

**Academic Honesty:** Work completed in this course must be original and developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information. Announcements about the course will be posted on Course Den. Please log on regularly!

**CLASS OUTLINE**

*This is a draft. The professor may make changes to due dates, add readings, and/or adjust topics in response to class pacing. Any changes will be announced on Course Den and appear on weekly Class Agendas.*

| <b>Session</b> | <b>To Prepare For Class</b>   | <b>Class Activities/Topics</b>  | <b>Tasks, Written Assignment(s)</b>                             |
|----------------|---|---|---|
| Class 1        | Read: *Fowler, Ch 1<br>(in Media Library)                                     | Course Preview<br>Introduction to Law/Ethics/Policy<br><i>In the News</i><br>Law : Student Issues<br>Links Between Law and Policy<br>Policy : Policy Basics<br>Skills: Choosing a Policy for Analysis | Investigate policies that connect to your dissertation interest |
| Class 2        | Read: *Kingdon, Ch. 1, 2<br><br>Scan: *Gay, et.al, Ch 7<br>(in Media Library) | Participate in <u>Online Forum</u> about the Kingdon reading and your policy selection<br>Skills: Interview Design  | Submit Assignment 1<br>(Policy Identification) on CourseDEN     |
| Class 3        | Read: *Kingdon, Ch 3, 4<br>*GA Code of Ethics<br>(in Media Library)           | <i>In the News</i><br>Doctoral Student 202<br>Law : Employee Issues<br>Policy: Key Players,<br>Governmental Forces<br>Skills: Setting the Context for a Policy Analysis                               | Submit Assignment 2<br>(Interview Protocol) on CourseDEN        |
| Class 4        | Read: *Kingdon, Ch 5, 6<br>*Spring, Ch. 9<br>(In Media Library)               | <i>In the News</i><br>Doctoral Student 202<br>Law: Discrimination<br>Policy: Hidden Agendas<br>Conflicting Values<br>Skills: Analysis of Interview Data   | Submit Assignment 3<br>(Policy Analysis, Part 1) on CourseDen   |
| Class 5        | Read: *Kingdon, Ch 7, 8<br>*Fowler, Ch 11                                     | <i>In the News</i><br>Doctoral Student 202<br>Law: Special Education<br>Policy: Policy Survival<br>Assessing Outcomes<br>Skills: Writing the Policy Analysis  | Submit Assignment 4<br>(Analysis of Interview) on CourseDen     |
| Class 6        | Read: *Fowler, Ch 7<br>*Johnson, Ch 8, 9<br>(In Media Library)                | <i>In the News</i><br>Doctoral Student 202<br>Law: Tort Liability<br>Policy: Analysis with Multiple Lenses<br>Influencing Policy<br>Skills: Presenting Policy Findings                                | Submit Assignment 5<br>(Full Policy Analysis) on CourseDen      |
| Class 7        | Prepare Presentation<br>(Be sure to time it!)                                 | Presentations<br>Course Wrap-up and Celebration !   | Prepare Assignment 6<br>(In-Class Presentation) for             |

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add    Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

#### Course Details

EDSI    9933    Leadership for Change

Prefix    Number    Course Title

This course addresses the theories and processes of change in societies, cultures and organizations with particular emphasis on change within the educational systems. Completion of this course will enable students to effectively use theories and processes in their role as change agents within their own educational environments. Change strategies that lead to school improvement are emphasized.

Course Catalog Description

3    0    3    Spring - 2012    Yearly    Letter Grade  
Lec Hrs    Lab Hrs    Credit Hrs    Effective Term    Frequency    Grading

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

see attached

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

#### Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Leadership for Change EDSI 9933**

Semester Hours: 3

Semester/Year:

Time/Location:

Instructor:

Office Location:

Office Hours:

Online Hours:

Telephone: Direct Line:  
Department Line:

Email:

Fax:

**Online Support** Course Den Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

Course Den Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>

UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>

Distance Learning Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course addresses the theories and processes of change in societies, cultures and organizations with particular emphasis on change within the educational systems. Completion of this course will enable students to effectively use theories and processes in their role as change agents within their own educational environments. Change strategies that lead to school improvement are emphasized.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors, clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence [knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive]; (b) Field-Based Inquiry [decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading]; and (c) the Betterment of Society [collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic]. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and the program's core competencies.

## **APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION**

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

In course activities, students will:

1) consider and reflect on theories and definitions of leadership as a means for defining their own theories-in-use and skills for leading 21st century school organizations (*Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005*);

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence; ELCC 1);*

2) examine their own personal espoused theories of leadership through personal reflection and interactive considerations in colloquial sessions so as to reduce the tacitness of those concepts as a means of developing leadership skills and competencies *(Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);*

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence; ELCC 1, 2);*

3) consider the processes of influence and intention as strategies for leading organizational activities for change and improvement in schools and other educational organizations ; *(Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);*

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society; ELCC 2; Core Competencies 1Sc; 2Sb);*

4) consider and reflect on definitions and dimensions of followership as a means of using intention and influence on the improvement of school organizations *(Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);*

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society; ELCC 2; Core Competencies 1Sb; 2Dc, d);*

5) identify and reflect on strategies for assessing an organization's readiness for change and the application of change theories *(Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);*

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society, ELCC 2; Core Competencies 1Kd; 1Sa; 2Sa);*

6) identify, reflect on, and write about processes and dynamic of change theory in educational settings *(Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);*

*(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society, ELCC 2; Core Competencies 1Kd; 1Sd; 2Kb);*

7) identify components and symbols of organizational culture in schools that offer positive opportunities for change and improvement *(Christensen, 2008; Danielson, 2002; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Schein 2004);*

(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society, Field Based Inquiry, ELCC 2; Core Competency 1Kd);

8) identify and develop, through personal reflection and interactive consideration in colloquial arrangements, skills and competencies for facilitating change within individuals, local schools, school systems, and other educational contexts so as to assure accountability and improvement (Bennis, 2009; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; Friedman, 2007; Hargreaves & Fullan, 2009; Kotter, 1996; Morgan, 2006; Ravitch, 2010; Senge, 2006; Spring, 2005);

(COE Conceptual Framework: Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society; ELCC 2, 4; Core Competencies 1Da, c).

## TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES

### Required Text

Joiner, B. and Josephs, S. (2007). *Leadership Agility: Five Levels of Mastery for Anticipating and Initiating Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

### References

Bennis, W. (2009). *On Becoming a Leader*. Philadelphia: Basic Books.

Christensen, C. (2008). *Disrupting Class: How Disruptive Innovation Will Change the Way the World Learns*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing Student Achievement: A Framework for School Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Deal, T., & Peterson, K. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Friedman, T. (2007). *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Picador.

Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (2009). *Change Wars*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Kotter, J., & Cohen, D. (2002). *The heart of change: Real-life stories of how people change their organizations*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Spring, J. (2005). *Conflict of Interest: The Politics of American Education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

## ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING

### Assignments/Artifacts

- #1: Weekly Article Responses/Reactions (9 @ 4 points each)
- #2 : Post-Book Reflections – (4 @ 10 points each)
- #3 : Culminating Project/Action Plan (24 points)

### Grading

The generally accepted norm across accredited institutions for assigning grades at the graduate level is that the grade of “B” represents expected/average/median quality of work. At the graduate level this would reflect the application of more sophisticated ways of looking at and processing information or ideas; conscientious and thorough examination of a range of information/sources appropriate to the topic or issue; clear, grammatically correct, professionally appropriate, and error-free communication across multiple mediums; and the ability to apply new ideas to concrete situations in meaningful and unique ways. It is this grade that is earned when these characteristics are generally present in the totality of one’s work. A grade of “A” is earned when one’s work consistently reflects or exceeds these characteristics. Conversely, grades lower than “B” indicate that one’s work does not sufficiently reflect these characteristics in consistency or level.

In this context, the following scale will be used to assign letter grades to work:

| Percent of Total Points | Letter Grade Equivalent |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 92.5 – 100.0%           | A                       |
| 84.5 – 92.4%            | B                       |
| 75.0 – 84.4%            | C                       |
| 0.0 – 74.4%             | F                       |

## CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

### Class Outline

Because the class is 100% online and mostly asynchronous, students should check the learning modules posted on Course Den.

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add    Modify    Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

Course Details

EDSI

9942

Instructional Leadership That Facilltates School Impro

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course prepares students to be instructional leaders in their educational settings. The knowledge base in effective teaching, motivation and learning, clinical supervision, and professional development are explored and analyzed as vehicles for school improvement.

Course Catalog Description

3

Lec Hrs

0

Lab Hrs

3

Credit Hrs

Fall - 2012

Effective Term

Yearly

Frequency

Letter Grade

Grading

Prerequisites

Corequisites

Rationale

see attached

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

## Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Instructional Leadership That Facilitates School Improvement EDSI 9942****Semester Hours** 3**Semester/Year****Time/Location****Instructor****Office Location****Office Hours****Online Hours****Telephone****Email****Fax****Online Support**

CourseDen Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

CourseDen Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>

UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>

Distance Learning Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course prepares students to be instructional leaders in their educational settings. The knowledge base in effective teaching, motivation and learning, clinical supervision, and professional development are explored and analyzed as vehicles for school improvement.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors, clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence [knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive]; (b) Field-Based Inquiry [decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading]; and (c) the Betterment of Society [collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic]. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

1. describe trends, issues and barriers in teaching and classroom practice to school improvement and reform, and strategically plan to remove those barriers (Brookhart, 2010; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; Kohn, 2006);  
(Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 1Kc; 1Sa; 3Kb);
2. differentiate among whole school and content area renewal, restructuring, and reform, and describe the role of teachers, both individually and collectively, as change agents in school culture (Cruikshank, 1996; Kohn, 2006);  
(Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 1Ka; 2Kad; 3Kb);
3. recognize with proper perspective, the need for school improvement and reform (Thompson, 2008);  
(Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 1Da);
4. effectively use the knowledge base to prioritize student learning over school political issues, and to bring about change for increased student academic learning and social development (Brophy, 2004);  
(Professional Excellence, Field-Based Inquiry; Core Competency: 2Db; 3Sa; 3Db);

5. discriminate between sound and unsound reports, research, and practice in the areas of teaching, learning, curriculum, and assessment (Marzano, Pickering, & Heflebower, 2010); (Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 5Dc; 3Ka; 3Sd);
6. draw from the knowledge base to build foundational skills in developing personal positions relative to K-12 settings and communicate those positions effectively orally and in writing to lay and professional audiences (American Psychological Association, 2010; Stiggins, Arter, Chappuis, & Chappuis, 2009; Wiggins & McTighe, 2005); (Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society, Field Based Inquiry; Core Competency: 5Sab; 5Dab);
7. evaluate, synthesize, reflect on, and use professional literature to build a theoretical base for a research focus and to empower teachers to improve their effectiveness (Easton, 2004); (Professional Excellence, Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 3Sb; 4Sb; 4Dc; 5Dc);
8. interpret and communicate research results effectively to both professional and lay audiences; (Betterment of Society, Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 4Shi; 4Db);
9. observe and assess interpersonal dynamics between self and others, and individually within a group, and facilitate groups to achieve consensus and any needed development; (Field Based Inquiry, Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 2Kc; 2Sce);
10. demonstrate the ability to reflect and self-monitor; (Betterment of Society, Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 2Sd);
11. develop a personal vision of and commitment to school improvement and reform; (Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 1Dc; 4Sa);
12. value the involvement of key stakeholders in providing equitable and appropriate educational access to all students (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997); (Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 1Db; 3Da);
13. access electronic resources to conduct searches, prepare professional quality documents, and transmit documents through electronic sources (American Psychological Association, 2010); (Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 6Sbd);
14. identify and interpret nonverbal signals in different language systems (Howard, Dresser, & Dunklee, 2009; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995); (Betterment of Society; Core Competency: 5Kb);
15. recognize and use networks and pathways, including multi-media, to effectively disseminate information, positions, and decisions regarding teaching and classroom practice to professional and lay audiences; match technology resources to teaching, learning, and school administrative needs; (Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 5Sc; 6Kc; 6Da);
16. communicate in a logical, scholarly style using the format prescribed by the American Psychological Association (American Psychological Association, 2010); (Professional Excellence; Core Competency: 5Sd).

**TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES****Required Text(s)**

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publications manual of the American Psychological Association* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Cruikshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2009). *The act of teaching* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

**References**

Brookhart, S. M. (2010). *How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Brophy, J. (2004). *Motivating students to learn* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Cogan, M. L. (1973). *Clinical supervision*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Cruikshank, D. R. (1996). *Preparing America's teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.

Easton, L. B. (Ed.). (2004). *Powerful designs for professional learning*. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Howard, T., Dresser, S. G., & Dunklee, D. R. (2009). *Poverty is not a learning disability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kohn, A. (2006). *Beyond Discipline: From Compliance to Community*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Heflebower, T. (2010) *The Highly-Engaged Classroom*. Marzano Research Laboratory.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2006). *Building school-based teacher learning communities: Professional strategies to improve student achievement*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Roberts, S. M., & Pruitt, E. Z. (2009). *Schools as professional learning communities: Collaborative activities and strategies for professional development*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Sparks, D., & Hirsch, S. (1997). *A new vision for staff development*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stiggins, R. A., Arter, J. A., Chappuis, J. Chappuis, S. (2009). *Classroom assessment for student learning: Doing it right-using it well*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Thompson, M. (2008). *Leadership, achievement, and accountability: Benchmarking to exemplary practice*. Boone, NC: Learning-Focused Solutions.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Upper River Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education.

Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (1995). *Diversity and motivation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zepeda, S. (2007). *Instructional supervision: Applying tools and concepts* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

## ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING

### Assignments

1. **Assigned Readings:** Read and discuss materials from the texts, reference materials, and other materials as assigned.
2. **Peer Mentoring Project:** Individual class members will conduct an instructional leadership project. The project draws on the effective teaching literature, the professional development and supervision models and qualitative research methods. The project will be presented in both paper and oral formats.

Components of the project are as follows:

- a. Consult with a classroom teacher and obtain permission to observe and work collaboratively on some aspect of teaching (instruction, management, etc.) throughout the semester (due Jan. 26). *Be careful to use pseudonyms for individuals and schools throughout this project to protect confidentiality.*
- b. Identify teaching behaviors linked to student achievement or social development that will be the focus of the project. Connect these behaviors to the knowledge base on effective teaching (due Feb. 16).
- c. Among the readings you have done for 2b, select *five (5)* that relate to non-dominant populations. Write an annotated bibliography for each of these readings (due Feb. 23).
- d. Identify support behaviors, in addition to clinical supervision procedures, that should apply to this context and situation.
- e. Identify qualitative research methods that would be appropriate for gathering data in this situation. Connect these behaviors to the knowledge base on instructional leadership and supervision. You should have a research-based rationale for the supervision strategies you use and the suggestions that you make from the analysis of the teaching episodes.
- f. Observe a minimum of four classroom teaching sessions (a complete lesson or a minimum of 30 minutes, depending on the grade level) and analyze the application of the teaching behaviors identified in "b". One observation must be audio or video taped and analyzed.
- g. Develop anecdotal field notes reflecting observations and pre-and post- conferences.
- h. Submit a final report to summarize all of the above steps with the following categories of information clearly identified:
  - 2a - Description of the setting for the observations: school and classroom demographics; teacher's experience; environment; subject (if appropriate); and

any unusual aspects of the context that may have impact on the situation/setting (300 words);

- **2b - Overview of the target behavior** that was the focus of this project, with a summary of the literature relevant to this specific teaching situation (600-1000 words);
- **Overview of observation tools and support behaviors** you selected to work with the teacher in this project, linking your decision to use these to specific characteristics of the target behavior, teacher, or context. (600 words).
- **Time line** of dates and observations/ conferences.
- **Write a review** for the teacher you observed (300- 600 words)
- **Reflect** on this instructional leadership experience. Respond to these prompts for each observation / conference (1200 words):
  1. What instructional leadership skills and support behaviors did I use in these observations/conferences?
  2. What was most effective? Why?
  3. What would I do differently?

Next, reflect on this instructional leadership experience as a whole.

1. What did you learn about working with a teacher towards improved instruction and practice?
2. What did you learn about instructional leadership?
3. What did you learn about yourself as an instructional leader as a result of this experience?

Note: To protect the confidentiality of the process, no mention should be made of the participating teacher's name. You must use pseudonyms. Also, you must obtain written permission from the participant for any audio or videotaping. Keep the written permission for your own records and future use. Consult the *Portfolio Manual* at the doctoral program website ([www.coe.westga.edu/edd/](http://www.coe.westga.edu/edd/)) for directions on referring to participants and schools and for copies of permission forms.

DUE: On CourseDen March 18 by 5.30 p.m.

4. **Professional Development Project:** You will select a professional development model/trend that is suitable to your professional setting. Select a target audience for your paper, someone in your school building or district whom you will have to access to institute this PD model. Your analysis will consist of the following sections:

Section 1 (1500 words) (Due April 27)

- Purpose and focus of PD model
- Description of process and features of PD model
- Conditions in which PD model will be successful
- Implications of school culture for PD model

Section 2 (1500 – 2000 words) (Due May 4)

- Suitability of PD model for your setting
- Issues, problems and considerations - culture of change, etc.
- Solutions to barriers

This presentation will be presented as a PowerPoint, with an oral narrative, and placed on CourseDen.

DUE: May 4 by 5.30 p.m.

6. **Focus Questions:** The FQs are posted on CourseDen and should be downloaded. They should help you as you read assigned materials for the topic. Complete them in enough detail to use in the discussion in class and to reflect your understanding of the relevant research. Don't write papers for publication ☺ These are meant for notes that you refer to during the class discussion.

**Evaluation Procedures**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Peer Mentoring - Identification of a Teacher and Target Behavior | 10         |
| Peer Mentoring - Summary of Knowledge Base                       | 30         |
| Peer Mentoring - Annotated bibliography                          | 10         |
| Peer Mentoring Project Paper                                     | 40         |
| Professional Development - Section 1                             | 30         |
| Professional Development Annotated bibliography                  | 10         |
| Professional Development - Section 2                             | 40         |
| Narrative - Professional development Model                       | 10         |
| Professionalism  | 20         |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>200</b> |

**Grading**

A = 90-100%

B = 80-89%

C = 70-79%

F = 69% and below

**CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

**CLASS OUTLINE****SECTION A – EFFECTIVE TEACHING**

*Introduction to the course / Effective Instructional Leadership*

- Barr-York, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(3), 255-316.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(2), 130-141.
- Perkins-Gough, D. (2002). Beyond instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 96.

*Effective Supervision - Clinical supervision cycle*

- Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R. H., & Krajewski, R. J. (1993). *Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston. 42- 47.
- Wiles, J., Bondi, J., & Wiles, M. T. (2006). *The essential middle school* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall. p. 311
- Handout - ASCD: *Four models of classroom-based assistance*

Saturday Seminar: *Cognitive Coaching; Content Area Panel**What Instructional Leaders Know – Effective Curriculum*

- Huett, J., Moller, L., Foshay, W. R., Coleman, C. (2008). The evolution of distance education: Implications for instructional design on the potential of the web. Part 3: K-12. *Tech Trends, 52*(5), 63-67.
- Journell, W. (2009). Setting out the (un)welcome mat: A portrayal of immigration in state standards for American history. *The Social Studies, 100*(4), 160.
- Moore, J. R. (2009). Why religious education matters: The role of Islam in multicultural education. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*(3), 139-145. doi: 10.1080/15210960903116563
- Soslau, E. G., & Yost, D. S. (2007). Urban service-learning: An authentic teaching strategy to deliver a standards-driven curriculum. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 30*(1), 36.
- Tabak, I. (2005). Are disciplinary distinctions pertinent to multicultural education?: A view from science. *Multicultural Perspectives, 7*(4), 33-38. doi: 10.1207/s15327892mcp0704\_6
- Tochon, F. V. (2009). The key to global understanding: World language education — Why schools need to adapt. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(2), 650-681.
- DUE: Identification of teacher and target behavior area

*What Instructional Leaders Know - Effective Teaching- Brain/Mind Research*

- Cruikshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2006). *The act of teaching* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. Chapter 3.
- National Research Council. (2000). Learning and transfer (pp. 51-78); How children learn (pp. 79-113); and Mind and brain (pp. 114-130). In *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: Author. (<http://www.nap.edu>)

*What Instructional Leaders Know - Effective Teaching- Effective Instruction*

- Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does homework improve academic achievement? A synthesis of research, 1987-2003. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(1), 1-62.

- Cruikshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2006). The act of teaching (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. Chapter 6, 7 and 8.
- Curtin, E. A. (2005). Instructional styles used by regular classroom teachers while teaching recently mainstreamed ESL students: Six urban middle school teachers in Texas share their experiences and perceptions. *Multicultural Education*, 12(4), 36-42.
- Davis, E. A., Petish, D., & Smithey, J. (2006). Challenges new Science teachers face. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(4), 607-651.
- Harkness, S., Blom, M., Oliva, A., Moscardino, U., Zylicz, P. O., Bermudez, M. R., and Super, C. M. (2007). Teachers' ethnotheories of the 'ideal student' in five western cultures. *Comparative Education*, 43(1), 113.
- Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(2), 1010-1038.
- Shute, V. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- Walshaw, M., & Anthony, G. (2008). The teachers' role in classroom discourse: A review of recent research into mathematics classroom. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 516-552.

---

*What Instructional Leaders Know –Effective Motivation*

- Balfanz, R., Herzog, L., & Mac Iver, D. J. (2007). Preventing student disengagement and keeping students on the graduation path in urban middle-grades schools: Early identification and effective interventions. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(4), 223-235.
- Cruikshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2009). The Act of Teaching (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. Chapter 5.
- Dweck, C. S. (2007). The perils and promises of praise. *Educational Leadership*, 65(2), 34-39.
- Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Motivating the academically unmotivated: A critical issue for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 151-179.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic Optimism of Schools: A Force for Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425-446.
- Legault, L., Green-Demers, I., & Pelletier, L. (2006). Why do high school students lack motivation in the classroom? Toward an understanding of academic amotivation and the role of social support. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(3), 567.
- DUE: Summary of knowledge base on target teacher behavior

---

*What Instructional Leaders Know - Effective Management*

- Guest Lecture: Dr. Deb Jenkins
- Bogum, Y. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(2), 495-523.
- Cruikshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2009). *The Act of Teaching* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. Chapter 12.
- del Carmen Salazar, M., & Fránquiz, M. E. (2008). The transformation of Ms. Corazon: Creating humanizing spaces for Mexican immigrant students in secondary ESL classrooms. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 10(4), 185-191. doi: 10.1080/15332860802526073
- Marzano, R. J., & Marzano, J. S. (2003). The key to classroom management. *Educational Leadership*, 61(1), 6-13.
- DUE: Annotated bibliography – Peer Mentoring project

---

*What Instructional Leaders Know - Effective Assessment*

Guest Lecture: Dr. Kim Metcalf

Au, W. W. (2009). High-stakes testing and discursive control: The triple bind for non-standard student identities. *Multicultural Perspectives, 11*(2), 65-71. doi: 10.1080/15210960903028727

Baker, E. L. (2007). The end(s) of testing. *Educational Researcher, 36*(6), 309-317.

Heritage, M., Kim, J., Vendliniski, T., & Herman, J. (2009). From evidence to action: A seamless process in formative assessment? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 28*(3), 24-33.

Leung, C., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2007). Teacher assessment as policy instrument: Contradictions and capacities. *Language Assessment Quarterly, 4*(1), 6-36.

Smith, K. (2009). From test takers to test makers. *Educational Leadership, 67*(3), 26-30.

DUE: Annotated bibliography – Peer Mentoring project

---

March 9 - *What Instructional Leaders Know – Effective Teaching - Teachers*

Cruickshank, D. R., & Haefele, D. (2001). Good teachers, plural. *Educational Leadership, 58*(5), 26-30.

Demetriou, H., Wilson, E., & Winterbottom, M. (2009). The role of emotion in teaching: Are there differences between male and female newly qualified teachers' approaches to teaching? *Educational Studies, 35*(4), 449-473.

Ramanathan, H. (2007). Teacher beliefs and teacher decision-making. *SPELT*.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is competent beginning teaching? A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(1), 1-35.

Rosenshine, B., & Furst, N. (1971). Research on teacher performance criteria. In B. O. Smith (Ed.), *Research in Teacher Education: A Symposium*. (pp. 37-72). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Wayne, A. J., & Young, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 73*(1), 89-122.

---

Saturday Seminar: *Field Psych Trust; TBA*

---

March 16- *What Instructional Leaders Know – Teacher Growth and Reflection*

Cruickshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf, K. K. (2009). *The Act of Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill. Chapters 13-14.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational Leadership, 50*(6), 12-17.

Giovannelli, M. (2003). Relationship between reflective disposition toward teaching and effective teaching. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(5), 293-309.

National Research Council, (2000). How experts differ from novices (pp. 31-50). In *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: Author.

(<http://www.nap.edu>)

Wolfe, M. P. (2001). Lifecycle of the career teacher: Maintaining excellence for a lifetime

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add    Modify    Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

Course Details

EDSI    9943    Models of Professional Development

Prefix    Number    Course Title

This course identifies current research and theory in principles and models of professional development in the context of school improvement. Students will examine pedagogies of professional development, structures that support teacher and adult learning, models of professional development, issues that influence and define teacher learning, and evaluation of professional development.

Course Catalog Description

3    0    3    Spring - 2012    Yearly    Letter Grade  
Lec Hrs    Lab Hrs    Credit Hrs    Effective Term    Frequency    Grading

Prerequisites

Corequisites

Rationale

see attached

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Models of Professional Development EDSI 9943****Semester Hours** 3**Semester/Year****Instructor****Office Location****Office Hours****Online Hours****Telephone****Email****Fax**

**Online Support** Course Den Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

Course Den Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>

UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>

Distance Learning Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course identifies current research and theory in principles and models of professional development in the context of school improvement. Students will examine pedagogies of professional development, structures that support teacher and adult learning, models of professional development, issues that influence and define teacher learning, and evaluation of professional development.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors, clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence [knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive]; (b) Field-Based Inquiry [decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading]; and (c) the Betterment of Society [collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic]. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## **APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION**

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

### **Course Objectives**

The learning outcomes are derived directly from the Core Competencies of the doctoral program in school improvement and from the conceptual framework descriptors for the College of Education as indicated in parentheses below.

Learners will:

1. Synthesize, evaluate, reflect on, and use professional literature to build a theoretical base to empower teachers to improve their effectiveness (Borko, 2004; Craig, 2009; Dall'Alba, & Sandberg, J. 2006; Penuel, Fishman, Yamaguchi, & Gallagher, 2007;

Rowan, & Miller, 2007; Sullivan, & Glanz, 2000; Wayne, Yoon, Zhu, Cronen, and Garet, 2008; Webster-Wright, 2009).

(Decisive; Adaptive; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Core Competency: 3Sb; 4Sb; 4Dc; 5Dc)

2. Analyze reasons and conditions for teacher retention and how teacher professional learning can contribute to teacher retention (Borman & Dowling, 2008; Buckley, Schneider, & Shang, 2005; Coperhaver-Johnson, 2007; Guarino, Santibañez, & Daley, 2006; Ingersoll, 2004; Metzger, & Wu 2008; Ramirez, 2009)

(Decisive; Adaptive; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Core Competency: 3Sb; 4Sb; 4Dc; 5Dc)

3. Identify the areas in which individuals and group members need development to more effectively provide them professional development opportunities (Gordon, 2006; Speck & Knipe, 2005)

(Decisive; Leading; Adaptive; Culturally Sensitive; Empathetic; Knowledgeable; Core Competency: 2Sf; 3Kd)

4. Understand the scope of individual teacher professional learning and group teacher professional development (Ackerman, & McKenzie, 2007; Diaz-Maggioli, 2004).

(Decision-makers; Leaders; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective)

5. identify impediments that are peculiar to a school setting and help members recognize and overcome them (Danielson, 2007; Olsen, 2008; Reeves, 2010; Semaden, 2010; Sisk-Hilton, 2009)

(Knowledge; Leading; Empathetic; Proactive; Core Competency: 2Sg)

6. conceptualize the need for teacher professional learning to include addressing the instructional needs of diverse learners: multicultural students and special needs students (Guskey & Peterson, 1996; Richards, & Farrell, 2005; Sparks & Hirsch, 1997; Fullan, 2001, Speck & Knipe, 2005)

(Decision Makers; Knowledge; Adaptive; Lifelong Learners; Culturally Sensitive, Empathetic; Leaders)

7. determine the most appropriate professional learning strategies integral to meeting the developmental learning needs of teachers to support a system of continuous learning (Danielson, 2007; National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching, 1999; Olsen, 2008; Reeves, 2010; Semaden, 2010; Sisk-Hilton, 2009; Torres-Guzman, 2010.)

(Decision-makers; Leaders; Adaptive; Collaborative; Knowledgeable; Proactive)

8. demonstrate the ability to use appropriate tools, structures, and protocols to build and analyze professional development programs for teachers (Dede, 2006; DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Gordon, 2003; Guskey, 2000; Shulman, & Sato, 2006; Wiburg, & Brown, 2006)

(Decision-makers; Leaders; Adaptive; Collaborative; Culturally Sensitive; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective)

9. draw from the knowledge base to build foundational skills in developing personal positions relative to K-12 settings and communicate those positions effectively orally and in writing to lay and professional audiences (Danielson, 2007; DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Olsen, 2008; Reeves, 2010; Semaden, 2010; Sisk-Hilton, 2009)

(Inquisitive; Culturally Sensitive; Knowledgeable; Proactive; Reflective; Core Competency: 5Sab; 5Dab)

10. identify and evaluate past, existing, and emerging technology resources used in education and match them to teacher professional learning (Dede, 2006).

(Leaders, Lifelong Learners, Adaptive, Knowledgeable, And Proactive; Core Competency 6Kb, 6Db);

#### **TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES**

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

#### **References**

Ackerman, R., & McKenzie, S. V. (Eds.). (2007). *Uncovering teacher leadership: Essays and voices from the field*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Dede, C. (Ed.) (2006). *Online professional development for teachers: Emerging models and methods*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Diaz-Maggioli, G. (2004). *Teacher-centered professional development*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

DuFour, R., Eaker, R., & DuFour, R. (2005). *On common ground: The power of professional learning communities*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Services.

Gordon, S. P. (2003) *Professional development for school improvement: Empowering learning communities*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Olsen, B. (2008). *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live: How teachers' personal histories shape their professional development*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Reeves, D. B. (2010). *Transforming professional development into student results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Richards, J., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Semaden, J. H. (2010). *Taking charge of professional development: A practical model for your school*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Shulman, J. H., & Sato, M. (2006). *Mentoring teachers toward excellence: Supporting and developing highly qualified teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sisk-Hilton, S. (2009). *Teaching and learning in public: Professional development through shared inquiry (Technology, Education-Connections, TEC Series)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Speck, M., & Knipe, C.O. (2005). *Why can't we get it right? Designing high-quality professional development for standards-based schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Torres-Guzman, M. E. (2010). *Freedom at work: Language, professional, and intellectual development in schools*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Wiburg, K. M., & Brown, B. (2006). *Lesson study communities: Increasing achievement with diverse students*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

## ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING

Because this course is 100% online, students should check on Course Den for specific assignment instructions, projects, rubrics, and due dates.

### Evaluation Procedures

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Position Paper on Professional Development            | 50         |
| Professional Development Model-                       | 60         |
| Professional Development Model Annotated bibliography | 10         |
| Effective PD – A Pilot Project                        | 60         |
| Professionalism                                       | 20         |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>200</b> |

## CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

## CLASS OUTLINE

### Teacher Attrition and Retention

- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(3), 367-409.
- Buckley, J., Schneider, M. & Shang, Y. (2005). Fix it and they may stay: School facility quality and teacher retention in Washington, D. C. *Teachers College Record*, 107(5), 1107-1123.
- Coperhaver-Johnson, J. (2007). Part III: Creating multicultural classrooms: Rolling back advances in multicultural education: No child left behind and "highly qualified teachers". *Multicultural Perspectives*, 9(4), 40-47. doi: 10.1080/15210960701569690 Link
- Guarino, C. M., Santibañez, L. & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of recent empirical literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 173-208.
- Ingersoll, R. (2004). Revolving doors and leaky buckets. In C. Glickman (Ed.) *Letters to the next president: What we can do about the real crisis in public education?* (pp. 141-147). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Metzger, S. A., & Wu, M. (2008). Commercial teacher selection instruments: The validity of selecting teachers through beliefs, attitudes, and values. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 921-940.
- Ramirez, A. Y. (2009). Ethnic minorities and teaching: An examination of the low numbers in the teaching profession. *Multicultural Education*, 16(4), 19-24.
-

## Scope of Professional Development

- Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. *Educational Researcher*, 33(8), 3-15.
- Craig, C. J. (2009). Research in the midst of organized school reform: Versions of teacher community in tension. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(2), 598-619.
- Dall'Alba, G., & Sandberg, J. (2006). Unveiling professional development: A critical review of stage models. *Review of Research in Education*, 76(3), 383-412.
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R. & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-59.
- Rowan, B., & Miller, R. J. (2007). Organizational strategies for promoting instructional change: Implementation dynamics in schools working with comprehensive school reform providers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(2), 252-97.
- Sullivan, S., & Glanz, J. (2000). Alternative approaches to supervision: Cases from the field. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 15(3), 212-235.
- Wayne, A. W., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S. and Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with Teacher Professional Development: Motives and Methods. *Educational Researcher*, 37(8), 469-479.
- Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 702-739.

---

## Position Paper on PD

Select any one of the following books. (No more than 3 people may sign up for a book.) Your initial posting will be an in-depth review of the ideas in the book. Your reading and the discussions on Course Den through this fortnight should inform your Position Paper.

- Danielson, C. (2007). *Teacher leadership that strengthens professional practice*. ASCD.
- Olsen, B. (2008). *Teaching what they learn, learning what they live: How teachers' personal histories shape their professional development*. Paradigm Publishers
- Reeves, D. B. (2010). *Transforming professional development into student results*. ASCD.
- Semaden, J. H. (2010). *Taking charge of professional development: A practical model for your school*. ASCD
- Sisk-Hilton, S. (2009). *Teaching and learning in public: Professional development through shared inquiry (Technology, Education-Connections, TEC Series)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Torres-Guzman, M. E. (2010). *Freedom at work: Language, professional, and intellectual development in schools*. Paradigm Publishers.

---

## Mentoring

- Gagen, L., & Bowie, S. (2005). Effective mentoring: A case for training mentors for novice teachers. *Journal of Physical Education: Recreation and Dance*, 76(7), 40-45.
- Musanti, S. (2004). Balancing mentoring and collaboration: Midcareer teachers constructing a new role. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 6(1), 13-23.
- Smith, T.M., & Ingersoll, R. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 705.
- Trubowitz, S. (2004). The why, how, and what of mentoring. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 59-62.
- Wang, J., & Odell, S. J. (2002). Mentored learning to teach according to standards-based reform: A critical review. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 481-546.
- Young, J. R., Bullough, R. V., Draper, R. J., Smith, L. K., & Erickson, L. B. (2005). Novice teacher growth and personal models of mentoring: Choosing compassion over inquiry. *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 13(2), 169-188.

### Professional Learning Communities

- DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? *Educational Leadership*, 61(8), 6-11.
- Joyce, B. (2004). How are professional learning communities created? History has a few messages. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 76-82.

### Critical Friends Group

- Bambino, D. (2002). Critical friends. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 25-27.
- Dunne, F., Nave, B., & Lewis, A. (2000). Critical friends groups: Teachers helping teachers to improve student learning. *Research Bulletins Online*, (28). Retrieved 8/21/04 from <http://www.pdkintl.org/research/rbulletins/resbul28.htm>
- Hamilton, J. O. (2005). The national school reform faculty: Reforming schools from the inside. *Education Horizons*, 17-28.
- Key, E. (2006). Do they make a difference? A review of research on the impact of Critical Friends Group. Paper presented at the National School Reform Research Forum, Denver, CO, January 11, 2006. <http://www.nsrffharmony.org/research.key.pdf>
- National School Reform Faculty, Harmony Education Center. <http://www.nsrffharmony.org>
- Strahan, D. (2003). Promoting a collaborative professional culture in three elementary schools that have beaten the odds. *The Elementary School Journal*, 104(2), 127-146.
- The Virtual Protocol*. <http://www.lasw.org/vp.html>

### Lesson Study

- Chokshi, S., & Fernandez, C. (2004). Challenges to importing Japanese lesson study: Concerns, misconceptions, and nuances. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(7), 520-525.
- Fernandez, C., & Chokshi, S. (2002). A practical guide to translating lesson study for a U.S. setting. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(2), 128-134.

### Evaluating Teachers' Professional Learning

---

**Conduct a pilot study of a PD in your setting**

---

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add    Modify    Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

Course Details

EDSI

9963

Action Research for Change I

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course begins a two semester site-based research experience during which students conduct a school improvement project. Students reflect on practice to identify a research problem, conduct a review of literature to provide a theoretical base for their studies, develop research questions, and plan methods for data collection and implementation.

Course Catalog Description

3

0

3

Spring - 2012

Yearly

Letter Grade

Lec Hrs

Lab Hrs

Credit Hrs

Effective Term

Frequency

Grading

Prerequisites

Corequisites

Rationale

see attached

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Action Research for Change I EDSI 9963****Semester Hours** 3**Semester/Year****Time/Location****Instructor****Office Location****Office Hours****Online Hours****Telephone****Email****Fax****Online Support**Course Den Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>Course Den Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course begins a two semester site-based research experience during which students conduct a school improvement project. Students reflect on practice to identify a research problem,

conduct a review of literature to provide a theoretical base for their studies, develop research questions, and plan methods for data collection and implementation.

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Preparing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors (knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive, decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading, collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic), clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence; (b) Field-Based Inquiry; and (c) the Betterment of Society. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION

For this course we will draw on several pedagogical methods including small group discussions, reflective activities, interactive discussions, and activities.

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

1. use reflective and proactive processes of inquiry to identify a research focus for school improvement (Cole & Knowles, 2000; Hendricks, 2006) [*D9 Proactive; D10 Reflective; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sa*];
2. use research for continuous school improvement (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Hendricks, 2006) [*D10 Reflective; D9 Proactive; D4 Adaptive; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sh*];

3. evaluate, synthesize, and use professional literature to build a theoretical base for a research focus, discriminating between sound and unsound research reports (Hendricks, 2004); draw from the knowledge base in education and school improvement to construct scholarly, defensible positions (Hendricks); and effectively use the knowledge base to bring about change for increased student academic learning and social development and bring about change that empowers educators to enhance their effectiveness (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1992) [*D8 Knowledgeable; D1 Decision Makers; D9 Proactive; D10 Reflective; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sb; Scholarly Persuasion Sa; Teaching and Learning Sa, Sb, Sd*];
4. generate research questions based on a research focus and develop and implement a theoretically-based intervention for outcomes-based research studies (Hendricks, 2006) [*D1 Decision Makers; D4 Adaptive; D7 Empathetic; D8 Knowledgeable; D9 Proactive; D5 Collaborative; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sc, Sd*];
5. create a systematic data collection plan aligned with the research focus (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Hendricks, 2006) [*D1 Decision Makers; D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Se*];
6. use and value technology for exchanging ideas with others, gathering information, and preparing and transmitting professional quality documents electronically (Levin, Waddoups, Levin, & Buell, 2001) [*D4 Adaptive; D5 Collaborative; D8 Knowledgeable; D1 Decision Makers; D2 Leaders; D9 Proactive; D3 Lifelong Learners; Core Competencies Technology Sa, Sb, Sd, Dc*];
7. communicate in a logical, scholarly style using the format prescribed by the American Psychological Association (Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), 2001) [*D3 Lifelong Learners; D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competencies Scholarly Persuasion Sd*];
8. understand the role of teachers, both individually and collectively, in school improvement (Halsall, 1998) [*D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competencies Teaching and Learning Kb*];
9. value the involvement and engagement of key stakeholders as well as representatives of underserved populations in school improvement efforts (Brandon, 1998; Halsall, 1998) [*D5 Collaborative; D9 Proactive; D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competencies School Improvement and Reform Db*].

## TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Required Text(s) | Mertler, C. (2012). <i>Action Research: Improving Schools and Empowering Educators</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE<br>ISBN: 9781412988896 |
|------------------|--|

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

**Instructional Resources**      [www.sagepub.com/mertler3study](http://www.sagepub.com/mertler3study)

### References

- Brandon, P. R. (1998). Stakeholder participation for the purpose of helping ensure evaluation validity: Bridging the gap between collaborative and non-collaborative evaluations. *The American Journal of Evaluation, 19*, 325-337.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (Eds.) (1992). *Inside outside. Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cole, A.L., & Knowles, J. G. (2000). *Researching teaching. Exploring teacher development through reflective inquiry*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Halsall, R. (Ed.). (1998). *Teacher research and school improvement: Opening doors from the inside*. Cambridge: Taylor & Francis.
- Hendricks, C. (2009). *Improving schools through action research: A comprehensive guide for educators* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Levin, S. R., Waddoups, G. L., Levin, J., & Buell, J. (2001, January). Highly interactive and effective online learning environments for teacher professional development. *International Journal of Electronic Technology*. [Available online: <http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v2n2/slevin/index.html>]
- Mertler, C. A. (2007). *Interpreting standardized test scores: Strategies for data-driven instructional decision making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mertler, C. A. (2008). *Introduction to educational research* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.
- Mertler, C. A. (2009). A systematic approach to transforming the *art* of teaching into the *science* of teaching: Developing a D-DIDM mindset (MWERA 2008 Presidential Address). *Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 22*(1), 12-23.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wikeley, F. (1998). Dissemination of research as a tool for school improvement. *School Leadership & Management*, 18, 59-73.

## ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING

### Assignments

1. **Project Assignments:** Students will complete six (6) assignments that will serve as a basis for the final research project. Assignments are aligned with Chapters 1 - 5 in the textbook. Each assignment is worth 10 points (**60 points total**). These assignments are aligned with Course Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
2. **Collaborative Activities using Class Discussion Board:** Students are required to submit project updates three times during the course. Students will also respond to their peers' updates three times during the course. Each update is worth 3 points and each response is worth 2 points (45 total points). These activities are aligned with Course Objectives 6, 8, and 9. **Three updates/responses are due during this summer (15 points total).**
3. **Research proposal:** Students will draft the first three sections of the research proposal, introduction to the problem, literature review, and proposed methods. This activity is aligned with *all* Course Objectives. The paper is worth 25 points. A rubric will be provided

### Evaluation Procedures

| Assignment                               | Points          | Assessment Tools | Due Date |
|--|-----------------|------------------|----------|
| Summer Semester                          |                 |                  |          |
| 1. Chapter 1- questions 1 & 2            | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 2. Chapter 2- question 3                 | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 3. Chapter 3 –questions 5 & 6            | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 4. Chapter 4 – questions 3 & 5           | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 5. Chapter 5 – question 4 or 5           | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 6. IRB submission                        | 10              | Checklist        |          |
| 7. Post & respond                        | 5               | Checklist        |          |
| 8. Post & respond                        | 5               | Checklist        |          |
| 9. Post & respond                        | 5               | Checklist        |          |
| 10. Draft 1 <sup>st</sup> three sections | 25              | Informal rubric  |          |
| Total                                    | 100<br>(Summer) |                  |          |

### Grading

Grading scale:

**Summer:**

A = 90 - 100, B = 80 - 89, C = 70 - 79, and F = Below 70.

**CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

**CLASS OUTLINE Summer 2011**

| Module | Topics  | Assignment(s) & Readings   |
|--------|---|--|
| 1      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> <li>• What is "Applying the Research Cycle for Change"?</li> <li>• IRB...</li> <li>• Course Syllabus &amp; Overview</li> <li>• Discuss Chapters 1 &amp; 2</li> <li>• What is action research?</li> <li>• Action research process</li> </ul> | <p><b>Read Mertler – Chapter 1</b><br/> <b>Read Mertler – Chapter 2</b></p> <p><u>Assignments due:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit responses to Ch. 1 Q&amp;A, #1 &amp; #2 (p. 33) [ASSIGN1]</li> <li>• Submit responses to Ch. 2 Q&amp;A, #3 (p. 49) [ASSIGN2]</li> </ul> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin thinking of topics for project</li> <li>• Complete Ethics training (IRB)</li> <li>• Discuss Chapter 3</li> <li>• Planning for action research</li> <li>• Roundtable discussion of possible topics</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Read Mertler – Chapter 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit responses to Ch. 3 Q&amp;A, #5 &amp; #6 (p. 81) [ASSIGN3]<br/><i>Note: #6 can be outline or concept map</i></li> </ul>   |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing a research plan</li> <li>• Methodological considerations</li> <li>• Data organization</li> </ul>  | <p><b>Read Mertler – Chapter 4</b><br/><u>Assignment due:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit responses to Ch. 4 Q&amp;A, #3 &amp; #5 (p. 116) [ASSIGN4]</li> </ul>   |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collection</li> <li>• IRB submission process</li> </ul>   | <p><b>Read Mertler – Chapter 5</b><br/><u>Assignment due:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit response to Ch. 5 Q&amp;A, #4 <u>OR</u> #5 (p. 153) [ASSIGN5]</li> <li>• Submit IRB application to UWG and/or school district [ASSIGN6] – submit copy in class in drop box</li> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN7]</li> <li>•</li> </ul> |
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roundtable discussion of “final” planning for your projects; discussion of issues...</li> <li>• Independent work on research project; drafting of first three sections of final paper: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Introduction</i></li> <li>• <i>Literature Review</i></li> <li>• <i>Methodology</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <p><u>Assignment due:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to one other student’s post [ASSIGN8] –</li> <li>• Individual meetings with instructor for finalized action research plan</li> </ul>   |
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent work on research project; drafting of first three sections of final paper: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Introduction</i></li> <li>• <i>Literature Review</i></li> <li>• <i>Methodology</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | <p><u>Assignment due:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN9]</li> <li>• Submit draft of first three sections [ASSIGN10]</li> </ul>  |

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add    Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

#### Course Details

EDSI    9964    Action Research II

Prefix    Number    Course Title

In this course students implement a school improvement project initiated in EDSI 9963. Students will implement a theoretically-based intervention or innovation related to their research problems, and collect and analyze data for the purpose of answering research questions. Emphasis is placed on the cyclical, continuous process of action research for school improvement.

Course Catalog Description

3          3       Spring - 2012    Yearly    Letter Grade  
Lec Hrs    Lab Hrs    Credit Hrs    Effective Term    Frequency    Grading

#### Prerequisites

EDSI 9963

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

see attached

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

#### Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Action Research for Change II EDSI 9964**

**Semester Hours** 3 hours

**Semester/Year**

**Time/Location**

**Instructor**

**Office Location**

**Office Hours**

**Online Hours**

**Telephone**

**Email**

**Fax**

**Online Support**

Course Den Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

Course Den Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>

UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~online/>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

In this course students implement a school improvement project initiated in EDSI 9963. Students will implement a theoretically-based intervention or innovation related to their research problems, and collect and analyze data for the purpose of answering research questions. Emphasis is placed on the cyclical, continuous process of action research for school improvement.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Preparing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors (knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive, decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading, collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic), clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence; (b) Field-Based Inquiry; and (c) the Betterment of Society. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## **APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION**

For this course we will draw on several pedagogical methods including small group discussions, reflective activities, interactive discussions, and activities.

Because the doctoral program in school improvement is 100% online, various technological applications and tools will be used in this course to foster student engagement. Wimba live classroom, discussion boards, asynchronous and synchronous discussions, case studies, large and small group discussions are exemplars of tools and pedagogy used.

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

Students will:

1. collect and analyze multiple forms of data using data analysis consultants if necessary and draw credible, valid conclusions based on the analysis of data (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Hendricks, 2006) [*D1 Decision Makers; D10 Reflective; D6 Culturally*

- Sensitive; D7 Empathetic; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sf, Sg*];
2. understand, interpret, and communicate various forms of data including graphic presentations, descriptive statistics, and effect size (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Gay & Airasian, 2003; Hendricks, 2006) [*D1 Decision Makers; D2 Leaders; D3 Lifelong Learners; D8 Knowledgeable; D10 Reflective; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Kb*];
  3. understand how to guide others through the program evaluation cycle and/or to lead others to conduct school based research (Patton, 1997) [*D8 Knowledgeable; D2 Leaders; D9 Proactive; D5 Collaborative; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Kg, Kh*];
  4. use research for continuous school improvement (Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Hendricks, 2006) [*D10 Reflective; D9 Proactive; D4 Adaptive; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Sh*];
  5. interpret and communicate research results effectively to both professional and lay audiences (Hendricks, 2006; Wikeley, 1998) [*D2 Leaders; D6 Culturally Sensitive; D7 Empathetic; D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Si*];
  6. value dissemination of research findings to advocate for school improvement and effectively communicate educational issues using oral and written communication to diverse and lay audiences (Hendricks, 2006; Wikeley, 1998) [*D2 Leaders; D3 Lifelong Learners; D9 Proactive; D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competencies Research and the Effective Use of Data Db; Scholarly Persuasion Sb*];
  7. recognize networks and pathways appropriate for dissemination information, positions, and decisions regarding education (Wikeley, 1998) and value contributing to the knowledge base in school improvement (Hendricks, 2006) [*D9 Proactive; D3 Lifelong Learners; Core Competencies Scholarly Persuasion Sc, Dc*];
  8. communicate in a logical, scholarly style using the format prescribed by the American Psychological Association (Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), 2001) [*D3 Lifelong Learners; D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competencies Scholarly Persuasion Sd*];
  9. use and value technology for exchanging ideas with others, gathering information, and preparing and transmitting professional quality documents electronically (Levin, Waddoups, Levin, & Buell, 2001) [*D4 Adaptive; D5 Collaborative; D8 Knowledgeable; D1 Decision Makers; D2 Leaders; D9 Proactive; D3 Lifelong Learners; Core Competencies Technology Sa, Sb, Sd, Dc*];

10. understand the role of teachers, both individually and collectively, in school improvement (Halsall, 1998) [*D8 Knowledgeable; Core Competencies Teaching and Learning Kb*];
11. value the involvement and engagement of key stakeholders as well as representatives of underserved populations in school improvement efforts (Brandon, 1998; Halsall, 1998) [*D5 Collaborative; D9 Proactive; D6 Culturally Sensitive; Core Competencies School Improvement and Reform Db*].

## TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES

### Required Text(s)

Mertler, C. (2012). *Action Research: Improving Schools and Empowering Educators* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE  
ISBN: 9781412988896

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

**Instructional Resources** [www.sagepub.com/mertler3study](http://www.sagepub.com/mertler3study)

### References

- Brandon, P. R. (1998). Stakeholder participation for the purpose of helping ensure evaluation validity: Bridging the gap between collaborative and non-collaborative evaluations. *The American Journal of Evaluation*, 19, 325-337.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (Eds.) (1992). *Inside outside. Teacher research and knowledge*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cole, A.L., & Knowles, J. G. (2000). *Researching teaching. Exploring teacher development through reflective inquiry*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DuFour, R., DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (2008). *Revisiting professional learning communities at work: New insights for improving schools*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Halsall, R. (Ed.). (1998). *Teacher research and school improvement: Opening doors from the inside*. Cambridge: Taylor & Francis.
- Hendricks, C. (2009). *Improving schools through action research: A comprehensive guide for*

*educators* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Levin, S. R., Waddoups, G. L., Levin, J., & Buell, J. (2001, January). Highly interactive and effective online learning environments for teacher professional development.

*International Journal of Electronic Technology*. [Available online:

<http://www.outreach.uiuc.edu/ijet/v2n2/slevin/index.html>]

Mertler, C. A. (2007). *Interpreting standardized test scores: Strategies for data-driven instructional decision making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Mertler, C. A. (2008). *Introduction to educational research* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson.

Mertler, C. A. (2009). A systematic approach to transforming the *art* of teaching into the *science* of teaching: Developing a D-DIDM mindset (MWERA 2008 Presidential Address). *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 12-23.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wikeley, F. (1998). Dissemination of research as a tool for school improvement. *School Leadership & Management*, 18, 59-73.

## ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING

### Assignments

1. **Collaborative Activities using Class Discussion Board:** Students are required to submit project updates six times during the course. Students will also respond to their peers' updates six times during the course. Each update is worth 3 points and each response is worth 2 points (45 total points). These activities are aligned with Course Objectives 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. **Six updates/responses are due during Fall Semester (30 points total).**
2. **Research Project:** Students will complete a research project, which is due during the last week of Fall Semester. The paper must be written in APA (6<sup>th</sup> edition) format and should be suitable for submission as an article in an academic journal or as a presentation at a professional conference. The paper, which will be graded on both content and format, is worth 100 points. A rubric for evaluating the paper is provided on Course Den. This project is aligned with all course objectives. **The final paper is due by.**
3. **Presentation of Research Project:** Each student will prepare a 15-minute presentation of his or her research project. Students are expected to use technology when appropriate and to prepare handouts and/or materials of professional quality. Students will present their projects twice: (1) at the *Graduate Student Celebration of Scholarship* night and (2) to a stakeholder audience. Each presentation is worth 50 points. A video of the stakeholder presentation must be submitted to me (burned to a CD or DVD). Rubrics for the presentations and supplemental

materials (i.e., handouts) are available on Course Den. The presentations are aligned with Course Objectives 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11. **Both presentations occur near the end of the Fall semester.**

### Evaluation Procedures

|                      |                     |           |  |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| Fall Semester        |                     |           |  |
| 1. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| 2. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| 3. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| 4. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| 5. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| 6. Post & respond    | 5                   | Checklist |  |
| Final Research Paper | 100                 | Rubric    |  |
| Paper Presentation 1 | 50                  | Rubric    |  |
| Paper Presentation 2 | 50                  | Rubric    |  |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>230 (Spring)</b> |           |  |

### Grading

Grading scale:

Fall:

A= 207-230, B = 184-206, C= 161-183, and F = Below 160

### CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services.

Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia:

[http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

**Student Email Policy:** University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

### **Tentative CLASS OUTLINE Fall 2012**

| <i>M</i> <i>d</i> <i>u</i> <i>e</i> | <i>T</i> <i>o</i> <i>p</i> <i>i</i> <i>c</i> <i>s</i> <i>a</i> <i>n</i> <i>d</i> <i>R</i> <i>e</i> <i>a</i> <i>d</i> <i>i</i> <i>n</i> <i>g</i> <i>s</i>                   | <i>A</i> <i>s</i> <i>s</i> <i>i</i> <i>g</i> <i>n</i> <i>e</i> <i>m</i> <i>e</i> <i>n</i> <i>t</i> <i>(</i> <i>s</i> <i>)</i>   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss Chapter 6</li> <li>• Analyzing data</li> </ul>  | <b>Read Mertler – Chapter 6</b><br><u>Assignment due:</u><br>Submit project update to class discussion board & respond to another post [ASSIGN1]  |
| 2                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss Chapter 7</li> <li>• Developing an action plan</li> </ul> Roundtable discussion of data collection and analysis issues... | <b>Read Mertler – Chapter 7</b><br><u>Assignment due:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN2]</li> </ul>                       |
| 3                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis</li> <li>• StatCrunch</li> <li>• Individual meetings</li> </ul>   | <u>Assignment due:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN3]</li> </ul>  |
| 4                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discuss Chapter 8</li> <li>• Sharing research</li> <li>• Reflection</li> </ul>  | <b>Read Mertler – Chapter 8</b><br><u>Assignment due:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN4]</li> </ul>                       |
| 5                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion Chapter 9</li> <li>• Writing and presenting research discussions</li> </ul>  | <b>Read Mertler – Chapter 9</b><br><u>Assignment due:</u><br>Submit project update to class discussion board & respond to another post [ASSIGN5]  |
| 6                                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent work on research project; drafting of final paper (meetings as needed)</li> </ul>                                     | <u>Assignment due:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit project update to class discussion board &amp; respond to another post [ASSIGN6]</li> <li>• Submit the Research Project (final paper) and</li> </ul> |

|  |  |                                       |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|
|  |  | the stakeholder video with reflection |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

COE Doctoral

College of Education

Parrish, Margaret

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add    Modify    Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

Course Details

EDSI

9998

Research for Doctoral Dissertation

Prefix

Number

Course Title

Students develop and carry out an independent research project in school improvement. A minimum of nine semester hours in this course is required for graduation. Continuous enrollment is required while working on the dissertation project. Prerequisites: Consent of dissertation chairperson; admission to candidacy.

Course Catalog Description

1-5

Lab Hrs

1-5

Credit Hrs

Spring - 2012

Effective Term

Every Term

Frequency

S/U/I

Grading

Prerequisites

Consent of dissertation chairperson; admission to candidacy.

Corequisites

Rationale

see attached

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

College Approvals

Andy Nixon [APPROVED 2011-10-03]

Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-10-08]

Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# Memorandum

**Re:** Requested Changes (Doctorate in School Improvement Degree)

**Date:** September 29, 2011

**To:** Whom It May Concern

**From:** Andy Nixon, Interim Director and Doctor of School Improvement Advisory Team

---

The Doctorate in School Improvement Advisory Team requests support for changes to the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree. This represents the second set of program changes in as many years as other changes were approved during the 2010-2011 academic year. Some of the recent changes include:

- *August 25, 2010 COE FGC approved program changes to the online delivery approach*
- *October 29, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies BOR of request for online status to program)*
- *November 2, 2010 (BOR acknowledges the change)*
- *November 3, 2010 (Dr. Anderson notifies SACS of change to online status)*
- *January 31, 2011 (SACS acknowledges the change)*
- *March 14, 2011 (COE FGC approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*
- *March 25, 2011 (Faculty Senate approved year-one course modifications, syllabi, and new courses)*

Overall, some of the recent changes to the program include:

- ✓ Becoming an online program

- ✓ Providing early support and expectations for students to complete dissertations earlier in the program
- ✓ Changes in sequencing of courses and creating new courses so that students may complete the entire degree within three years
- ✓ Modification of some of the content of courses and the development of new courses
- ✓ Re-numbering of courses and changing all course prefixes to EDSI from EDUC

Each course objective has been tied to the program Core Competencies (attached). In addition, the three-year course sequence has been attached.

*We request approval of the attached year two and year three syllabi; and we request approval of the course prefixes, titles, and numbers as noted on the syllabi and three year sequence.*

#### **Rationale for the Area of Concentration (AoC)**

Beginning with the summer of 2011 and the admission of the Doctor of School Improvement Cohort # 12, students were advised that completing a twelve hour Area of Concentration (AoC) was a requirement of the program. Students were advised that the area could be customized to particular academic interests. Students have reported that they view this as an attractive aspect of the program, and that it allows students to study in areas of high interest.

The (AoC) is particularly important to students for at least three reasons. First, Georgia students who are interested in adding new certification areas or upgrading existing certification areas may be able to do so. Second, because the Doctorate in School Improvement Degree is interdisciplinary and not tied to a specific content area, students need the advantage of including a content-specific concentration to their transcript and subsequent credentials. And finally, the

AoC requires students to develop a thematic, cohesive competence in a content area which helps refine their learning. The AoC has helped to attract more highly qualified students to the program. It is integral to the future growth of the program. With this concentration designation, student's future career opportunities increase and the Doctoral Degree in School Improvement is more valuable to the student.

*To these ends, we request the appropriate AoC designation be placed at the top of the student's transcript upon completion of the degree, to include the following areas:*

*Educational Leadership, School Counseling, Special Education General Curriculum, K-12 Online Learning, Instructional Technology, Reading, English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), Media Specialist, and Individual (to be added with specific concentration area upon completion of the degree).*

**Research For Doctoral Dissertation EDSI 9998**

**Semester Hours** 1-5 (varies)

**Semester/Year**

**Time/Location**

**Instructor**

**Office Location**

**Office Hours**

**Online Hours**

**Telephone** Direct Line:  
Department Line:

**Email**

**Fax**

**Online Support** CourseDen Home Page  
<https://westga.view.usg.edu/>

CourseDen Help & Troubleshooting  
<http://www.westga.edu/~distance/webct1/help>

UWG Distance Learning  
<http://distance.westga.edu/>

UWG On-Line Connection  
<http://www.westga.edu/~onlinc/>

Distance Learning Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/depts/offcampus/>

Ingram Library Services  
<http://westga.edu/~library/info/library.shtml>

University Bookstore  
<http://www.bookstore.westga.edu/>

## **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

Students develop and carry out an independent research project in school improvement. A minimum of nine semester hours in this course is required for graduation. Continuous enrollment is required while working on the dissertation project. Prerequisites: Consent of dissertation chairperson; admission to candidacy.

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Preparing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors (knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive, decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading, collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic), clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence; (b) Field-Based Inquiry; and (c) the Betterment of Society. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. Core Competencies for the doctoral program in school improvement are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## **APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION**

Instruction in this course is individualized by the dissertation committee chair.

## **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

Students will:

- 1) understand the dissertation process and work with the Director and committee chair to establish a dissertation committee.
- 2) understand the research cycle as it applies to school based research and program evaluation (Professional Excellence and Field Based Inquiry; Core Competence 4Kc);
- 3) successfully undertake and complete a rigorous doctoral dissertation on some aspect of school improvement (Field Based Inquiry, Betterment of Society, Professional Excellence; Core Competency 4Ka, 4Kc, 4Sa, 4Sb, 4Sc, 4Sd, 4Se, 4Sf, 4Sg, 4Sh, 4Si, 4Da, 4Db, 4Dc, 5Sd); and

4) orally defend and disseminate the doctoral dissertation (Betterment of Society, Professional Excellence, Field Based Inquiry; Core Competency 4Si, 4Da, 4Db, 5Sb, 5Sd, 5Da).

## **TEXTS, READINGS, INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES, AND REFERENCES**

### **Required Text(s)**

American Psychological Association, (2010). *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Washington, D. C.: Author.

### **Suggested Text(s)**

### **Instructional Resources**

### **References**

## **ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING**

### **Assignments**

### **Evaluation Procedures**

Evaluation will be based on the candidate's progress toward completing the dissertation and on the quality of that work.

### **Grading**

Students are assessed by a grade of S or U. If the instructor determines that the student is making sufficient progress, the instructor will mark as S; if sufficient progress is not evident, U is assigned and no credit is earned.

## **CLASS, DEPARTMENT, AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES**

**Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

**Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the

Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

Student Email Policy: University of West Georgia students are provided a MyUWG email account, which is the official means of communication between the University and student. It is the student's responsibility to check this email account for important University related information.

## **CLASS OUTLINE**

Working arrangements and policies will be determined by the instructor.

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

Leadership and Applied Instruction    College of Education    Butts, Frank  
 Department                                  College                                  Originator

Action

Add    Modify    Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

Course Details

SEED    7288    TEACHING INTERNSHIP  
 Prefix    Number    Course Title

Teaching one semester in the public schools at the secondary level, 6-12, under the supervision of an experienced, qualified classroom teacher. Seminars (SEED 7289) are scheduled as an integral part of the student teaching experience.

Course Catalog Description

3                                  3                                  Fall - 2012                          Every Term                          S/U/I  
 Lec Hrs                                  Lab Hrs                                  Credit Hrs                                  Effective Term                                  Frequency                                  Grading

Prerequisites

Prerequisite: Admission to Teacher Education; completion of all MAT core requirements except SEED Simultaneous

Corequisites

Enrollment in SEED 7289 is a corequisite.

Rationale

In order to receive a clear and renewable teaching certificate, which is the goal of the Masters in Arts in Teaching degree, the student must teach for one semester. This course is that experience and meets the requirements of the PSC and NCATE.

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
 Library Resources Need Enhancement  
 Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30

Comments

College Approvals

Frank Butts [APPROVED 2011-04-15]  
 Chair, Course Department

Dianne Hoff [APPROVED 2011-04-26]  
 Associate Dean, College of Education

Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A  
 Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
 Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]  
 Chair, Faculty Senate

## Proposed Syllabus

SEED 7288

### TEACHING INTERNSHIP

Semester Hours: 3

Semester/Year:

Instructor:

Office Location:

Office Hours:

Telephone:

E-mail:

Fax:

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

Teaching one semester in the public schools at the secondary level, 6-12, under the supervision of an experienced, qualified classroom teacher. Seminars (SEED 7289) are scheduled as an integral part of the student teaching experience.

Prerequisite: Admission to Teacher Education; application for field experience required prior to enrollment. Students will be in a full-time, supervised, and directed classroom setting.

### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The conceptual framework of the College of Education at UWG forms the basis on which programs, courses, experiences, and outcomes are created. With the goal of *Developing Exemplary Practitioners*, our programs incorporate ten descriptors, clustered into three interrelated and overlapping themes, that demonstrate our commitment to (a) Professional Excellence [knowledgeable, reflective, inquisitive]; (b) Field-Based Inquiry [decisive, adaptive, proactive, leading]; and (c) the Betterment of Society [collaborative, culturally sensitive, empathetic]. These themes and descriptors are integral components of the conceptual framework and provide the basis for developing exemplary practitioners who are prepared to improve schools and communities. National standards (*insert applicable professional associations that guide your program, e.g. ASHA*) also are incorporated as criteria against which candidates are measured.

The mission of the College of Education is to provide excellence in the initial and advanced preparation of professionals for a variety of settings, to foster an innovative learning community, and to empower a faculty committed to teaching and the dissemination of knowledge. This course's objectives, activities, and assignments are related directly to the conceptual framework and national standards, as identified below.

## COURSE OBJECTIVES

Students will:

1. plan for and deliver instruction including formulating daily lesson plans, instruction, and evaluation of student progress (Baldwin, Keating, & Bachman, 2006; Cruickshank, D, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

2. design and implement assessment procedures useful in determining grades (Baldwin, Keating, & Bachman, 2006; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; *Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Decisive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

3. participate in professional activities (e.g., attend faculty meetings, PTA, in-services) (*Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Proactive; INTASC 5, 7, 9, 10)*

4. assume general faculty duties such as lunchroom duty and bus duty (*Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Decisive, Proactive; INTASC 5, 6, 9, 10)*

5. identify instructional resources (*Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

6. evaluate each day for the purpose of effecting change or planning for the next day (*Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Reflective; INTASC 4, 9)*

7. practice the Code of Professional Ethics as identified by the Professional Standards Commission as found at [Code of Ethics](#);

*(Leading; INTASC 5, 10)*

8. teach skills progressing from simple to complex (Baldwin, Keating, & Bachman, 2006; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

9. develop and implement lesson plans (Arnold, 2001; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

10. use various teaching strategies (Arnold, 2001; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

11. use appropriate discipline techniques when necessary to manage class (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; Savage, Savage, & Armstrong, 2006);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

12. motivate students to maximize participation (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; Savage, Savage, & Armstrong, 2006);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

13. measure and evaluate student progress based on instructional objectives (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; Savage, Savage, & Armstrong, 2006; *Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

14. personalize learning to meet the special needs of each child (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009; Savage, Savage, & Armstrong, 2006; *Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*, 2010-2011);

*(Adaptive, Empathetic; INTASC 1, 3, 8)*

15. use appropriate instructional technology in delivery of instruction (Roblyer & Doering, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

16. use technology to facilitate student achievement (Roblyer & Doering, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

17. document accommodations for learners with diverse needs in their lesson plans (Baldwin, Keating, & Bachman, 2006; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

18. demonstrate ability to build on prior knowledge, skills, abilities, and interests students bring into the classroom in their lesson plans and classroom teaching (Baldwin, Keating, & Bachman, 2006; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

19. demonstrate ability to diagnose and evaluate learning of diverse learners (Arnold, 2001; Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009);

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

20. adapt content in textbooks and other resources to increase comprehensibility and establish educational equity (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009); and

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

21. demonstrate ability to include the perspectives and voices of those who have not been traditionally included in both lesson planning and implementation (Cruickshank, Jenkins, & Metcalf, 2009).

*(Decisive, Adaptive, Knowledgeable; INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)*

## **TEXT, READINGS, AND INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCES**

Required Text: *Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook* (2010-2011). Carrollton, GA: College of Education. May be found on the College of Education web page at <http://coe.westga.edu/Students/TCFP/teacherhandbook.asp>

### References:

Arnold, H. (2001). *Succeeding in the secondary classroom: Strategies for middle and high school teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Baldwin, M. D., Keating, J. F., & Bachman, K. J. (2006). *Teaching in secondary schools: Meeting the challenges of today's adolescents*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Cruickshank, D. R., Jenkins, D. B., & Metcalf K. K. (2009). *The act of teaching* (5th ed.). Columbus, OH: McGraw-Hill.

Goethals, M. S. (2004). *Student teaching: A process approach to reflective practice* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robyler, M. D., & Doering, A. H. (2009). *Integrating educational technology into teaching* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Savage, T. V., Savage, M. K., & Armstrong, D. G. (2006). *Teaching in the secondary school* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

*Teacher education handbook: Policies and procedures handbook*. (2009-2010). Carrollton, GA: College of Education.

## **ASSIGNMENTS, EVALUATION PROCEDURES, AND GRADING POLICY**

### **Assignments and Responsibilities:**

The outline below reflects the desired experiences, behaviors, and responsibilities for each of the participating groups: students, university supervisors.

### **Responsibilities of Students:**

1. Be professional, including the following: be present and on time every day, complete tasks on time, dress professionally, behave responsibly, show initiative, communicate effectively, interact professionally.
2. Turn in reports/lesson plans to university supervisors as requested.
3. Meet the objectives outlined in this syllabus.
4. Treat students with fairness and carry the belief that all students can learn.

### **University Supervisor's Responsibilities:**

1. Coordinate efforts for students to gain desired experiences.
2. Maintain communication with students through means such as conferences, telephone calls, seminars, classes, visits to classrooms, videotapes, journals, and electronic mail.
3. Provide assistance to mentoring teachers as requested and facilitate resolutions if problems arise.
4. Complete observation reports of on-site visits (and/or videotapes).
5. Complete final evaluation form and at least one other formal evaluation, e.g., principal's.
6. Confer immediately with appropriate university personnel if major problems arise.

## Evaluation Procedures:

The mentor teacher and college supervisor will assess the student on personal, professional, and classroom management and teaching competencies. The university supervisor will complete the Teacher Education Field Experience Evaluation (TEFEE). With the information above, the university supervisor is responsible for assignment of the final grade.

A S is assigned for satisfactory performance and an U for unsatisfactory performance.

## CLASS OUTLINE

Student is at a field site for one semester under this syllabus.

## CLASS POLICIES

1. University policy requires that all students have regular access to a computer with at least a certain capability level (see *Catalog, Student Handbook, etc.*). All students are required to make use of technological advances in coursework. Students will be required to make use of computer resources in this class, including communication (e.g., class announcements) and accessing materials needed for class via the Internet and the UWG portal/pipeline. In addition, students should realize that formal communications from UWG will be sent through campus e-mail (myUWG); this e-mail needs to be checked regularly.

2. **Disability:** All students are provided with equal access to classes and materials, regardless of special needs, temporary or permanent disability, special needs related to pregnancy, etc. If you have any special learning needs, particularly (but not limited to) needs defined under the Americans with Disabilities Act, and require specific accommodations, please do not hesitate to make those known, either yourself or through the Coordinator of Disability Services. Students with documented special needs may expect accommodation in relation to classroom accessibility, modification of testing, special test administration, etc. For more information, please contact Disability Services at the University of West Georgia: [http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index\\_8884.php](http://www.westga.edu/studentDev/index_8884.php). Any student with a disability documented through Student Services is encouraged to contact the instructor right away so that appropriate accommodations may be arranged. In addition, certain accommodations (which will be discussed in class) are available to all students, within constraints of time and space.

3. **Attendance** is expected every day.

4. **Academic Honesty:** All work completed in this course must be original work developed this semester. Students are expected to adhere to the highest standards of academic honesty. Plagiarism occurs when a student uses or purchases ghostwritten papers. It also occurs when a student utilizes ideas or information obtained from another person without giving credit to that person. If plagiarism or another act of academic dishonesty occurs, it will be dealt with in accordance with the academic misconduct policy as stated in the latest *Connection and Student Handbook* and the *Graduate Catalog*.

Program View Request (Read-Only)

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Originator</b><br>College of Social Sciences<br>College | <b>Psychology Department</b><br>Department | <b>Malone, Kareen R.</b><br>Originator |
|--|--|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Action</b><br>Add <input checked="" type="radio"/> Modify <input type="radio"/> Deactivate <input type="radio"/> Terminate <input type="radio"/> Reactivate <input type="radio"/> | <b>Modifications</b><br>Program Name    Program Description    Degree Name    See Modification Details |
|--|--|

|  |   |                          |  |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|
| <b>Program Selection</b>   |   |                          |  |
| College of Social Sciences<br>College  | Doctor of Philosophy with a Major in Psychology: Consciousness and Society<br>Program |                          |  |
| Doctor of Philosophy with a Major in Psychology: Consciousness and Society<br>Program Name | On Campus<br>Program Location   | Graduate<br>Degree Level |  |
| Doctor of Philosophy<br>Degree Name  | Spring<br>Effective Semester/Year   | 2011                     |  |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Modification Details</b><br>In any graduate program, except education, all work (including the comprehensive examinations) must be completed within a six-year period. For degree programs in education, all work must be completed within seven years.<br>Please add here: For the Ph.D. in Psychology, the maximum time for completion is 8 years.<br><br>(Max 4000 characters) |
|--|

|   |
|---|
| <b>Rationale</b><br>The six year limit is more relevant to Masters level work. This provision does not affect financial support currently offered in any way. Total time to degree form baccalaurate to doctorate in 2003 was (median) ten years while<br><br>(Max 4000 characters) |
|---|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Planning Info</b><br>Library Resources are Adequate<br>Library Resources Need Enhancement<br>Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 30 |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Comments</b><br><br>(Max 4000 characters) |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Document To Upload</b><br>Choose File    No file chosen<br><br>(e.g. syllabi, other supporting documentation) |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>College Approvals</b><br><br>Donadrian Rice    [APPROVED 2011-09-09]<br>_____<br>Chair, Course Department<br><br>Heather Mbaye    [APPROVED 2011-09-16]<br>_____<br>Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Cross Listing Approvals</b><br><br>N/A<br>_____<br>Chair, Cross Listed Department<br><br>N/A<br>_____<br>Associate Dean, Cross Listed College |
|--|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Other Approvals</b><br><br><br><br> |
|--|

|   |
|---|
| <b>Final Approval</b><br><br>Jon Anderson    [REQUIRED]<br>_____<br>Chair, Faculty Senate |
|---|

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

Psychology Department

College of Social Sciences

Maione, Kareen R. (Dr.)

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add Modify Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites Description Title Credit See Comments

Course Details

PSYC

8007

Foundations In Critical Psychology

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course represents one of the program's fundamental approaches to the study of consciousness and society. This course provides a historical and current day perspective on the seminal philosophical, theoretical and empirical perspectives in the discipline of critical psychology. Within this course we develop an understanding of consciousness as situated at the intersection of systems of power, be it at the individual, group or societal level.

Course Catalog Description

4

0

4

Spring - 2012

Yearly

Letter Grade

Lec Hrs

Lab Hrs

Credit Hrs

Effective Term

Frequency

Grading

Prerequisites

none

Corequisites

none

Rationale

The course addition supports the transformation of the PsyD program to a PhD program by adding more rigor and depth to the curriculum.

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 12

Comments

Current library and faculty are sufficient.

College Approvals

Donadrian Rice [APPROVED 2011-06-08]

Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-10-14]

Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

PSYC 8007  
Foundations of Critical Psychology

***Course Description***

This course provides a historical and current day perspective on the seminal philosophical, theoretical and empirical perspectives in the discipline of critical psychology. Within this course we develop an understanding of consciousness as situated at the intersection of systems of power, be it at the individual, group or societal level.

**Learning Objectives**

By the end of this course students will be able to:

- Identify key theoretical perspectives in critical psychology
- Identify key methodological frameworks in critical psychology
- Understand consciousness as emergent from systems of power
- Be able to apply the philosophical and theoretical perspectives of critical psychology to individual scholarly interests.
- Be able to apply analytical frameworks from critical psychology to understand current societal events and trends.
- Develop a framework through which to analyze mainstream psychological theory and research.
- Be able to link critical psychological perspectives to those of humanistic and transpersonal psychology.
- Write about personal and/or professional interests using the discourse of critical psychology.
- Using the analytical framework of critical psychology to develop ideas about individual, group or societal intervention strategies.

**Course Assignments**

1. Class Presentation – 25%
2. CDA paper – 25%
3. Two Essay Exams – 25%
4. Participation – 25%

**Description of Assignments**

1. Class Presentation Given the breadth of what constitutes critical psychology we will be unable to cover all the sub-discipline within this area. Each student will therefore choose one aspect of critical psychology not covered in the class and make a formal presentation to our class on this topic. Possible topics include: critical social psychology; critical personality psychology; critical community psychology; critical approaches to psychoanalysis; critical methodology.

2. **Critical Discourse Analysis Paper:** For this assignment each student will choose a content area and a series of writings in this area; these writings will be the subject of an analysis using critical discourse analysis. The student will write up the analysis using standard APA style for empirical manuscripts.
3. **Essay Exams.** These will be essay format, demonstrating comprehension of course material and an original approach to its integration.
4. **Participation:** Regular attendance and active, engaged interaction with other students and course material is expected. No more than two (excused in advance) absences will be permitted.

## **Course Schedule**

### **Week 1: Introduction to topic**

Antonio, R. J. (1983). The origin, development, and contemporary status of critical theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 24, 325-351.

Fox, D., Prilleltensky, I. & Austin, S. (2009). Critical psychology for social justice: Concerns and dilemmas. In D. R. Fox, I. Prilleltensky & S. Austin (Eds). *Critical psychology: An introduction (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. pp

Parker, I. (2007). Critical psychology: What it is and what it is not. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00008.x

## **Philosophical Foundations of Critical Psychology**

### **Week 2: Marx & Engel**

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1846/1970). *The German Ideology*. (Ed. C.J. Arther). New York: International Publishers. (Selected Readings)

Parker, I. (2009). Critical psychology and revolutionary Marxism. *Theory and Psychology*,

### **Week 3: Fanon**

Selected Readings :

Fanon, F. (1986). *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York : Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1952). *Black Skin, White Mask*. Editions Du Seuil: Paris.

Week 4: Freire

Freire, P. (1973). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (Selected Readings)

Week 5: Foucault

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. (C. Gordon, Ed.). New York: Pantheon. (Selected Readings).

Week 6: Gramsci & Habermas

Femia, J. (1975). Hegemony and consciousness in the thought of Antonio Gramsci. *Political Studies*, 23, 2, 29-48. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.1975.tb00044.x

Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Vols. 1 & 2. Boston: Beacon Press. (Selected Readings).

Week 7: Social Construction

Selected Readings:

Gergen, K. *An invitation to social construction*. London: Sage, 1999

Gergen, K. *Relational Being: Beyond Self and Community*, Oxford University Press, 2009

**Critical Methodology**

Week 8: Critical Discourse Analysis

Selected Readings:

Parker, I. (1997). Discursive Psychology in *Critical Psychology: An Introduction*

Potter, J. (1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*.

Week 9: Participatory Action Research

Fine et al. (2001). Participatory action research within and behind bars. *International Journal of Critical Psychology*.

**Contemporary Theoretical Perspectives**

Week 10: Feminist Perspectives

Burman, E. (1997). *Deconstructing Feminist Psychology*. NY: Sage. (Selected Readings)

Horney, K. *Feminine Psychology* (reprints), Norton, 1922-37 1967. [ISBN 0-393-00686-7](#)  
(Selected Readings).

Zerbe, E. C. (2010). Locational feminisms and feminist social identity analysis. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 41(4) 333-339

Week 11: Critical Race Theory

Crenshaw, Kimberlé, Neil Gotanda, Gary Peller, and Kendall Thomas. eds. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*. New York: New Press, 1995 (Selected Readings).

Howard, T. C. (2008). Who really cares? The disenfranchisement of African American males in prek-12 schools: A critical race theory perspective. *Teachers College Record*.

Campbell, F. I. (2007). Exploring internalized ablesim using critical race theory. *Disability and society*, 23, 2,

Week 12: Queer Theory

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. (Selected Readings)

Plummer, K. (2005). Critical humanism and queer theory: Living with the tensions. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Qualitative research (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed)*. Ch. 14 357-373).

Sedgwick, E. (1990). *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990), (Selected Readings)

Week 13: Moral Exclusion

Opatow, S. (2005) From moral exclusion to moral inclusion: Theory for teaching peace. *Theory into Practice*, 44, 4, 303-318. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4404\_4.

Opatow, S. (2005). *Hate, conflict and moral exclusion*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association (selected readings).

Weeks 14 and 15: Individual student presentations.

Program View Request (Read-Only)

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Originator</b><br>College of Social Sciences<br><small>College</small> | Sociology Department<br><small>Department</small> | Luken, Paul<br><small>Originator</small> |
|---|---|--|

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Action</b><br><small>Add   Modify   Deactivate   Terminate   Reactivate</small> | <b>Modifications</b><br><small>Program Name   Program Description   Degree Name   See Modification Details</small> |
|--|--|

|   |                                   |  |   |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Program Selection</b>  |                                   |  |   |
| College of Social Sciences<br><small>College</small>                    | Program<br><small>Program</small> | On Campus<br><small>Program Location</small>     | Graduate<br><small>Degree Level</small> |
| Master of Arts with a Major in Sociology<br><small>Program Name</small> |                                   | Spring<br><small>Effective Semester/Year</small> | 2012                                    |
| Master of Arts<br><small>Degree Name</small>                            |                                   |  |   |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Modification Details</b>  |
| Remove the following statement from the Graduate Catalog: "In addition, all students must satisfy the Graduate School's foreign language requirement."<br><small>(Max 4000 characters)</small> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Rationale</b>  |
| With the dissolution of the Graduate College each college and graduate program has the prerogative of establishing its own foreign language requirement. The Sociology Department does not wish to have a foreign<br><small>(Max 4000 characters)</small> |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Planning Info</b>   |
| Library Resources are Adequate<br>Library Resources Need Enhancement<br>Present or Projected Annual Enrollment: 12 |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Comments</b>                                  |
| <br><br><br><small>(Max 4000 characters)</small> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Document To Upload</b>   |
| Choose File   No file chosen<br><small>(e.g. syllabi, other supporting documentation)</small> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>College Approvals</b>  |
| Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-15]<br>_____<br>Chair, Course Department          |
| Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-10-14]<br>_____<br>Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Cross Listing Approvals</b>                       |
| N/A<br>_____<br>Chair, Cross Listed Department       |
| N/A<br>_____<br>Associate Dean, Cross Listed College |

|                        |
|------------------------|
| <b>Other Approvals</b> |
| <br><br><br><br><br>   |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Final Approval</b>                                     |
| Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]<br>_____<br>Chair, Faculty Senate |

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add   Modify   Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites   Description   Title   Credit   See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI   5132   Human Life Cycle and Cross-Cultures

Prefix

Number

Course Title

A cross-cultural study of the social and cultural meanings of human experience through such phases as birth and death; adolescence; adulthood; and old age.

#### Course Catalog Description

|         |         |            |                |           |         |
|---------|---------|------------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| 3       | 0       | 3          | Fall - 2012    |           |         |
| Lec Hrs | Lab Hrs | Credit Hrs | Effective Term | Frequency | Grading |

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
 Library Resources Need Enhancement  
 Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-08]  
 Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-09-16]  
 Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross Listing Approvals

N/A  
 Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
 Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]  
 Chair, Faculty Senate

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

**Originator**

Sociology Department      College of Social Sciences      Luken, Paul

Department      College      Originator

**Action**      **Modifications**

Add    Modify    Delete      Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

**Course Details**

SOCI      5153      Women and Aging

Prefix      Number      Course Title

This course will focus upon the realities of being an aging woman in a youth oriented society. Contemporary personal and social issues facing older women will be explored and long held beliefs about the aging process challenged.

Course Catalog Description

3      0      3      Fall - 2012

Lec Hrs      Lab Hrs      Credit Hrs      Effective Term      Frequency      Grading

**Prerequisites**      **Corequisites**

**Rationale**

This course is no longer being offered to students.

**Planning Info**      **Comments**

Library Resources are Adequate  
 Library Resources Need Enhancement  
 Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

**College Approvals**

Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-08]  
 Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-09-16]  
 Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

**Cross Listing Approvals**

N/A  
 Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
 Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

**Other Approvals**

**Final Approval**

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]  
 Chair, Faculty Senate

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add   Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites   Description   Title   Credit   See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI   5182   Aging Families  
Prefix   Number   Course Title

This course is a study of intergenerational family life. Will examine ways in which gender, social class, and race/ethnicity shape our experiences of family life. Topics include grand parenting, intergenerational relations, family care giving theories, and methods for studying families. This is a service learning course and requires 15 hours of service with older adults.

Course Catalog Description

3   0   3   Fall - 2012  
Lec Hrs   Lab Hrs   Credit Hrs   Effective Term   Frequency   Grading

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
Library Resources Need Enhancement  
Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders   [APPROVED 2011-09-08]  
Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye   [APPROVED 2011-09-16]  
Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A  
Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson   [REQUIRED]  
Chair, Faculty Senate

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add   Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites   Description   Title   Credit   See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI   5203   Women in American Society

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course will concentrate upon the theories and analyze the research that is of current interest to scholars in the the research that is of interest to scholars who focus upon the lives of American women.

#### Course Catalog Description

3   0   3   Fall - 2012  
Lec Hrs   Lab Hrs   Credit Hrs   Effective Term   Frequency   Grading

#### Prerequisites

SOCI 1101 or SOC 105

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-08]

Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-09-16]

Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add   Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites   Description   Title   Credit   See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI   5204   Women in American Society

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course will concentrate upon the theories and analyze the research that is of current interest to scholars who study women's statuses and roles in the U.S.

#### Course Catalog Description

3   0   3   Fall - 2012  
Lec Hrs   Lab Hrs   Credit Hrs   Effective Term   Frequency   Grading

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
Library Resources Need Enhancement  
Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders   [APPROVED 2011-09-08]  
Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye   [APPROVED 2011-09-16]  
Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross Listing Approvals

N/A  
Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson   [REQUIRED]  
Chair, Faculty Senate

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add    Modify     Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites    Description    Title    Credit    See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI    5513    Comparative Social Psychology

Prefix

Number

Course Title

Learn theories and research methods in cross-cultural studies. Investigate universalities and specificities in human interaction and psychological process across social-cultural boundaries.

#### Course Catalog Description

|         |         |            |                |           |         |
|---------|---------|------------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| 3       | 0       | 3          | Fall - 2012    |           |         |
| Lec Hrs | Lab Hrs | Credit Hrs | Effective Term | Frequency | Grading |

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders    [APPROVED 2011-09-08]

Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye    [APPROVED 2011-09-16]

Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson    [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add   Modify    Delete

#### Modifications

Prerequisites   Description   Title   Credit   See Comments

#### Course Details

SOCI   5913   Sociology of Everyday Life  
Prefix   Number   Course Title

Qualitative research course examining how existentialism and phenomenology have influenced sociological interpretations of the everyday lived social world traditionally studied through symbolic interactionism. Focuses on social features of life world experiences such as aging, the body, emotions, health and illness, art, gender, identity, race, domination and inequality, etc.  
Course Catalog Description

3   0   3   Fall - 2012  
Lec Hrs   Lab Hrs   Credit Hrs   Effective Term   Frequency   Grading

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This course is no longer being offered to students.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate  
Library Resources Need Enhancement  
Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders   [APPROVED 2011-09-08]  
Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye   [APPROVED 2011-09-16]  
Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A  
Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A  
Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson   [REQUIRED]  
Chair, Faculty Senate

Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

Action

Add Modify  Delete

Modifications

Prerequisites Description Title Credit See Comments

Course Details

SOCI

6241

Legal Theories

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course provides an interdisciplinary exploration of classical and contemporary texts in legal theory. The primary focus will be to discover those things for which legal theory must account as well as examining contemporary critiques of legal theory such as is entailed by the critical legal studies movement.

Course Catalog Description

3

0

3

Fall - 2012

Lec Hrs

Lab Hrs

Credit Hrs

Effective Term

Frequency

Grading

Prerequisites

Corequisites

Rationale

This criminology class was inadvertently added to sociology when the criminology MA program was developed.

Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

Comments

College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-08]

Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-09-16]

Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

Cross Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

Other Approvals

Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

## Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

**Originator**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Sociology Department</b><br><small>Department</small> | <b>College of Social Sciences</b><br><small>College</small> | <b>Luken, Paul</b><br><small>Originator</small> |
|--|---|---|

**Action**

Add    Modify     Delete

**Modifications**

| Prerequisites | Description | Title | Credit | See Comments |
|---------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------------|
|---------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------------|

**Course Details**

|                                      |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>SOCI</b><br><small>Prefix</small> | <b>6250</b><br><small>Number</small> | <b>The Color of Justice</b><br><small>Course Title</small> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|

Using a critical approach, the purpose of this course is to study the relationship between race, ethnicity, and crime.

**Course Catalog Description**

|                                    |                                    |                                       |   |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| <b>3</b><br><small>Lec Hrs</small> | <b>0</b><br><small>Lab Hrs</small> | <b>3</b><br><small>Credit Hrs</small> | <b>Fall - 2012</b><br><small>Effective Term</small> |  |  |  |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|

**Prerequisites**

**Corequisites**

**Rationale**

This criminology class was inadvertently added to sociology when the criminology MA program was developed.

**Planning Info**

Library Resources are Adequate  
 Library Resources Need Enhancement  
 Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

**Comments**

**College Approvals**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Robert M. Sanders</b> [APPROVED 2011-09-08]<br><hr/> Chair, Course Department          |
| <b>Heather Mbaye</b> [APPROVED 2011-09-16]<br><hr/> Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee |

**Cross Listing Approvals**

|  |
|--|
| <b>N/A</b>                                 |
| <hr/> Chair, Cross Listed Department       |
| <b>N/A</b>                                 |
| <hr/> Associate Dean, Cross Listed College |

**Other Approvals**

**Final Approval**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Jon Anderson</b> [REQUIRED]<br><hr/> Chair, Faculty Senate |
|---|

### Course Update Request (Add, Delete, Modify)

#### Originator

Sociology Department

College of Social Sciences

Luken, Paul

Department

College

Originator

#### Action

Add    Modify     Delete

#### Modifications

| Prerequisites | Description | Title | Credit | See Comments |
|---------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------------|
|---------------|-------------|-------|--------|--------------|

#### Course Details

SOCI

6342

Crisis Intervention

Prefix

Number

Course Title

This course presents an overview of techniques and approaches to crisis intervention for crisis management professionals. It covers initial intervention, defusing and assessment, resolution and/or referral, with an emphasis on empathy. Crisis theory will be examined and then applied to various types of crises including sexual assault/rape; natural disasters; personal loss; and suicide.

Course Catalog Description

3

0

3

Fall - 2012

Lec Hrs

Lab Hrs

Credit Hrs

Effective Term

Frequency

Grading

#### Prerequisites

#### Corequisites

#### Rationale

This criminology class as inadvertently added to sociology when the criminology MA program was developed.

#### Planning Info

Library Resources are Adequate

Library Resources Need Enhancement

Present or Projected Annual Enrollment:

#### Comments

#### College Approvals

Robert M. Sanders [APPROVED 2011-09-08]

Chair, Course Department

Heather Mbaye [APPROVED 2011-09-16]

Coordinator, COSS Executive Committee

#### Cross-Listing Approvals

N/A

Chair, Cross Listed Department

N/A

Associate Dean, Cross Listed College

#### Other Approvals

#### Final Approval

Jon Anderson [REQUIRED]

Chair, Faculty Senate

# **Addendum VI**



## Institutional Review Board (IRB) External Researcher Policy

### **Applicability**

This External Researcher Policy applies to all individuals not currently affiliated with the University of West Georgia (UWG) interested in conducting research involving UWG, its students, faculty, staff or alumni.

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this policy is to establish a standard method to review and approve any research conducted involving UWG faculty, staff, students, or alumni as research participants. To balance a cooperative, collaborative research effort with existing research and data collection by researcher affiliated with UWG. Any external researcher (anyone currently unaffiliated with the University) is required to follow this policy.

### **Background**

The UWG Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Subjects has been established in compliance with Federal Regulations concerning experimentation involving human subjects (45 C.F.R. Part 46, Protection of Human Subjects). The purpose of this board is to provide review of all research conducted by faculty, staff, and students to insure protection of human subjects and compliance with the federal regulations. All research conducted on the UWG campus, involving UWG students, faculty, staff, alumni, or UWG resources is subject to comply with all federal regulations regarding human subject research.

### **Education**

All individuals engaged in research involving human participants must complete an educational program related to the responsible conduct of research prior to initiation of a research project. University of West Georgia (UWG) has selected the Collaborative Training Initiative (CITI) as the best and most efficient mechanism for delivering education to UWG researchers involved with human subjects research. CITI is an on-line educational training course that provides relevant, up-to-date information on the protection of human research subjects in the format of instructional modules.

### **Policy**

It is the policy of the Office of Research & Sponsored Operations at the University of West Georgia that all research involving human subjects must be approved by the UWG IRB. For all research activities, the external researcher must identify a UWG employee (regular, full-time) willing to serve as the local sponsor for the duration of the research project. The local sponsor should be able to answer questions about the project, serve as the campus contact for questions or concerns about the research, and have completed UWG required CITI educational program.

### **Procedure**

Researchers who are unaffiliated with the University but wish to recruit participants on the UWG campus, must request permission from the IRB before recruiting alumni, students, or employees at UWG (via poster, flyer, email announcement, or newspaper ad). Unaffiliated researchers must submit to the UWG IRB Office, one copy of the full packet of materials they submitted to the IRB of their own institution, including the letter of IRB approval for the project. Researchers who do not have an IRB at their home institution should submit to the IRB all required materials

using UWG application materials found at [http://www.westga.edu/orso/index\\_17493.php](http://www.westga.edu/orso/index_17493.php). The packet should include, but may not be limited to, the IRB protocol application, consent form or information sheet, recruitment flyer or ad, instruments or measures to be used, and any supporting documentation.

For research activities that qualify as exempt from IRB review, evidence must be provided from the home institution that exempt status has been granted. The IRB Chair or his/her designee will review the request and issue a letter of permission to recruit on campus. The IRB reserves the right to have requests for permission to recruit on campus go to the full board for review and approval, should the Chair decide that the nature of the study requires the independent scrutiny of the IRB to protect its students and employees.

The UWG IRB only considers the protection of human subjects; it does not grant authority for the PI to conduct the research at UWG. Therefore, the authority to conduct research must also be obtained from the appropriate university official relative to the research to be conducted. For assistance in obtaining this approval, contact the UWG Research Compliance Officer in the Office of Research and Sponsored Operations.

# **Addendum VII**

## **104.04 Evaluation of Academic Deans**

### **104.0401 General Policy Statements**

The Provost shall conduct annual reviews and periodic evaluations of academic Deans.

#### **A. Purpose**

The purpose of this policy is to:

1. Guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units, and to facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
2. Ensure that faculty and staff participate in the evaluation of their academic Deans.
3. Ensure Deans are afforded due process in the evaluation.
4. Afford all appropriate constituencies the opportunity to provide input.
5. Clarify the process of assembling the Review Committee, and the procedures for how it shall conduct the periodic evaluation.
6. Guide the Review Committee in producing an Evaluation Report of its findings, and delivering it to interested parties.

#### **B. Definitions**

1. For the purposes of this policy, an Academic Dean is one who carries a title of Dean, bears responsibility for an academic unit containing faculty members, and reports to the Provost.
2. In Sections 104.04, 104.05, and 104.06, a unit refers to a college, school, or the library.

## **104.05 Annual Reviews of Deans**

### **104.0501 General Policy Statement**

The Provost shall review the performance of Deans reporting to him or her annually. The following characteristics of that process shall be common to all units.

### **104.0502 Procedures**

- A. Interval of Annual Review: before the conclusion of each fiscal year.

B. Purpose and Objectives: the purpose of annual reviews of Deans is to improve the effectiveness of the unit administered, including its contribution to the effectiveness of other units and the institution as a whole. The overall objectives are:

1. To review goals and accomplishments of the Dean and unit supervised, especially as these relate to the continuing mission and strategic goals of the institution.
2. To review the Dean's job description and responsibilities, as well as the organization of the unit.
3. To review the level of resources and other support provided to the Dean and unit.
4. To discuss concerns and opportunities and to plan for changes that may be warranted or desirable.

C. Components of the Annual Review:

1. *Feedback.* The Provost shall direct the annual review process. Faculty members and staff, whenever possible, may be asked to provide input.
2. *Self report.* Each Dean under review shall provide the Provost a brief written report:
  - a. Listing initiatives and professional activities undertaken during the review period.
  - b. Listing achievements, areas in need of improvement, and efforts related to those areas, as well as future plans and goals for the unit.
  - c. Indicating any changes that seem warranted in the Dean's job description.
3. *Conference with the Provost.* The conference will be an occasion to discuss the feedback received, the Dean's and the Provost's views, and future plans and goals for the unit.
4. *Dean's Annual Review Letter.* The Annual Review Letter shall be shared with the Dean and placed in his or her personnel file. The Dean may issue a written response to this document, which shall also be retained in the file.

## **104.06 Periodic Evaluations of Deans**

### **104.0601 General Policy Statement**

Procedures for the periodic evaluation of Deans shall be guided by three essential principles: shared governance, impartiality, and transparency. The procedures enumerated below seek to realize these principles.

A. Interval of Periodic Evaluation:

The first periodic evaluation of an academic Dean shall cover a full three-year period occurring in the Dean's fourth year of appointment. Thereafter, periodic evaluations shall cover a full four-year period and occur every five years. All periodic evaluations begin in the Fall semester and

conclude in the Spring semester of one academic year. Credit for service as an Interim Dean shall be determined by the Provost in consultation with the Dean at the time of permanent appointment. After the first periodic evaluation the Provost may initiate an evaluation of a Dean at any time, but shall explain its necessity and appropriateness. Refer to Table 1 below for a sample periodic evaluation sequence.

Table 1. Sample Periodic Evaluation Sequence.

| <b>Appointment Year</b> | <b>Academic Year</b> | <b>Evaluation Year</b> | <b>Evaluation Review Period</b>   |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1                       | 2011-2012            |                        |                                   |
| 2                       | 2012-2013            |                        |                                   |
| 3                       | 2013-2014            |                        |                                   |
| 4                       | 2014-2015            | 2014 – 2015            | Evaluates Fall 2011 - Summer 2014 |
| 5                       | 2015-2016            |                        |                                   |
| 6                       | 2016-2017            |                        |                                   |
| 7                       | 2017-2018            |                        |                                   |
| 8                       | 2018-2019            | 2018 – 2019            | Evaluates Fall 2014 - Summer 2018 |

**B. Purpose and Objectives:**

1. To provide the faculty and administration with information on the performance of academic Deans who report to the Provost, both annual reviews and periodic evaluations shall be practiced.
2. The periodic evaluation will help guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units and facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
3. To this end, a Review Committee shall be charged with collecting information about the performance of an academic Dean. Findings of the Review Committee shall supplement information from other sources (e.g., Annual Review Letters, unit financial documents) to provide the Provost with a comprehensive record of the Dean’s performance.

**C. Timeline of Evaluation:**

1. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the pending evaluation and appoint the Chair of the Review Committee in the Fall semester.
2. Within five working days of receiving the Provost’s notification, the Dean under evaluation notifies the faculty and staff of his or her unit of the pending evaluation.
3. Within five working days of receiving the Provost’s appointment, the Chair of the Review Committee shall call for the election of six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean. Refer to section 104.0601(D)(3) for guidance on the manner in which the Review Committee members shall be elected.

4. The Review Committee will provide its Evaluation Report to the Dean no later than February 28<sup>th</sup> of the academic year during which the evaluation is conducted.
5. The Dean has the right to review and respond to the Review Committee's Evaluation Report no later than March 28<sup>th</sup>.
6. The Review Committee's Evaluation Report and the Dean's response shall be forwarded to the Provost no later than March 30<sup>th</sup>.
7. The Chair of the Review Committee presents the results of the Dean's Evaluation Report to the faculty of the Dean under evaluation no later than April 30<sup>th</sup>.
8. In the event that the dates in this timeline fall on a weekend or holiday, the documents are due the following business day.

D. Composition of Review Committee:

1. The Review Committee will be composed of seven members.
2. A Review Committee Chair, who is a senior faculty member from outside the unit led by the Dean being evaluated. The Provost shall appoint the Review Committee Chair. The Chair of the Review Committee shall receive one course reassigned time.
3. Six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean, one of which must be a department chair. The faculty governance body from the unit led by the Dean under evaluation determines the manner in which the committee members shall be elected. In the case of a unit that does not have an elected faculty governance body, the faculty at large of the unit determine the manner in which the committee members shall be elected.
4. The Provost and the Dean under evaluation shall have the right to object to the inclusion of a member of the committee. Both parties shall each be allowed only one objection.
5. No person with a conflict of interest may serve as a member of the Review Committee. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to and reviewed by the Review Committee Chair prior to the selection of faculty to serve on the Review Committee. Such conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude dispassionate, disinterested, correct, complete, and unbiased participation in these matters. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the Dean are explicitly prohibited from participation.

E. Review Committee Procedures:

1. The Review Committee meets with the Provost and then with the Dean to be evaluated. At these meetings, the Review Committee:
  - a. Outlines the timeline for review and the evaluation criteria.
  - b. Requests relevant information to be considered during the evaluation. At this time, the Provost and the Dean may specify topics, questions, or concerns for the Review Committee to consider in making its evaluation, as well as particular individuals whose input would contribute to a complete review.

- c. Informs the Provost and the Dean of:
  1. Their right to object to one member of the Review Committee, which shall trigger the search for a new member.
  2. The right to communicate with the Review Committee throughout the evaluation process. That is, the Committee must guarantee the Provost and the Dean the right to provide input at any time during the evaluation.
2. The Review Committee shall notify the faculty of the Dean under review of the procedures guiding the evaluation process and how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency shall be realized.
  - a. The notification shall include information about data collection, administration of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, how the identity of participants will be protected from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law, and the Review Committee's guarantee to grant full access to anyone wishing to provide input at any time during the evaluation, unless a significant conflict of interest can be demonstrated.
  - b. Among its procedures, the Review Committee must administer the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire to the Dean's constituency. The Dean's constituency shall include, but not be limited to, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, the faculty and staff of the unit, the faculty governance body of the unit, and any other individuals who interact with the Dean on a regular basis.
  - c. In addition to the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, the Review Committee shall gather information related to the topics, questions, and concerns noted by the Provost and Dean in their initial meetings.

#### F. Components of the Evaluation:

##### 1. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria should be based on the duties specified in Article III, Section 2 of the Policies and Procedures of the University of West Georgia and the By Laws of the unit of the Dean under evaluation.

##### 2. Evaluation Report

The Review Committee shall produce an Evaluation Report of its findings, which shall be descriptive in nature. The Evaluation Report shall not include interpretations of the findings, nor recommendations regarding personnel actions. The Evaluation Report shall include, but not be limited to, the following sections:

###### Introduction

- a. Purpose of the evaluation.
- b. Description of how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency have been realized through the process.
  1. Description of the procedures that guided the composition of the Review Committee.
  2. Disclosure of conflicts of interest, if any, and how they were handled.
  3. Discussion of the timeline of the evaluation.

###### Methodology

- a. Data collection efforts (e.g. description of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, distribution methods, response rate).
- b. Procedures to protect the identity of participants from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law.

#### Results

- a. Descriptive analysis of data from the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire.
- b. Descriptive summary of additional data collected.

#### Conclusion

- a. Purpose of the evaluation (briefly revisited).
- b. Timeline for the next periodic evaluation, per guidelines in Table 1 in Section 104.0601.

G. Post-Evaluation Conference with the Faculty. The Chair of the Review Committee shall present the Evaluation Report to the faculty of the unit no later than April 30th.

### **104.0602 Dean Evaluation Questionnaire**

The Review Committee shall use the following questionnaire to evaluate the Dean. However, each unit may include additional context-specific items to the instrument. Additional items must be placed at the end of the questionnaire in a new section labeled Unit Specific Items. Please tell us, what is your role at UWG?

- A. Faculty
- B. Staff

In your role as faculty or staff, please rate the Dean on the following questions related to leadership, faculty and program development, fairness and ethics, communication, and administration. Please use the following scale to help with your answer:

1 = Strongly Agree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Somewhat Agree; 4 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree; 5 = Somewhat Disagree; 6 = Disagree; 7= Strongly Disagree; 8 = Unable to Judge.

#### Leadership

The Dean...

1. articulates a clear vision for the future of the unit.
2. involves the faculty in developing plans for the unit.
3. demonstrates a commitment to intellectual integrity and the pursuit of knowledge.
4. demonstrates administrative leadership of the unit.
5. is a professional role model for the unit.
6. weighs the opinions of all segments of the unit.

#### Faculty and Program Development

The Dean...

7. promotes a favorable environment for individual faculty development.
8. emphasizes teaching in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.

9. emphasizes service in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
10. emphasizes professional growth and development in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises. (Note: each unit should adapt item #10 to reflect its P & T standards. For example, replace the term “professional growth and development” with “scholarship.”)
11. encourages creative approaches to teaching, research, and program development.
12. is responsive to the educational needs of the region when developing new programs.
13. supports student learning outcomes in work related to faculty and program development.

#### Fairness and Ethics

The Dean...

14. treats all members of the unit fairly irrespective of age, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or veteran status.
15. respects views that are contrary to his or her own views.
16. exhibits high ethical standards in his or her official duties.
17. strongly encourages high ethical professional standards for all members of the unit.
18. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to faculty promotion and tenure.
19. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to staff hiring and promotion.
20. arbitrates disputes among faculty, staff, and department heads fairly.
21. affords departments opportunities to explain their resource needs.
22. affords all members of the unit opportunities to explain their individual needs and concerns.

#### Communication

The Dean...

23. welcomes constructive criticism from all members of the unit.
24. creates an environment where individuals are free to communicate without concern of rejection or reprisal.
25. provides feedback in a constructive manner.
26. is well-informed about my department’s accomplishments, challenges, and future plans.
27. communicates changes affecting all the members of the unit in a timely manner.
28. recognizes and expresses appreciation for the accomplishments of all members of the unit.
29. fosters and maintains positive external relationships.

#### Administration

The Dean...

30. uses administrative procedures that are clear and unambiguous for promotions, tenure, merit raises, leave, and other personnel actions.
31. exercises sound judgment in appointing associate and assistant Deans.
32. attends to administrative matters in a timely fashion.
33. conducts productive meetings.
34. handles concerns from all members of the unit well.
35. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of the undergraduate programs.
36. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of graduate programs.
37. integrates planning, assessment, and budgeting when making decisions.
38. is transparent about the unit’s budget.
39. makes evidence-based decisions.
40. is a team player.

Open Ended Items

41. In your opinion, what are the Dean's strengths and/or contributions?
42. In your opinion, what are the Dean's weaknesses?
43. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Dean in carrying out the academic mission of the school.
44. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Provost.

Unit Specific Items

Units may use Likert scale or open-ended items; regardless, the items should begin with number

45. Units that opt to use a Likert scale must employ the same response options used in items 1-40.

# **Addendum VIII**

## 103.01 Foreword

These procedures are designed to select those persons in the University qualified for promotion and tenure.

The number of faculty members who advance in rank and/or achieve tenure is dependent on various factors, several of which are beyond the control of the University of West Georgia. The external factors include the following: the Board of Regents, which must maintain a sound and equitable structure within the University System; financial appropriations; appointments of new faculty members; and resignations or retirement of faculty members within departments.

Beyond these factors, advance in rank shall be controlled within the University by an annual promotion recommendation system, which shall promote qualified members to advanced professional positions. Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. The University approves faculty for promotion in accordance with *Section 8.3.6, Board of Regents Policy Manual*. The University approves faculty for tenure in accordance with *Section 8.3.7, Board of Regents Policy Manual*, which includes a comprehensive statement of tenure policies in the University System. The annual promotion recommendation system shall also apply to tenure recommendations. In recognition of professional achievement and service, tenure shall be extended to provide an element of economic security and to ensure academic freedom in teaching and research.

Tenure is the keystone for academic freedom; it is essential for safeguarding the right of free expression and for encouraging risk-taking inquiry at the frontiers of knowledge. Both tenure and academic freedom are part of an implicit social compact which recognizes that tenure serves important public purposes and benefits society. The people of Georgia are best served when faculty are free to teach, conduct research, and provide service without fear of reprisal and to pursue those activities with regard for long term benefits to society rather than short term rewards. In return, the faculty has the responsibility of furthering the institution's programs of research.

The annual promotion recommendation system shall be administered according to the procedures herein established.

If there exists a significant conflict of interest, no person with such a conflict may participate in promotion and/or tenure recommendations; advisement of candidates; and/or preparation of materials. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed and reviewed. Such conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude dispassionate and disinterested recommendations and correct, complete, and unbiased participation in these matters. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with a candidate are explicitly prohibited from participation. (This paragraph also applies to any and all recommendations made during the probationary period. See Section 102.0201)

## **103.02 Procedures**

By the end of the first week of fall semester classes, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall establish the date by which recommendations shall be submitted at each level of the promotion/tenure process. Any faculty member who meets the criteria for promotion and tenure established herein and who desires to be considered shall submit a dossier to his or her department chair or library supervisor. Department chairs or supervisors shall see that dossiers are organized uniformly according to the appropriate criteria specified. Each dossier shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- a curriculum vitae;
- the three evaluations of teaching effectiveness and performance of allied duties specified in Section 103.06;
- any letters of recommendation which the department chair has received;
- reprints of scholarly publications or other evidence of scholarly or creative work.

The promotion/tenure process shall include reviews at the levels of both the Department and the College or School. Given the diverse nature of academic disciplines and the rigorous professional standards associated with each, departments may formulate specific criteria appropriate to their discipline. If a department specifies unique criteria, such criteria must be in written form and approved by the governing body of the College. Such approved department criteria must be made available as part of a candidate's dossier at each subsequent level of review. Departmental criteria must not conflict with University criteria.

Each subsequent level of review must consider the dossier in terms of these stated criteria, thus ensuring that candidates are considered in the professional contexts of both their discipline and of the University.

### **103.0201 Formation and Operation of Faculty Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Committees**

#### **A. Departmental Evaluation**

##### **1. Faculty Committee**

A departmental committee, composed exclusively of tenured faculty members selected by the voting members of the department, shall formally review dossiers submitted to the department chair. In the event that a department does not have a sufficient number of tenured faculty members, tenured faculty from other departments should be invited to serve. Alternatively, non-tenured faculty may be invited to serve. Departments may elect to function as a committee of the whole; however, in no case shall the person being considered for promotion and/or tenure serve on the committee. No department chair may serve as a member of the committee.

The departmental committee shall be guided by all of the specific university, college, and departmental criteria for promotion or tenure in their formal review of dossiers submitted to the department chair and shall make a recommendation in writing (including a discussion of the candidate's strengths and identification of areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria) regarding each case for promotion and/or tenure. A simple majority vote of the committee is required for a positive recommendation. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the chair of the department shall give the candidate a copy of the committee's evaluation in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

## 2. Department Chair

The department chair shall include the faculty committee's written evaluation along with his or her own written evaluation in the dossier of the candidate. Formal written evaluations shall include a discussion of the candidate's strengths and shall identify areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria.

## 3. Evaluation of a Department Chair

When a department chair is under consideration for promotion and/or tenure, the faculty committee (see above) shall review the candidate's dossier submitted to the Dean. The committee shall make a recommendation in writing (including a discussion of the candidate's strengths and identification of areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria) regarding the case for promotion and/or tenure. A simple majority vote of the committee is required for a positive recommendation. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the chair of the Committee shall give the candidate a copy of the committee's evaluation in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

## 4. Evaluations of other faculty holding administrative positions

Faculty above the level of department chair (e.g., deans, vice presidents) shall be evaluated in accordance with the same promotion and/or tenure criteria and procedures outlined in this Handbook including an independent evaluation by the candidate's immediate supervisor.

## 5. Appeals

Candidates may appeal any evaluation that does not recommend promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

# **B. College, School or Library Evaluation**

1. A Faculty Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Committee shall be established in each of the following: The College of Arts and Humanities, the School of Business, the College of Education, the College of Science and Mathematics, the College of Social Sciences, the Library, and the School of Nursing. Each committee shall be composed exclusively of tenured faculty members selected by the voting members of the academic unit and shall formally review dossiers submitted to the dean. Department chairs, Assistant/Associate

Deans and Deans are excluded from selection as committee members. No faculty member shall serve on the committee during a year in which he or she is being considered by the committee. Each department shall have representation on the committee, but no department shall have more than two members. In the event that a department does not have any tenured faculty members, a non-tenured member may be selected from the department to serve. Deans shall be responsible for calling the initial meeting of this committee. At the initial meeting, the members of each committee shall elect one of the members as chair, who will be a voting member of the committee.

2. Each committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. At the initial meeting, the committee chair shall review the qualifications for each rank so that members will be guided by all of the specific university, college, and departmental criteria for promotion or tenure.
3. Dossiers submitted shall be reviewed by committee members prior to committee meetings.
4. The merits of each candidate for promotion or tenure shall be discussed to the extent desired by a simple majority of committee members. Department members serving on the Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Committee are to serve as resource persons to the committee rather than advocates for or adversaries against members of their department under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. Any supervisor may be called to discuss with the committee the qualifications of each person nominated from his or her department.
5. Voting on promotion and tenure shall be by separate secret ballots and according to the following procedures: all candidates for promotion to each academic rank shall be voted on at the same time, and all candidates for tenure shall be voted on at the same time. Each candidate shall receive a vote of approval or disapproval. The committee chair shall total the votes awarded each candidate. A simple majority vote of the committee is required for a positive recommendation. It will be the responsibility of the Dean to preserve the original ballots and to keep these on file for a period of ten years.
6. Each committee chair shall submit a list of the names of those recommended for promotion and/or tenure to the appropriate Dean. The committee chair shall report to the Dean the number of approval/disapproval votes that each candidate received in the voting. The dossiers of those considered by the committee will be submitted with the report.

The committee chair shall prepare a written evaluation for each candidate that includes a discussion of the candidate's strengths and areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria. A copy of this written evaluation, including vote totals and individual ratings, shall be forwarded in the dossier of the candidate to the appropriate dean. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the dean shall give the candidate a copy of the committee's evaluation in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

## 6. Appeals

Candidates may appeal any evaluation that does not recommend promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

### **103.0202 Dean's Evaluation**

Each Dean shall evaluate the qualifications of the people under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The Dean's review shall be guided by all of the specific university, college, and departmental criteria for promotion or tenure, taking into account all the material in their dossiers, vote totals, and recommendations provided in each previous evaluation. The names of those recommended for promotion shall be arranged by academic rank; an additional list shall consist of the names of those recommended for tenure. The names of those not recommended for promotion and/or tenure will be listed separately. The dean shall prepare a written evaluation which includes a discussion of the candidate's strengths and areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria. A copy of this written evaluation shall be included in the dossier of the candidate and forwarded to the Provost. In the event the Dean recommends a candidate who, up to this point, has not been recommended for promotion and/or tenure, or chooses not to recommend a candidate who up to this point has been recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean's written report shall articulate the reasons for differing with prior evaluations. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the Dean shall give the candidate a copy of the committee's evaluation in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205. Candidates may appeal any evaluation that does not recommend promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

### **103.0203 The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' Evaluation**

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall evaluate the qualifications of the people under consideration for promotion and/or tenure. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' review shall be guided by all of the specific university, college, and departmental criteria for promotion or tenure taking into account all the material in their dossiers, vote totals, and recommendations provided in each previous evaluation. The names of those recommended for promotion shall be arranged by academic rank; an additional list shall consist of the names of those recommended for tenure. The names of those not recommended for promotion and/or tenure will be listed separately. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall prepare a written evaluation which includes a discussion of the candidate's strengths and areas where the candidate failed to meet the criteria. A copy of this written evaluation shall be included in the dossier of the candidate and forwarded to the President. In the event the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs recommends a candidate who, up to this point, has not been recommended for promotion and/or tenure, or chooses not to recommend a candidate who up to this point has been recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' written report shall articulate the reasons for differing with prior evaluations. If a candidate is not recommended for promotion and/or tenure, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall give the candidate a copy of the committee's evaluation in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall then notify the dean of each college of his or her decisions in each case. The dean of each College shall notify the department chair or area supervisor of the status of each candidate.

Candidates may appeal any evaluation that does not recommend promotion and/or tenure in accordance with the procedures and timelines specified in Section 103.0205.

#### **103.0204 Final Approval**

The President shall evaluate the qualifications of the people under consideration for promotion and/or tenure as revealed by the material in their dossiers and by the reports from the College, School, or Library Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Committees, the Deans, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The President shall approve or disapprove the candidate's application for promotion and/or tenure.

#### **103.0205 Appeal for Reconsideration**

Notification of a negative evaluation shall be communicated in a verifiable method by the appropriate supervisory level no later than ten University Business Days prior to the required notification to the next level. Any candidate appealing for reconsideration at any level shall within five University Business Days of the receipt of the report state in writing the grounds for his or her request and shall include in this appeal such additional material as is pertinent.

Within five University Business Days of receipt of an appeal, the party to whom the appeal has been made shall carefully re-evaluate the candidate's dossier in light of the written appeal. This re-evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration at this level and shall replace this party's previous evaluation in the candidate's dossier. The dossier will then proceed to the next level.

#### **103.0206 Promotion in Professorial Rank of a Member of the Administrative Staff**

Members of the administrative staff who hold faculty rank in a teaching area and who wish to be considered for promotion shall submit a dossier to the chair of the department in which they hold rank. Their applications shall be considered under the procedures herein prescribed.

### **103.03 Time Limits and Minimum Criteria for Promotion**

#### **103.0301 Time Limits--Promotion**

A Lecturer may serve in rank six years. Reappointment after six consecutive years of service will be permitted only if the lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. Lecturers who have served for a period of at least six years at the University of West Georgia may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer if they have met criteria for Senior Lecturer.

An Instructor may serve in rank a maximum of seven years. He or she should be considered for promotion as soon as he or she has met criteria for Assistant Professor. To be considered for tenure-track appointment at the assistant professor level, BOR policy 8.3.7.6 should be applied regarding years of service.

An Assistant Professor shall normally not be considered for promotion to Associate until his or her fourth year in rank at the University of West Georgia. A faculty member's receipt of tenure in rank shall not preclude his or her future consideration for promotion.

An Associate Professor shall normally not be considered for promotion to professor until his or her fifth year in rank.

#### **103.0302 Specific Minimum Criteria for Promotion**

Foreword. Four criteria are prescribed by Board of Regents Policies, 8.3.6: 1) superior teaching, 2) outstanding service to the institution, 3) academic achievement, and 4) professional growth and development. According to Regents' Policies, noteworthy achievement should be expected in at least two areas. At the University of West Georgia, one of those “noteworthy” areas must be teaching, except in the case of librarians and administrators whose primary tasks are not teaching. For employment or promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, one must have demonstrated at least some substantive and documentable achievement in all four areas. For those holding academic rank in the Library, outstanding fulfillment of duties rather than superior teaching shall be the criterion applied although teaching librarians and administrators must supply evidence of excellence in teaching as part of their case for promotion.

As the institution becomes more diverse in the types of programs offered and clientele served, it might reasonably have different levels of expectation for faculty in different programs. All faculty members at the University of West Georgia, however, are expected to participate actively in the intellectual life of their discipline and their profession. This may take the form of professional development activities which involve the practical application of existing knowledge or the creation of new knowledge. All faculty members are expected to have a professional development agenda, to make progress annually in addressing it, and to maintain proper professional ethics. (see Section 109) Below are outlined specific MINIMUM UWG requirements by rank for meeting each criterion:

### **1. To Be Promoted to Senior Lecturer**

- 1.1. Teaching. Demonstration of excellence in teaching with evidence from sources listed in section 103.0302.5.1 .
- 1.2. Service to the Institution. Demonstration of effectiveness as shown by successful, collegial service on departmental, college-wide, institutional or system-wide committees and with evidence from additional sources listed in section 103.0302.5.2 .
- 1.3. Academic Achievement. Graduate degree in discipline.
- 1.4. Professional Growth and Development. Demonstration of professional development in the candidate's discipline with evidence from the sources listed in section 103.0302.6.

### **2. To Be Promoted to Assistant Professor**

- 2.1. Teaching. Demonstration of excellence in teaching with evidence from sources listed in section 103.0302.5.1.
- 2.2. Service to the Institution. Demonstration of effectiveness as shown by successful, collegial service on departmental, college-wide, institutional or system-wide committees and with evidence from additional sources listed in section 103.0302.5.2 .
- 2.3. Academic Achievement. Terminal degree in discipline.
- 2.4. Professional Growth and Development. Demonstration of scholarly contributions, creative work, or successful professional practice in the candidate's discipline with evidence from the sources listed in section 103.0302.5.3 .

### **3. To Be Promoted to Associate Professor**

- 3.1. Teaching. Demonstration of significant contributions as a teacher and a high level of sustained excellence in teaching with evidence from sources listed in section 103.0302.5.1.
- 3.2. Service to Institution. Demonstration of significant contributions in such service and a strong likelihood of continuing effectiveness as shown by successful, collegial service on departmental, college-wide, institutional or system-wide committees and with evidence from additional sources listed in section 103.0302.5.2 .
- 3.3. Academic Achievement. Terminal degree in discipline.
- 3.4. Professional Growth and Development. Demonstration of scholarly contributions, creative work, or successful professional practice in the candidate's discipline and a strong likelihood of continuing effectiveness with evidence from the sources listed in section 103.0302.5.3 .

### **4. To Be Promoted to Professor**

- 4.1. Teaching. Demonstration of a clear and convincing record of a high level of sustained excellence with evidence from sources listed in section 103.0302.5.1.

- 4.2. Service to Institution. Demonstration of a clear and convincing record of a high level of sustained effectiveness as shown by successful, collegial service on departmental, college-wide, institutional or system-wide committees and with evidence from additional sources listed in section 103.0302.5.2.
- 4.3. Academic Achievement. Terminal degree in discipline.
- 4.4. Professional Growth and Development. Demonstration of a clear and convincing record of emerging stature as regional, national, or international authority within the candidate's discipline, and/or a clear and convincing record of a high level of sustained effectiveness in the candidate's discipline with evidence from the sources listed in section 103.03025.3.

## **5. Additional evidentiary Sources Relevant to Promotion**

### **5.1. Teaching:**

- 5.1.1. Effectiveness as shown by peer or supervisor evaluation
- 5.1.2. Honors or special recognitions for teaching accomplishments
- 5.1.3. Letters from former students attesting to the candidate's instructional abilities
- 5.1.4. Successful direction of individual student work (e.g., independent projects, theses, exit papers, etc.)
- 5.1.5. Scholarship related to teaching
- 5.1.6. Successful development of courses
- 5.1.7. Development of effective curricula and/or instructional methods
- 5.1.8. Faculty directed student research that complements classroom learning
- 5.1.9. Student evaluations
- 5.1.10. Evidence of student learning such as student self-assessments, pre- and post-test results, external test scores, rubric-based assessments, portfolios, examples of student work, and other relevant discipline-specific evidence.

### **5.2. Service to Institution:**

- 5.2.1. Successful development of service programs or projects.
- 5.2.2. Effective service-related consultation work or technical assistance.
- 5.2.3. Effective advisement of student organizations.
- 5.2.4. Successful counseling/advising of students.
- 5.2.5. Successful service on local, statewide, regional, national, or international levels in community-service organizations (e.g., committees, boards, panels).
- 5.2.6. Honors, awards and special recognitions for service to the institution or the community.
- 5.2.7. Significant contributions to the improvement of student, faculty or community life.
- 5.2.8. Successful mentoring of colleagues.
- 5.2.9. Collaborating with PK-12 schools, university colleagues, or external agencies to strengthen teaching quality and to increase student learning (as stipulated in B.O.R. policy 8.3.15)

### **5.3. Professional Growth and Development:**

- 5.3.1. Scholarly Publications (as determined by the disciplines):
  - Books published by peer-reviewed presses
  - Other published books related to the candidate's professional field
  - Articles published in refereed journals

- Papers and articles published elsewhere
- 5.3.2. Presentations before learned society
  - Presentations before learned societies and professional organizations
- 5.3.3. Grants
  - Grants received for research, scholarship, or creative activity
  - Grants received for curricular development or other academic projects
  - Submitted proposals for competitive external grants
- 5.3.4. Honors and Awards
  - Honors and awards for research, scholarship, or other creative activities
- 5.3.5. Recognition by professional peers
  - Reviews of a candidate's publications or creative work by persons of recognized competence in the discipline.
  - Election or appointment to offices in professional organizations, successful committee work and important service to state, regional, national or international professional associations and learned societies, including editorial work.
  - Receipt of competitively awarded fellowships, or selective admission to seminars related to one's discipline, scholarship, and/or creative activities.
  - Successful performances in significant recitals or productions in which such performances are invited or selected after competitive review.
  - Other performances related to academic field
  - Exhibitions of creative works in which such works are invited or selected after competitive review.
    - Non-refereed exhibitions
      - Membership on editorial boards, juries judging art works, or juries auditioning performing artists.
      - Development of scholarly applications of technology, e.g., laboratory devices, computer software packages or programs, videotapes, etc.
      - Consultation which involves scholarly application of professional expertise
- 5.3.6. Scholarship that promotes and improves student learning and achievement in PK-12 schools and/or in the university (as stipulated in B.O.R policy 8.3.15)
- 5.3.7. Other as approved by departments and colleges

## **6 Professional Growth and Development for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer:**

- 6.1. Significant contributions to continuing education programs for the community or local educators.
- 6.2. Significant contributions to workshops on teaching, pedagogy, or educational technology.
- 6.3. Significant consulting work related to teaching, pedagogy, or educational technology.
- 6.4. Completion of coursework required to obtain or maintain teacher certification.
- 6.5. Completion of graduate coursework in one's primary field beyond the Master's level.

6.6. Supervision and training of instructors, teaching assistants, lab assistants, or tutors.

6.7. Significant contributions to curricular development.

6.8. Academic publications and/or presentations at academic conferences.

## **103.04 Minimum Tenure Criteria**

### **103.0401 Foreword**

The awarding of tenure is a serious and significant step for both the faculty member and the university. It is not awarded merely on the basis of time in service or minimal effectiveness. Retention throughout a probationary period of service, regardless of faculty academic rank held, is by itself insufficient to guarantee the success of a candidate for tenure. To be eligible for consideration for tenure, a candidate must not only meet the required period of service and the minimum criteria specified below but must also show a history of evaluations that merit the award of tenure. Tenure is awarded to individual faculty members upon evidence of the capacity and likelihood for continued intellectual, scholarly, and professional vitality and a sense of responsibility and dedication to make the continuing exemplary performance of duties a reasonable expectation; and upon evidence of maintenance of proper professional ethics. (See AAUP statement on professional ethics, academic freedom and responsibility in "Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Professional Ethics" in this Handbook.) Protected from arbitrary dismissal and from transient political and ideological currents, the individual faculty member assumes a responsibility to make a continuing effort to achieve the expectations upon which the award of tenure was based. Tenure at the University of West Georgia should be regarded as a most valuable possession, signifying a long-term commitment of resources by the University of West Georgia, matched by the sincere commitment by the faculty member to continued professional growth and achievement. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are normally employed full-time (as defined by Regents' Policies) by an institution are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with the rank of lecturer or senior lecturer or with adjunct appointments shall not acquire tenure.

The term "full-time" is used in these tenure regulations to denote service on a one hundred percent workload basis for at least two of three semesters.

### **103.0402 Time Limitations**

1. Tenure may be awarded upon recommendation by the President and approval by the Board of Regents upon completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service at the rank of Assistant Professor or higher. The five-year period must be continuous except that a maximum of two years interruption because of a leave of absence or of part-time service may be permitted, provided, however, that no probationary credit for the period of an interruption shall be allowed. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of Instructor or Lecturer at the University of West Georgia. Such credit for prior service shall be defined in writing by the President and approved by the Board of Regents at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher.

2. The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the president.
3. The maximum time that may be served in the combination of full-time instructional appointments as instructor or professorial ranks without the award of tenure shall be ten years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eleventh year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the president. The maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time instructor shall be seven years.
4. Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon resignation from the University of West Georgia or upon written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position at the University of West Georgia or upon written resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given at the University of West Georgia. In the event such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure at the University of West Georgia, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.

#### **103.0403 Specific Minimum Criteria for the Award of Tenure**

1. **Teaching.** Same as criteria for promotion to Associate Professor
2. **Service to the Institution.** Same as criteria for promotion to Associate Professor
3. **Academic Achievement.** Same as criteria for promotion to Associate Professor
4. **Professional Growth and Development.** Same as criteria for promotion to Associate Professor

### **103.05 Instruments for Evaluating Teaching**

5. Evaluation of a faculty member's work should be continual because evaluation aids a faculty member in becoming more effective in the performance of his or her duties as well as offers evidence for promotion and/or tenure.
6. Although evaluation of classroom success is necessarily somewhat subjective, three modes of evaluation can, to a significant degree, objectively measure teaching effectiveness: self-evaluation, evaluation by the department chair, and student evaluation. Because the University of West Georgia believes that teaching is the most important function of a faculty member, the focus of evaluation instruments shall be on teaching and related duties.
7. Copies of the forms for student evaluation (103.0601), self-evaluation (103.0602) and the evaluation by the department chair ( 103.0603 ) are given on the next pages. 103.0601 Instructor/Course Evaluation Questionnaire

# **Addendum IX**

# Grow West: A Strategic Plan for the Targeted Advancement of Online Teaching and Learning at UWG

---

## Introduction

More than 60% of all the University of West Georgia (UWG) students took one or more online courses in academic year 2011, and nearly 10% of all UWG students were enrolled in fully online degree programs. This translates to three out of five UWG students taking at least one online course and *over 1200 students attending UWG completely online* during the span of FY11. This paper focuses on fully-online students and programs and outlines how additional enrollments can be generated through the delivery of targeted, high-quality, online offerings to *new and underserved audiences*. The taskforce does not advocate diminishing traditional student enrollments or resources for our outstanding campus-based programs in any way. The motivation is to produce a net gain in student enrollments and not to exploit our existing student population merely to increase online enrollments. The working assumption is that UWG can further leverage the potential of online learning to supplement, and not to supplant, existing campus offerings resulting in favorable outcomes for all stakeholders.

In terms of growth numbers and projections across the country, the *2010 Sloan Survey of Online Learning* reveals that enrollment of online postsecondary students rose by almost one million students in *one* year. This survey of more than 2,500 traditional colleges and universities nationwide found approximately 5.6 million students were enrolled in at least one online course in fall 2009. This also represented the single largest year-to-year increase ever and, as of 2009, approximately 30% of all college and university students took at least one online course. Further, a large scale survey of students enrolled in higher education in the United States conducted by Eduventures, Inc. (2010) indicated that 92% of respondents would be willing to consider wholly online courses and programs. Across the country, online enrollments are increasing at rates exceeding 21% annually. This is far greater than the 2% growth of traditional site-based programs (Allen & Seaman, 2010).

It is important to note that more than 90% of this growth is coming from existing traditional brick-and-mortar universities and not from for-profit institutions (Allen & Seaman, 2010). What this means is that UWG's main competition includes not only for-profit schools like *The University of Phoenix* (Atlanta is one of their top two markets), but also other public and private universities developing online learning initiatives. And this growth shows *no signs* of slowing.

It is also important to acknowledge the changing nature of our incoming audience as well. In the current P-12 system, three quarters of public school districts are already offering online or blended courses with 66% of school districts reporting they expect to significantly increase their online enrollments in coming years (Keeping Pace, 2010; Picciano & Seaman, 2008). Some projections expect more than one-half of all high school courses to be delivered online by 2020 (Christensen, Curtis, & Horn, 2008).

Statewide, regionally, nationally, and internationally, enormous opportunities also exist to serve other non-traditional students as well as specific audiences like the military. Currently, the U.S. military is spending more than half a billion dollars annually on tuition assistance for its members, and service members are increasingly expected to hold college degrees (Blumenstyk, 2006). This could be a key new demographic for UWG's distance programs.

*In short, our audience has changed, and the institutions that do the best job providing high-quality, flexible, and dynamic technology-enhanced learning experiences to broad audiences will be better positioned to enjoy sustainable growth.*

In spring of 2011, a taskforce was convened under the direction of Dr. Myrna Gantner to conduct an analysis of the current status of distance-delivered programs and courses at UWG. The taskforce was also charged with exploring how UWG could leverage the innovative potential of online learning to serve new audiences (like the military and other non-traditional students) as well as how UWG could better position itself in the increasingly competitive regional, national, and international distance education marketplace. This taskforce was composed of more than 20 representatives, including individuals from most colleges and schools across campus, key administrators, and distance education leaders.

This report represents the initial findings of this taskforce and provides a rationale and list of recommendations for accomplishing three main goals:

- 1) position UWG to become a leader in the field of online learning in the regional, national, and global marketplace;
- 2) expand UWG's student audience through distance-delivery of high quality educational experiences to individuals *who would otherwise be unable to attend a strictly campus-based program*; and
- 3) increase revenue.

To accomplish these goals, the taskforce proposes institutionalizing an official "third programmatic strand" that serves the online student. Currently, UWG serves three distinct student audiences or "strands:" traditional students (strand 1), commuter students (strand 2), and online students (strand 3)<sup>1</sup>. This report contends that UWG should formalize an institutional strategic plan that fully serves all the stakeholders of the proposed third strand.

The proposed third strand clearly aligns with the mission and vision of UWG as a *Destination University*. Through targeted high-quality online programs, we can attract excellent undergraduate and graduate students to UWG who stay and graduate, thereby positively impacting RPG figures and UWG's standing as a first-class educational institution. Through such programs, we can also draw world-class faculty and staff from around the globe and increase external recognition and stature. We can also use the online delivery medium to expand high quality and innovative doctoral-level programs (as we have recently done with programs in *School Improvement* and *Nursing Education*), further cementing UWG's position as a leader in the Robust Tier and advancing our Carnegie classification. Finally, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), our major regional accrediting body, has released updated and extensive requirements, standards, principles, and best practices for online education, and the proposed third strand along with the following seven recommendations will serve to further facilitate compliance with SACS requirements (*Footnotes are included and matched to specific SACS core requirements and standards where appropriate*).

The taskforce strongly believes we can do all this while maintaining our commitment to *educational excellence in a personal environment* and while staying true to our core values of respect for teaching and learning as well as our pioneering spirit and "Go West" philosophy of blazing new trails in scholarly achievement, creative expression, and service to humanity.

---

<sup>1</sup> The taskforces acknowledges that the strand categories of "online" and "commuter" overlap to include extended degree programs and satellite campuses such as the Newnan Campus. Many of the recommendations proposed here should have a positive impact on these programs as well. However, for the purposes of this report, we are focused specifically on *online* teaching and learning in the proposed third strand.

## Summary

The first charge of the taskforce was to review the current status of distance education at the university. In short, UWG has a long and impressive history of delivering distance education programs. From early correspondence courses, to real-time remote delivery systems like *GSAMS*, to advanced Learning Management System (LMS) course delivery via the Web, UWG has pioneered quality distance education initiatives in the State of Georgia, throughout the region, and recently across the United States and other countries. Since the Board of Regents began keeping records on distance education enrollments in 2000, UWG's distance enrollment, credit hours generated, and number of online course sections consistently ranks among the top two to five schools in the state, depending on the variable. UWG's Distance and Distributed Education Center (DDEC) is well-known for its collaboration with administrators, staff, university colleges, schools, and departments and for its ability to support and facilitate quality distance instruction, technology-enhanced learning, faculty and student support, and other distance learning initiatives. UWG is also internationally known for the *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, the *Distance Learning Administration Conference*, and several certificate programs for distance educators. UWG also competitively obtained the rights to system-wide administrative responsibility for *USG eCore*: a collaborative, multi-institutional program that provides the undergraduate core curriculum fully online. At UWG, eCore has been a resounding success with new affiliate institutions added, course completion rates improving from 68% to 90%, and enrollment tripling in the last two years. Under the DDEC's leadership, UWG also proposed, developed, and implemented the university's eTuition plan, generating \$2 million annually for the institution while providing scalable operations and faculty incentives for online growth.

The growth of online programs at UWG can be called exponential. As of July 2010, the number of fully online programs, certificates, and endorsements stood at nine. In FY11, that number nearly doubled as a record *eight* new programs committed to going online including one of only two online doctorate programs offered in the state and our first fully online bachelor's degree. As of September 2011, at least another five fully online undergraduate and graduate degree/certificate programs are in the planning-to-approval stages including another doctorate in Nursing Education. Clearly, the DDEC has the experience, leadership, and ability to help UWG rethink the role of online learning on an institutional scale and leverage this opportunity in positive ways. The taskforce believes it is time to build on these past successes, address any restraining forces limiting further innovation, and craft an institutional vision and plan for further advancing online teaching and learning at UWG.

Among the current challenges that the taskforce seeks to address:

- Because UWG has yet to adopt a clear institutional mission, vision, and plan for online learning, it is a challenge to prospective and current students, faculty, administrators, and staff to understand exactly what UWG offers in terms of online learning, how online learning is supported, and how it factors into UWG's overall mission and vision.
- Prospective student information regarding online learning at UWG often seems disjointed, fragmented, and confusing. Many university webpages, our main "face" to the global marketplace, are often poorly designed, make little use of emerging technologies, and offer little consistency and information regarding online program availability, requirements, delivery, cost, etc. Pricing of programs is often inconsistent and confusing to students.
- Student services (recruitment through graduation), processes, and policies at UWG are disconnected from the needs of online and off-campus students, who represent a significant and growing portion of institutional enrollment.
- Marketing and branding for online programs have been noticeably absent.

- Current university financial allocations and budgetary processes do not consistently provide support for online programs, in particular for new permanent faculty lines for online programs, resulting in qualified students being turned away from popular online degree programs.

The taskforce believes that now is the time for UWG to make online learning a strategic priority if it hopes to assume a leadership position in online learning, garner an appropriate market share, and remain viable in this new educational landscape.

### **Recommendations**

The taskforce identifies the following recommendations to better serve its growing online student population and position UWG to compete more aggressively in the dynamic world of online education. These recommendations are broad in scope and are intended to serve as a general framework for shaping a long-term strategy for achieving the aforementioned three goals of better positioning UWG in the global marketplace, expanding our potential student base, and increasing revenue. If the need for an institutional-level online teaching and learning strategic plan is agreed upon, further situational analyses and committee work will be required to carry out these, and possibly other, recommendations.

#### **Recommendation One**

*Formalize and Institutionalize an Official “Third Programmatic Strand” that Targets and Serves the Online Student*

UWG is clearly a leader in online teaching and learning for Georgia in terms of course quality and number of students served and is poised to become a national, and even international, leader as well. However, to recognize our potential and to reach new and underserved audiences, we need to build on current successes and enculturate online learning into who we are as an institution.

At UWG, online learning is currently integrated into, and relies upon, our existing organizational processes and practices. As we continue to expand, it will become increasingly important to insure consistency and adequacy of programs across delivery mediums. With this in mind, the university should further examine ways to reengineer the existing organizational processes and practices for maximum efficiency and effectiveness. While the campus has achieved an impressive level of success under its current operational model, further expansion of online programs will require more resources and personnel to develop, deliver, and support online programming across the campus. To ensure appropriate levels of service and accountability, the organizational processes, practices, and personnel may also need to be adjusted to afford more responsibility, authority, and oversight of online programming at UWG. To accomplish this and the three goals outlined in this paper, we need to develop, formalize, institutionalize, and fully support an official third programmatic strand that targets and serves the online student<sup>2</sup>. This will require a cultural shift and a comprehensive strategic plan for online teaching and learning at UWG.

Many competitors such as Kennesaw State University, Georgia Southern University, Georgia Perimeter College, Valdosta State University, and other universities in neighboring states and across the country are adopting clear financial and strategic plans to target *specific* online student populations, to increase revenue through quality online courses/programs, to support online students, and to hire, incentivize, and reward faculty participating in these mission-critical endeavors. To be brief, UWG needs to officially recognize the potential of

---

<sup>2</sup> SACS (Core Requirement 2.4, 2.5; Comprehensive Standard 3.1.1, 3.3.1) Provision of distance education courses and programs should be reflected in the institution’s mission and approved by the governing board because of the distinct character of distance education and because of human, technological, and financial resources required for a high quality distance education program. Courses and programs offered by distance education should be included in the planning and evaluation processes at the institution.

online learning and make advancing this third programmatic strand a strategic priority. The remaining recommendations build upon this premise.

## **Recommendation Two**

### *Further Develop Financial Models and Budgeting Practices that Support Innovation and Scalability*

Currently, tuition revenues are being used to excellent effect to provide many operational costs of online learning as well as motivation and financial incentives to colleges, departments, and individual faculty to participate in online teaching and learning. Tuition is a tuition differential (currently \$90/credit hour) assessed to students taking fully online courses in lieu of certain other fees typically charged to face-to-face students. While this model is working very well and has served as a model for other USG institutions, the taskforce believes that tuition revenue is somewhat limited in terms of its ability to promote appropriate scalability and to support large enrollments in online programs.

The taskforce recommends UWG continue the successful tuition model, but further explore additional budgeting practices that will provide for adequate permanent funding of new faculty as online programs experience growth.<sup>3</sup>

## **Recommendation Three**

### *Incorporate Distance Education into UWG's Advertising and Brand Marketing*

UWG's current "Go West" branding campaign has been very successful and even won a coveted Best of Show honor in the *26th Annual Educational Advertising Awards*. While these accomplishments are laudable, the taskforce feels that marketing strategies and tactics that highlight our online programs should be included in advertising campaigns, websites, and other brand marketing. A strong UWG brand with visible inclusion of UWG's online programs allows for the university to ideally position itself in a competitive marketplace and showcases a clear alternative to expensive for-profit and private institutions for students. Most potential online students prefer to attend programs connected to quality brick-and-mortar traditional schools for three reasons: cost, name recognition, and accreditation. These are all areas where UWG holds a clear market advantage. We need to exploit this advantage and make targeted, high-quality online education synonymous with the UWG brand.

## **Recommendation Four**

### *Develop a System to Incentivize, Train, Support, and Hire Faculty Involved with Online Teaching and Learning*

Faculty buy-in and support is an absolute necessity for online programs that desire to build and maintain long-term quality and viability and a must for any planned systematic change. Extensive research has been done over the last decade regarding faculty perceptions and concerns about online learning (McCarthy & Samors, 2009). As educators, faculty are generally positive about online learning and seem to appreciate the opportunity (and the challenge) to advance their technical know-how and develop new teaching and learning skills. However, they have several legitimate concerns that need to be addressed.

Online educators are faced with new and different issues surrounding student interactions, course content design and delivery, multiple levels of communication, defining new types of assignments and performance expectations, and different assessment and evaluation techniques (to name a few). Without training

---

<sup>3</sup> SACS (Core Requirement 2.11.1) The institution, in making distance education, courses/programs a part of its mission, is expected to provide adequate funding for faculty, staff, services, and technological infrastructure to support the methodology.

and support, faculty often design courses using only the simplest technology with little regard to necessary instructional design parameters for the new medium or how advances in emerging technologies, social networking, mobile technologies and other resources can be utilized to enhance motivation, interaction, and instruction. The inclusion of such technology often requires extensive training, new skill sets, new ways of thinking, new time and resource management skills, new ways of communicating and new communication boundaries, additional workers, and interdepartmental, college, and university coordination to be done successfully (Moller & Huett, 2011; Moller, Foshay, & Huett, 2008).

All of this can be very time-intensive for the faculty member in question, leading to feelings of isolation and a sense of being overworked, undercompensated, and underappreciated. In fact, faculty concerns seem to center around three main areas: 1) faculty have the perception that compensation for participating in online learning initiatives is not commensurate with the required additional workload and training; 2) if online learning is not clearly valued and codified at the institution, it is often perceived by faculty to interfere with or be detrimental to promotion and tenure; and 3) faculty often have questions about online course quality (McCarthy & Samors, 2009; Moller, Foshay, & Huett, 2008).

UWG, through the DDEC, has worked to address these issues over the years and recently hired an Associate Dean of Online Development and a Director for Online Faculty Development to further support and train faculty interested in online teaching and learning. Additionally, mentor-mentee models in some colleges, which pair neophyte online instructors with more experienced instructors to design and develop quality distance courses, have been shown to be successful. Moreover, certain colleges on campus are now placing value on developing, teaching, and evaluating online courses and programs through their department-level and college-level promotion and tenure review processes, and tuition money and other revenue is being used to provide some training and compensation models for faculty developing online courses.

However, the taskforce believes that UWG would benefit from the administration supporting 1) the development of a clear campus-wide system of faculty incentives, training, support, and hiring practices that support online learning; 2) a clear articulation of the value of developing, teaching, and revising online programs/courses into the university's tenure and promotion process and; 3) a cultural shift that reflects the stance that online learning is not relegated to an isolated subset of certain faculty, staff, and administrators. Rather, it is a highly valued part of the overall institution's mission and vision.

To further the University's efforts to remain relevant in the digital age, UWG needs to recognize that online learning is a campus-wide issue and promote its growth through appropriate hiring practices and through supporting and training existing faculty at all levels and positions, including those with tenure.<sup>4</sup>

## **Recommendation Five**

### *Implement a Quality Control Plan for Online Courses/Programs*

Online education is coming under greater regulation and scrutiny and many institutions across the country are adopting quality control systems to ensure the high quality of their online offerings and to comply with regulatory and accrediting bodies. These quality assurance, training, and evaluation plans can be a very effective way to help standardize the course creation, evaluation, and revision process as well as increase

---

<sup>4</sup> SACS (Core Requirement 2.8; Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1, 3.4.10, 3.4.12) A support system exists for faculty teaching distance education courses. The institution should employ sufficient full time faculty to support its mission...there should be a sufficient number of faculty qualified to plan for, design, and teach distance education courses. The institution should consider and define unique qualifications for faculty members teaching distance education courses...[and] ensure that faculty have played an appropriate role in designing the courses/programs to be offered by distance education.

faculty proficiency with the delivery medium and improve market share and brand recognition through the delivery of consistently high quality online educational experiences.

UWG, through the DDEC, offers a vast menu of training to new and existing faculty to help ensure online course/program quality and has provided funding, extensive resources, and rubrics for designing, developing, implementing, and evaluating online courses/programs. However, the DDEC lacks the necessary institutional support to implement a research-based, practice-based, appropriate quality control plan for online courses/programs.<sup>5</sup>

It is important to note that the taskforce is advocating a quality control (QC) system that centers on the effective and efficient management of the technology and instructional design considerations for online delivery and not a QC system that dictates course content or in any way impinges on academic freedom. In this case, QC focuses on appropriate design and use of the online delivery medium and not on selection of the content itself. The emphasis is on standards for the unique aspects of the online delivery medium such as the appropriate use of distance technologies, online instructional design, online course management, and distance learner interaction and engagement. In other words, the proposed QC system does not concern itself with the message being taught; it is only concerned with ensuring that the message is delivered successfully.

Our competition is clearly outlining organizational strategic plans focused on improving the quality of their online offerings. For instance, Kennesaw State University has adopted the nationally recognized *Quality Matters*<sup>6</sup> (QM) online course framework institution-wide, and the President has mandated that all faculty members teaching online must complete the required QM training and receive certification. Additionally, the registrar is not allowed to list the class for student enrollment until it can be shown that the faculty member teaching the course has been certified and that the course has been previously and thoroughly reviewed using the QM framework. KSU recognizes that this process is asking a lot of faculty members in terms of time, training, and the acquisition of new skillsets. This process also requires faculty to become more comfortable with increased levels of scrutiny regarding their courses. To address these concerns, KSU and other institutions have established incentives and policies that address the unique demands and considerations associated with online teaching and learning. In fact, Augusta State University, Darton College, Georgia Perimeter College, North Georgia College and State University, and Valdosta State University are all current subscribers to the Quality Matters framework.

UWG needs to begin to implement a consistent but *flexible* quality control plan for its online courses/programs that is *clearly articulated from the highest administrative levels*. This plan should complement our overall mission and vision for online teaching and learning and should include appropriate resources, staffing, and incentives for faculty participating in these valuable undertakings.

---

<sup>5</sup> SACS (Core Requirement 2.5, 2.8; Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1, 3.4.7, 3.4.10, 3.4.12, 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.3) Purpose and outcomes should be identified for the distance education program as a whole. Students learning competencies should be identified and achievement assessed for distance education courses and programs. [T]he institution should be an active participant in ensuring the effectiveness and quality of the courses/programs offered by all of the participants...[and] ensure that faculty members teaching distance education courses are proficient in the use of technology. The institution is expected to make its case that faculty teaching distance education courses are qualified to teach those courses...[and] should regularly evaluate the effectiveness of faculty member who teach distance education courses. The institution should make professional development activities and training available to distance education faculty members and ensure that distance education faculty members engage in training and professional development.

<sup>6</sup> From the Quality Matters website: Quality Matters (QM) is a faculty-centered, peer review process that is designed to certify the quality of online and blended courses. QM is a leader in quality assurance for online education and has received national recognition for its peer-based approach and continuous improvement in online education and student learning. QM subscribers include community and technical colleges, colleges and universities, K-12 schools and systems, and other academic institutions.

## Recommendation Six

### *Expand Student Services to Specifically Address the Needs of the Online/Distant Student*

In general, UWG's student support services and many policies and procedures are fabricated almost entirely on existing brick and mortar operational principles and reliant upon traditional face-to-face business practices. UWG does not have an integrated student support system for its graduate and undergraduate programs that is designed specifically with the needs of *distance students* in mind. In fact, it may be argued that many admissions and enrollment processes and policies are decidedly unfriendly to the potential online or off-campus student<sup>7</sup>.

Competitive research shows that other institutions are making great strides in the area of distant student services such as providing potential online students with real-time video conferencing with faculty and staff for program inquiries, registration, and advising, 24/7 toll free call centers for marketing and online student support, social networking platforms for communication and community building, mobile technology access for classes and campus resources, dynamic Web portals, etc. While the DDEC has implemented many of these strategies for online students, there needs to be adequate support and a campus-wide culture in place that treats our distant students with the same level of consideration and high-quality student support services afforded to our traditional face-to-face students.

Dr. Charles Bird (2011), Vice-President for Regional Higher Education at Ohio University and author of the blog *Creating the Future: Innovation in Higher Education*, correctly notes that successful online and off-campus program delivery means treating students well and "lies in providing outstanding service, from the point of inquiry, through admissions, to graduation . . . the institutions that act now and intelligently will be successful; other institutions will be left behind. (§ 7)"

## Recommendation Seven

### *Explore New Programs, Markets, Audiences, and Partnerships*

The market for students has changed, and UWG needs to change its thinking. UWG has a large potential audience for online programs and identifying, understanding, and catering to this audience is critical to the growth, stability, and viability of the institution. It would be difficult to include all of the specific profiles of potential online audiences in this paper, so the following brief review is provided.

In terms of specific programs, online demand has been strongest for complete undergraduate and graduate degree programs in criminal justice, computer and information technology, health care, business, nursing, public administration, liberal arts, communication, education, and psychology (Online Learning: By The Numbers, 2010). UWG has existing strengths in many of these areas and has the opportunity to strategically develop several strong, high-enrollment niche, or carefully targeted online programs.

We are also seeing a dramatic increase in public/private partnerships concerning online degree programs. Our recent campus visits and solicitations from *Academic Partnerships*<sup>8</sup> is one example as is *Wal-*

---

<sup>7</sup> SACS (Core Requirement 2.10; Comprehensive Standard 3.4.9, 3.9.3) The institutions is expected to consider support services needed by distance education students and provide for those needs [including]...staff sufficient to meet support needs...access to advisement, tutorials, and mentoring...[monitoring] of dropout rates, failure rates, and completion rates.

<sup>8</sup> From the Academic Partnerships website: "Academic Partnerships is a higher education service company working exclusively with state universities. AP helps the faculty of partner institutions convert traditional degree programs to online delivery and builds enrollment by recruiting and retaining qualified students."

*Mart* partnering with *American Public University (APU)* to offer reduced tuition to all of *Wal-Mart's* employees seeking an online degree. If just 10% of *Wal-Mart's* U.S. workers end up getting degrees through the program, it would be the equivalent of over 180,000 APU graduates (Klopsis, 2010).

In July of 2011, the University of Massachusetts, through its *UMassOnline* initiative, announced it was partnering with the National Education Association (NEA) to become one of only three online learning partners to deliver advanced online degree programs exclusively to NEA members. Through this unique partnership, the NEA estimates that *approximately 500,000 members* are potential candidates for the programs offered by UMass and the other two partner institutions (Business Wire, 2011).

These three different partnership models are just a few examples of the new pattern of competition in the education marketplace. UWG would be wise to explore the possibility of similar arrangements with groups like the US military, large local education agencies (LEA), and companies like *Southwire* and *Walmart.com* and to pay careful attention to and learn from how private companies like *Academic Partnerships* are beginning to conduct the business of online education with public institutions.

These represent only a few instances of new program, market, audience, and partnership possibilities. The taskforce is *not* advocating that UWG try to be all things to all people. Rather, it is suggesting that we focus on what makes us unique and specifically target programs and audiences with demonstrated need that we believe we can successfully serve through online delivery. *The important thing is that UWG begin to think creatively and focus not only on pulling students to our campus but also on pushing targeted high quality online instruction, in distinctive programs, out to new and underserved audiences.*

## Conclusion

The taskforce acknowledges that some individuals may be reluctant to adopt online learning as part of UWG's strategic plan and that such an adoption represents a cultural shift for the university. For many years, online education has, at best, been regarded by some as a stepchild to the dominant classroom model, or, at worst, as an oxymoron conjuring an unsavory image of questionable diploma mills. However, one cannot deny that online learning is an impressive force in mainstream education. What was once considered a last option for learners is now a viable opportunity for educational providers in many learning contexts. Technology has advanced to the point where quality online learning is both possible and in dramatically increasing demand by students. Further, while the taskforce does not advocate simply adopting technology for its own ends, we feel that UWG cannot afford to ignore the aggregate impact of decades of breakthrough technological advances and the trend toward more ubiquitous and personal learning opportunities offered through distance technologies. The taskforce strongly believes that UWG can focus on preserving our reputation as an excellent traditional institution of higher learning while fostering the growth and development of quality, targeted, online programs.

Further, the taskforce believes this is less about selecting new technologies and delivery mediums and more about managing change. We have reached a point in the change process, and our own evolution, where UWG needs to articulate a clear, workable, and inspirational strategic plan for a third programmatic strand addressing online learning that aligns with our institution's culture, mission, and values; energizes, empowers, and supports all the stakeholders; and allows us to move aggressively but thoughtfully forward.

The important thing to understand is that this is not an either/or proposition; it is more a symbiotic relationship. We can be the "right fit" for traditional face-to-face students and, in many cases, for distant students as well. Further, exploring high-quality, targeted, and scalable online programs for delivery *to new and*

*underserved audiences will generate additional revenue* to support campus-based traditional programs resulting in favorable outcomes for all our programs, students, faculty, and other stakeholders.

Finally, we must come to terms with the fact that education has changed, and we have to change our thinking. The question is no longer *if* we have to change to keep up with the new world of learning, but *how*. Online learning is a point of pride for this institution and being a *Destination University* should be about choice and not just geography. UWG needs to realize its potential as a *first-choice Destination University* for its online programs as well.

### References

- Allen, I. E. & Seaman, J. (2010). *Class differences: Online education in the United States, 2010*. Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from [http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/class\\_differences](http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/survey/class_differences)
- Bird, C. (2011). *The coming third wave of change in higher education*. Retrieved from <http://drcharlesbird.com/creatingthefuture/2011/07/the-coming-third-wave-of-change-in-higher-education/>
- Blumenstyk, G. (2006). The military market. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/The-Military-Market/10484/>
- Business Wire (2011). UMassOnline reports a 12% increase in enrollments and a 16% increase in revenue generated by online courses offered through university of Massachusetts campuses in FY11. Retrieved from <http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20110706005892/en/UMassOnline-Reports-12-Increase-Enrollments-16-Increase>
- Christensen, C., Curtis, J., & Horn, M. (2008). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Eduventures, Inc. (2010). *Assessing Consumer Preferences for Continuing, Professional, and Online Higher Education*. Boston, MA: Online Higher Education Learning Collaborative.
- Keeping Pace with K-12 online learning: An annual review of policy and practice*. Retrieved from [http://www.kpk12.com/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPaceK12\\_2010.pdf](http://www.kpk12.com/wp-content/uploads/KeepingPaceK12_2010.pdf)
- Klopsis, N. (2010). Wal-Mart, American Public University partner to offer affordable employee college plan. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from [http://www.nydailynews.com/money/2010/06/03/2010-06-03\\_walmart\\_american\\_public\\_university\\_partner\\_to\\_offer\\_affordable\\_employee\\_college\\_.html](http://www.nydailynews.com/money/2010/06/03/2010-06-03_walmart_american_public_university_partner_to_offer_affordable_employee_college_.html)
- McCarthy, S. & Samors, R. (2009). *Online learning as a strategic asset, Vol. 1: A resource for campus leaders*. Washington DC: Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities.
- McCarthy, S. & Samors, R. (2009). *Online learning as a strategic asset, Vol. 2: The paradox of faculty voices*. Washington DC: Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities.
- Moller, L., Foshay, W., Huett, J. (2008). The Evolution of distance education: Implications for instructional design on the potential of the web (Part 2: Higher Education). *TechTrends*, 52(4), 66-70.
- Moller, L., & Huett, J. (Eds.). (2011). *The next generation of distance education: Unconstrained learning*. New York: Springer Press.
- Online learning: By the numbers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Online-Learning-Enrollment/125202/>
- Picciano, A. & Seaman, J. (2008). *K-12 online learning: A 2008 follow-up of the survey of U.S. school district administrators*. Retrieved from [http://sloanconsortium.org/sites/default/files/k-12\\_online\\_learning\\_2008.pdf](http://sloanconsortium.org/sites/default/files/k-12_online_learning_2008.pdf)