Greetings from the Executive Director | Laura Lynn

Walden Community,

I hope you enjoy this issue of re:Research, which includes updates on current initiatives, tools, and research activities that support effective research mentoring and assessment.

**Tools to Support Effective Research Mentoring and Assessment**

Over the next several months, specific tools will come into place to support effective research mentoring. There will be a series of orientation meetings to support the new prospectus framework that is currently being integrated into programs and the new dissertation rubric, which will be available in the spring. Both of these efforts support both formative and summative assessment for our students. Students can self-evaluate with these tools prior to submission and faculty can use them to guide developmental feedback. As a form of assessment, these approaches are built to ensure that solid work moves forward and is approved in the capstone process. At the University Faculty Meeting on Friday, January 20, 2012, CRS team members will be providing an orientation to the Litmus Test, Prospectus 2.0, and the new design for the dissertation rubric.

**Research Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee**

On November 30 we had the first Research Curriculum and Academic Policy (RCAP) Committee. This committee is part of the new university governance structure and is charged to review and vote on research curriculum and academic initiatives related to research courses, residency, research fora, and research tools and processes. RCAP is made up of Associate Deans and two faculty representatives from each college. We are very pleased with both the energy and thoughtful deliberation provided by members.

**Community Partnerships**

Part of being a strong research-oriented university is establishing good and responsible partnerships with organizations when conducting student and faculty research. In this issue, Dr. Leilani Endicott describes the study that she is leading to investigate the nature of current relationships between our students and the community partners that have supported students’ capstone research. Findings from this study will be used to inform ways that Walden can...
strengthen partnerships and further support community partners in research sponsored by the university.

I’m looking forward to seeing many of you at the University Faculty Meeting and upcoming research events in Miami. If you have any question on current research initiatives or activities feel free to contact me at crs@waldenu.edu

Sincerely,

Laura

A CRS Study of Community Partnerships | Leilani Endicott

The Center for Research Support will be conducting a study entitled, “Descriptions and Predictive Factors of Strong Community Research Partnerships: What Makes a Community Organization Value a Walden Researcher as a Partner?”

Walden students and faculty members partner with a vast range of research sites across the world, including schools, businesses, government agencies, non-profits, and other types of organizations. The IRB office proposes to collect extensive data on the factors related to quality of these community partnerships in order to better define best practices for developing and maintaining strong partnerships between community partner organizations and a non-traditional university, such as Walden. Surveys and interviews will:

- assess the partner organizations’ perceptions of the researcher and the research experience;
- ask the organizations whether they would partner with another Walden researcher in the future;
- analyze which factors predict a partnership that is highly valued by the organization.

The IRB is responsible for ensuring that the each study’s costs and burdens are ethically proportionate to its benefits. Among other things, the IRB evaluates the following dynamics between the researcher and the partner organization:

- how each researcher describes his/her relationship with each research site (partner organization);
- how the researcher will present the study to the potential participants during the informed consent process;
- how the organization might benefit from the data collection/analysis;
- costs to the organization in terms of privacy/safety risks, time given, and other contributions.
The mixed methods study includes descriptive, quantitative, and qualitative research questions to help us understand which researcher, partner, and study characteristics result in the community organization valuing the partnership (thus positively impacting the reputation of the university and the organization’s willingness to partner again with another Walden researcher). With these data in hand, the IRB can develop empirically-supported procedures and guidance for researchers to help ensure that Walden studies result in strong community partnerships that strategically place Walden researchers as leaders in ethical research and sought-after research partners among these types of organizations.

Participant Pool Updates | Jenny Sherer

The Participant Pool has seen tremendous growth and many researchers have completed their research through the site. A question that many student researchers have in relation to the site is if they can determine early on in the proposal process if they would be able to use the Participant Pool for their own research.

Identifying where the research will take place can be a daunting task. Fortunately, an application to place a study on the Participant Pool Website is available online. Students can submit this application to participantpool@waldenu.edu during the proposal process to determine if their study could be posted. The data collection tool(s) for the study would also need to be submitted. IRB approval would be needed before the study could be formally posted, but this option lets students minimize any potential surprises once their proposal is approved. Students interested in using the site for their own research are also encouraged to set up participant accounts to see how other researchers are using the site. Any questions about the site should be directed to participantpool@waldenu.edu.

To access the website, please copy and paste it into your web browser: http://walden.sona-systems.com

The first time the site is accessed, participants will need to create a participant account by clicking on the New Participant? link at the bottom of the page. If an account has already been created, but the username or password cannot be recalled, please e-mail participantpool@waldenu.edu to have that information provided.
The Prospectus 2.0 | Daniel Salter

Over the past year, the Center for Research Support has been involved in a number of key initiatives to support the quality of doctoral capstones, with much of the effort focusing on the early stages of the process. To that end, a team of experienced faculty members, representing each of the colleges, was empaneled to look at the current prospectus processes and to make recommendations to strengthen them.

What this group discovered was quite a lot of overlap among the various program-level documents. When looking at the differences, however, they saw strengths in individual prospectuses that were not as well articulated in some of the others. This working group also examined the Historical Alignment Tool from Academic Residencies, and some key documents developed by other working groups associated with the Doctoral Capstone Quality Enhancement effort, including the recommendations from the Benchmarking and Rubric working groups, and the Litmus Test for Doctoral Level Research Problems.

Three documents emerged from their review, which will soon be available on the CRS website in Winter Quarter for Ph.D. students, and rolled into other programs in the months ahead. In creating these documents, the working group tried to remain mindful of where they will fit into a student’s overall capstone development, while keeping the process as streamlined as possible.

The Premise: The working group found that many programs have some type of pre-prospectus process that is used to determine initial committee assignments. In some programs, the old prospectus was used in that way. Other programs have developed program-specific documents. To support program operation, the Premise was designed to operationalize that initial phase a little better. It focuses on two key aspects of the capstone: 1) the problem statement and 2) initial thoughts on methodology.

The Prospectus: As the agreed upon plan for developing the proposal, a few things are noticeable in the enhanced prospectus. First, it captures the content of all the current prospectuses and builds on them. Second, the "fill in the box" Word™ template (on which it was difficult to give feedback) has been eliminated, and students are asked simply to write their prospectus as a word processing document. Third, we have built an annotated outline of the prospectus, including recommended lengths for each section.

The Prospectus Rubric: The "new" part to the process is implementing a rubric. In designing one, the goals were to keep it simple and focused on some key quality indicators of a doctoral-level capstone project, at this point in its development. What resulted was a 9-item, yes-no checklist for the chair and member to use to evaluate the quality of the prospectus, during development and prior to its final approval by the university.
The Rollout and What to Expect

To move a student from "no capstone topic" to "an approved prospectus and committee", a number of differences were found in how programs approached this challenge. Also noted was the fact that some academic programs had already taken some steps that align with the recommendations of the working group. As we work with program leaders this term to roll-out these enhancements to the prospectus, faculty members can expect a few things.

- The premise and prospectus will be word-processing documents, aligned with a template. In this way, giving feedback on student work product will be easier.
- Faculty members have a rubric for use during the prospectus development process.
- The premise and prospectus guides only capture minimal expectations of all doctoral students. Although the prospectus should not become a "proposal-lite", faculty members should continue to use their best judgment in the amount of depth necessary.
- Instead of program-specific prospectuses, starting Spring Quarter, there will be only a Dissertation Prospectus guide on the CRS website.
- Students currently in the prospectus process will be able continue with their prospectus. Unless a student is at the end, we would encourage you to ask them to move to the new one.

Watch for more information on the prospectus rollout-out in the weeks ahead.

Update from the Ph.D. Rubric Revision Committee | by Gary Burkholder

In the early spring, as part of our ongoing efforts toward improving doctoral quality, a subcommittee of research experts representing departments and programs across the university (Lou Milanesi, Center for Research Support; Linda Crawford, Richard W. Riley College of Education and Leadership; John Nirenberg, College of Management; Angela Prehn, College of Health Sciences; and Gary Burkholder, Committee Chair, Center for Research Support, College of Health Sciences, and Richard W. Riley College of Education and Leadership) have been meeting to redesign the current Ph.D. dissertation rubric. We have engaged in a very thorough process of evaluation of the current process and vetting draft materials through the various Ph.D. programs and the Writing Center. The materials have had preliminary review through the Office of Academic Affairs Advisory Council, and a small pilot study on usage in the College of Health Sciences was completed at the end of October 2011.
The Research Curriculum and Academic Policy (RCAP) Committee has approved the materials, which will be used by faculty and students. Some of the key changes:

- A set of more detailed checklists for Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed-Methods studies that will be primarily used by students to guide content of the dissertation and to demonstrate to their committee members where they have met the requirements, as appropriate. These checklists will not be “graded”; students will indicate on them the specific page number where they met the requirement to aid in review by committee members.

- The three committee members (Chair, 2nd member, and University Research Reviewer) will complete a Minimum Standards Checklist. This checklist consists of 9 items that are either present or not present. In order for the dissertation to Pass and move to the next stage, all 9 indicators must be scored as Yes by all members of the committee.

- At the final dissertation only, the members of the committee will complete a rubric to assess dissertation quality on 5 key dimensions and on a 3-point scale (Meets Standards, Above Average, and Outstanding).

We have worked to simplify the process for students and committee members. The materials have received enthusiastic support across a broad range of constituents. Look for more information on this in the next several months; target for launch of the new Ph.D. Dissertation evaluation tools is March 2012.

**Pending Updates to Federal Research Regulations | Leilani Endicott**

Researchers across the U.S. are wondering how the pending changes to research regulations will impact their work. Some of the proposed changes would be particularly significant for social scientists.

In January 2011, a presidential order mandated that each federal agency re-examine its regulatory frameworks. In July, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) entitled *Human Subjects Research Protections: Enhancing Protections for Research Subjects and Reducing Burden, Delay, and Ambiguity for Investigators*. The period for public comment was extended until October 24, and the date of the actual modifications has not yet been publicly announced. A table comparing proposed changes to the current regulations is available on the HHS website, however.

Regardless of when and how the federal regulations are updated, we anticipate that every Walden study will continue to be subject to some sort of ethics review. Efforts are underway to further streamline ethics feedback and review...
processes as well as clarify approval standards. The updates to our university's ethics review system will focus on engaging researchers earlier in the proposal development process (rather than focusing on a “final” review just before data collection), as well as facilitating a rich learning experience that will ensure ethical research implementation (rather than the traditional focus on forms and documentation).

Three New Research Tutorials Available | Daniel Salter

In our August 2011 newsletter, we highlighted two new research tutorials from the Center for Research Support: *Phenomenological Research* and, *Disseminating Your Research*. We are happy to announce the availability of three more, all of which are appropriate for faculty and students who need more information on these topics.

**Case Study Research**

This tutorial outlines the elements of case study research. Emphases include the appropriateness of case study and procedural considerations in conducting case study research.

**Writing for External Grant Support for Your Research**

This tutorial addresses applying for grant funding to support research, including advantages and types of funding, how to determine grant eligibility, and elements of research grant proposals.

**Action Research**

This tutorial defines, describes, and provides examples of action research, including action research design and ways to use data to inform program development and practice.

Please note that other tutorials can be found on the Research Tutorials and Webinars page of the CRS website, including information on Turnitin.com, the Participant Pool, and using the Faculty Expertise Database (FED). If you have any questions, or suggestions for future tutorials that we should consider, please send an email to CRS@waldenu.edu.
Best Practices for Collecting Data on Race, Ethnicity, Sex, Primary Language, and Disability Status | Leilani Endicott

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has recently published its new standards for data collection on race, ethnicity, sex, primary language, and disability status. Although non-funded research is not technically obligated to uphold these standards, all Walden researchers are encouraged to consider implementing these best practices in order to help make their results more interpretable in the broader context of U.S.-based research. This choice will, in turn, positively impact the risk/benefit ratio of most studies.

Take race and ethnicity data collection, for example. HHS’s standard for U.S.-based research is to use the ethnicity and race categories that were used in the 2000 and 2010 census. Guidelines on race and ethnicity data collection include the following:

- Self-identification is the preferred means of obtaining information about an individual’s race and ethnicity, except in instances where observer identification is more practical. The surveyor should not tell an individual who he or she is, or specify how an individual should classify himself or herself.
- To provide flexibility and ensure data quality, separate questions for race and ethnicity should be used wherever feasible. Specifically, when self-reporting or other self-identification approaches are used, ethnicity is asked first, and then race.
- The specified race and ethnicity categories provide a minimum set of categories except when the collection involves a sample of such size that the data on the smaller categories would be unreliable, or when the collection effort focuses on a specific racial or ethnic group.
- The minimum categories for race are: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and White.
- The minimum categories for ethnicity are: Hispanic or Latino and Not Hispanic or Latino.
- When self-reporting or other self-identification approaches are used, respondents who wish to identify their multi-racial heritage may choose more than one race; there should be no “multi-racial” category.
- Additional granularity is encouraged where it is supported by sample size and as long as the additional detail can be aggregated back to the minimum standard set of race and ethnicity categories.

The federal guidelines for sex, primary language, and disability status, as well as further explanation of each standard, can be viewed on the HHS website.
Research Process Advisory Council | Lou Milanesi

As many of you already know, Walden University recently unveiled a new governance model to improve communication and operations within the university. This model sought to better integrate and align information sharing relative to key processes within the university. Chaired by the Director of Research Quality Management, the Research Process Advisory Council (RPAC) provides a university-wide working group to improve the day-to-day operational processes and tools related to research, and primarily with the student research capstone processes. Thus, the RPAC serves to facilitate vertical and horizontal communication to disseminate research related information, solicit input and share best practice among programs and colleges.

This group consists of faculty in positions that deal with the research capstones on a daily basis, are closest to the process and bring the best insights regarding strengths and opportunities for improvement to the discussion. Membership includes faculty serving as program directors, research directors and research coordinators as well as representatives from the Writing Center and other support units. The RPAC e-campus community provides a platform to share documents and extend input on key topics via asynchronous discussion boards. To provide a bridge for relaying research-related topics to and from college leaders, the chair and select members of the RPAC also participate in the Research Curriculum and Academic Policy (RCAP), which will be discussed in the next issue of re:Research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Rea</td>
<td>CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Barkley</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Root</td>
<td>CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Radak</td>
<td>CHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Endres</td>
<td>CMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Jespersen</td>
<td>CMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freda Turner</td>
<td>CMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis (Lou) Milanesi</td>
<td>CRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Ajsenberg</td>
<td>CRS, OSRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Coker</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisha Galaif</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George (Dick) Larkin</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Settles</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Andberg</td>
<td>CSBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Brown</td>
<td>RWRCoEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurt Schoch</td>
<td>RWRCoEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Dawidowicz</td>
<td>RWRCoEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha King</td>
<td>CSS, Writing Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from the Abstract Seminars | by Gary Burkholder

During the summer, the Center for Research Support offered webinars focused on writing good abstracts. I am pleased to say that over 100 faculty members have attended the seminars; satisfaction has been high, and attendees have responded that they found the webinar useful for their work with students.

Writing a good abstract is a key component of a high quality dissertation, doctoral study, or project study. The abstract requires careful attention and thought, as this part may be the only section of the dissertation that will be read by people searching the dissertation abstract database. Therefore, it is very important to help students to convey the nature and key findings of the study in the abstract clearly and concisely. Everyone wants others to read their work; a clearly written abstract will increase the likelihood that the dissertation will be read by others.

We will be offering the abstract webinars again in 2012. However, if you would like to set up a special training session with faculty in your program, please contact me at gary.burkholder@waldenu.edu. I am happy to arrange a training session by program. I have done this for the Public Policy and Administration program, and the session received high attendance.

Abstract rejection at first review still remains high; therefore, I highly encourage you to attend one of our open sessions or to contact your administrators to arrange a training session for your program.

2012 David A. Wilson Award for Teaching & Learning | Molly Lauck

In October 2007, Laureate Education, Inc.'s Chairman and CEO, Douglas Becker, established The David A. Wilson Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in honor of the company's former Board Member, Dr. David Wilson, for his dedicated service to the Laureate network. Since the award's inception, more than 200 professors from 20 Laureate higher education institutions have submitted research proposals for eight research awards totaling $400,000.

Each year, two Laureate faculty members will each receive a $50,000 grant for the research projects proposed in their applications.
This program is open to faculty that have held full-time status for a minimum of two years or taught as part-time faculty for a minimum of three years, and full-time administrators who have also taught for a minimum of two years. Applicants are required to demonstrate a track record/commitment to excellence in teaching and learning, present a compelling research topic on teaching and learning that can be completed within one year of the date of the award, and show outstanding success with students and professional respect of peers.

**Program Timeline**
- **January 10, 2012:** Intent to apply conference call (Noon–1 p.m. Central time.
- **February 13, 2012:** Final date for first time requests for feedback on applications/research proposals.
- **February 20, 2012:** Walden application submission deadline.
- **March 23, 2012:** Walden David A. Wilson Award nominee announced.
- **April 30, 2012:** Award winners selected by Dr. David A. Wilson.
- **June 11, 2012:** Laureate Education Inc. announces the two winners of the David A. Wilson Award for Excellence in Teaching and Learning at the Laureate Leadership Summit.

Additional information, including the 2012 David A. Wilson Award Request For Proposals can be found on the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (OSRP) page of the CRS website. Questions about the David A. Wilson Award should be directed to grants@waldenu.edu.

**Staff Updates**

We are pleased to announce the following staff updates and promotions

**Tony Ajsenberg** has been promoted to Associate Director of the Office of Student Research Support. Since joining CRS in Winter 2010, Tony has built and supervised a strong team for capstone processing and data reporting, and has led efforts to enhance operations and efficiencies in the office. In his new role, he takes on additional responsibilities in coordinating logistics for student-facing initiatives for CRS and OSRS. Tony holds an M.A. in Education from the University of St. Thomas.

**Kristina Harris** has been promoted to Operations Manager for CRS. In this role, she works as the point person for center logistics and events, project management for key initiatives, and coordinating the synthesis and distribution of center metrics. She also works with each office to support streamlining operational efficiency. Kristina joined CRS in Spring 2010 and holds an M.B.A. from University of Dayton.
June and August 2011 RDS Award Recipients

The Research Dissemination Support (RDS) program supports faculty who promote the visibility and scholarly reputation of Walden University through the dissemination of their research and research-related activities. The RDS program offers two types of awards: 1) Presentation RDS – travel support for research and research-related presentations at conferences; and 2) Publication RDS – support for research and research-related publications. For further information about this program, including how to apply, please download the RDS Program Guidelines, which can be found on the Office of Research & Sponsored Programs page of the CRS website.

June and August 2011 RDS recipients’ names appear below in bold-face.

Center for Faculty Excellence.

Yob, I. (2011, April). If we knew what spirituality was, we would teach for it. Paper presented at Research in Music Education international conference, Exeter, UK.

College of Health Sciences

Anderson, E., Anderson, B., & Lee, J. (2011, October). Flexibility, connection, and structure as predictors of online and face-to-face learning preference among nursing and education students. Presentation given at Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education’s E-LEARN 2011 World Conference, Honolulu, HI, USA.


**College of Management and Technology**


**College of Social and Behavioral Sciences**

Bidjerano, M. (2011, September). *The 'political effect' of political ethnography reconsidered: Contributing to a local government election campaign while researching it.* Paper presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA), Seattle, WA, USA.


Hicks, M. W. (2011, March). *Inception through a psychoanalytic lens*. Invited panel discussion given at the annual conference of the Christian Association of Psychological Studies, Indianapolis, IN, USA.


Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Conference, 
Nashville, TN, USA.

**Simpson, L. & Moore, R.** (2011, September). *Counselors as witnesses: 
Implications for counseling supervisors.* Poster presented at the 2011 
ACES conference in Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

**Trippany Simmons, R.,** Rush-Wilson, T., Gaviria, C., Gilliam, B. and Scott, 

**Wilson, D. R.** (2011). Preparing adult survivors of childhood sexual abuse for 

**College of Undergraduate Studies**


**Dawkins, M. A.** (2011, November). *Passing as rhetoric.* Paper presented at the 
annual meeting of the National Communications Studies Association, 
New Orleans, LA, USA.


**The Richard W. Riley College of Education and Leadership**


Dawidowicz, P. (2011, May). *What metasynthesis does and doesn’t reveal about critical thinking instruction in secondary schools.* Poster presented at the Seventh International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, IL, USA.


