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What a year we have had! We are now – thanks to the dedicated work of our students, faculty, and alumni – active participants in the national research conversations on so many fronts. We are impacting how other professionals in our field see and recognize our value as scholars and leaders. All of this is made possible by the extraordinary energy and commitment of so many of you across our vibrant and growing research and scholarship community of practice.

The year ended with a bang for the Research and Scholarship Enterprise as the annual Knowledge Without Boundaries Research Summit showcased its accomplishments and program of work. The purpose of the Research Summit was to provide opportunities that enable University of Phoenix faculty, students, and alumni to showcase their professional research and scholarship achievements, and – through the demonstration of scholarly leadership – engage and improve the performance of the industries, organizations, schools, and communities they serve. By all accounts the Research Summit was a huge success.

If you were among the hundreds of registered participants you had the opportunity to learn about, share your research expertise and experiences, and network within a growing and healthy community of scholarship. The four day virtual event, the first of its kind, showcased the full scope of University of Phoenix’s research and scholarship enterprise. Present at this year’s Research Summit were 172 presenters across five main room addresses, seven concurrent sessions, ten workshops, six Research Center hospitality rooms, and a very important virtual help desk.

We continue to see growth in the production of research. At year’s end we will have significantly outpaced our productivity from last year. As President Cohen noted, University of Phoenix researchers are now producing roughly two presentations per day. Through our research agendas and the accomplishments of faculty, students, and alumni, we are no longer just engaging in the research conversations across our disciplines, we are shaping them.

The dedicated scholarly leaders of the Research and Scholarship Enterprise work hard every day to advance scholarship, address real-world challenges across industries and organizations, and put University of Phoenix scholarship out in front in the academic community, in business and industry, in government, and in local communities across the country.

So how did we do? Did we hit the nail on the head? Did we shoot a hole in one? Did we hit the ball out of the park? I think so. But don’t take my word for it. See for yourself. In this special Phoenix Scholar edition read Erik Bean’s photo story A Bold Initiative: 2018 KWB Virtual Summit Success. We believe you will agree and see via the centerfold detailed photographs of exactly why this effort was heralded by Dean of Research and Scholarship, Mark McCaslin, Ph.D., as a new level of interactive communication and camaraderie. UOPX has again reaffirmed what it does best, delivering meaningful and rigorous high-quality higher education experiences that allow students and faculty to explore their full potential. We are now in lofty thoughts about the potentials of the 2019 KWB Summit. Stay tuned for developments.
The Center for Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Research (Center) serves as a hub for faculty, students, and alumni with expressed interests in topics related to diversity and inclusion within various workforces and areas of practice. As the University Research Chair (URC) of the Center, I often field the question of where this Center fits within the disciplines offered by our University. The response is simple, “diversity is everywhere and inclusionary practices strategies are always needed in all areas of work.” As the field of diversity and inclusion encompasses a broad range of possible topics for research and scholarship development, the Center brings together scholars across various disciplines to support existing research agendas and generate new and innovative ideas for future research initiatives. As such, the Center relies heavily on fellows and volunteers to advance the agenda of the Center. We are proud to highlight individuals in three vital groups operating within the Center: research fellows, writing fellows, and special interest group leaders.

Meet the 2018 CWDIR Research Fellows (in alphabetical order)

Research fellows are vital members of the organization Center. They serve as a leadership role within the Center, assisting with the advancement of the Center’s research agenda and providing support on various projects within the Center. Research fellows not only work to advance their own personal research agenda, they often lead research teams under the research agenda of the Center. Further, they often assist on projects with external stakeholders and provide individualized support and guidance to other members within the Center on scholarship and research projects.

Dr. Donna Smith

Dr. Donna Smith earned her M.A. and Ph.D. degrees as a working adult, and has an affinity for students who must juggle multiple commitments and priorities. She has worked as a college administrator and faculty member for more than fifteen years, and is thankful each day for the opportunity to resolve conflicts and explore student, faculty, and staff issues. Her biggest successes have resulted from helping people by listening, reflecting, and encouraging them to understand potential choices and possible outcomes. Her educational background includes a B.A. with a dual major in mathematics and Spanish (not a native speaker).

After working in the Civil Engineering field, she transitioned to higher education during an economic downturn, and earned an M.A. in Instructional Leadership. Her Ph.D., in the multidisciplinary field of Conflict Resolution and Communication, has prepared her for many interesting endeavors. While working on her doctorate, her local community suffered enormous damage from Hurricane Ivan, prompting her to write her dissertation on the phenomenon of conflict experienced by flood survivors. From her research, she was able to provide assistance and guidance to municipalities, which were later decorated by Hurricane Sandy. She is most comfortable with the qualitative methodologies of phenomenology and case study, and has served as a committee member for quantitative dissertations. Her research interests include conflict analysis and resolution, and the intricacies of remediating conflict. She learns something new from each of her students and has served as a member of the University of Phoenix SAS faculty. As a research fellow, she is currently leading a research team focused on the experiences of transgender individuals in the workplace.

Dr. Rehema Underwood

Dr. Rehema Underwood is an Associate Professor and has been affiliated with the University of Phoenix since 2006. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Psychology from Ithaca College, and Master’s and Doctorate in psychology from Walden University, with an emphasis in Organizational Psychology. Dr. Underwood’s interests involve leadership effectiveness in a workplace, with a special interest in early attachment and its relationship to leadership styles.

Dr. Underwood has been an online facilitator for over 11 years, where she has taught several psychology courses for the University of Phoenix. She currently chairs and serves on multiple committees, with an interest in both qualitative and quantitative research. In her free time, she volunteers her time peer-reviewing for the Journal of Leadership Education (JOLE). Dr. Underwood enjoys a great challenge, and loves to help others achieve their goals. As a research fellow, she is currently leading a research team focused on management views of millennials in multigenerational workplaces.

Meet the 2018 CWDIR Writing Fellows (in alphabetical order)

Writing fellows are individuals who have a desire to advance their individual writing skills, as well as support the Center’s mission and research agenda. Group membership is open to all and consists of faculty, students, alumni, and staff from various schools within the University. The Center for Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Research sponsors activities within the following SIGS:

• Cultural Conflict in the Workplace Research Community (led by Dr. Ray Bynum)
• Special Needs, Abilities, and Workplace Inclusion Research Group (led by Dr. Alana Lyles)
• Spirituality in the Workplace Research Group (led by Dr. Marcye Nazon)
• Gender and Gender Identity Research Group (led by Dr. Donna Smith)

This collection of dynamic faculty continues to advance additional conversations and provide direction and leadership to others within their areas of focus. Their persistent efforts have resulted in various publication and presentations on a wide array of topics.

Continuous teamwork creates the “family” atmosphere within the Center for Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Research. I appreciate each member within these important positions for their continued service as we continue to advance the center. For more information about the Center or to learn more about these dynamic members, please visit the Center for Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Research webpage (http://www.phoenix.edu) or email the Center at workplacediversity@phoenix.edu.

Stemming from candid conversations with Center members, in 2017, the Center launched the first writing-focused fellowships. Writing fellows are individuals who have a desire to advance their individual writing skills, as well as support the Center through various writing projects. Fellowships are designed through a careful balance of creating advancement within individual writing projects and developing projects that benefit and advance the mission of the Center. Writing fellows explore various options leading to publications, such as developing publications from a dissertation, furthering existing scholarship, creating blogs for the Center, and writing test and blogs for the Center’s webpage.

Dr. James Ashton

Dr. James Ashton graduated from Florida A&M University with a B.S. in Business Administration along with his M.B.A. with a Human Resources con-
A new Blended Teaching Workshop has been developed by the CEITR Team to train faculty members and staff at the College of Education to further integrate synchronous communications into asynchronous courses. The workshop has been developed as a result of collaboration between Dr. Jonathan Lewis, Dean of College of Education, and Dr. Mark McCaslin, Dean of Research and Scholarship in the Office of Scholarship Support, and Dr. Mansureh Kebritchi, Chair of CEITR in SAS. Two CEITR fellows, Dr. David Proudfoot and Dr. Medgar Roberts have greatly assisted in developing and delivering the workshop.

The purpose of the workshop is to help the participants learn about available synchronous communication tools and develop skills for preparing synchronous learning experiences to increase students’ engagement and learning. Integration of synchronous communication into asynchronous courses enhances students’ engagement, increases instructors’ social and teaching presence, and promotes quality of instructors’ feedbacks. All these advancements improve student learning and success. Additionally, synchronous communication allows students to practice real time presentations and team collaboration process that are essential skills for their professional success.

However, integrating online asynchronous learning experiences into synchronous learning experiences can be challenging. Decisions such as how and when to use synchronous tools and strategies are difficult to make for many faculty members. Additionally, some of the faculty members are not familiar with the available synchronous tools. The workshop has been developed to address these difficulties and enhance faculty members’ skills and understanding of further integrating synchronous communication tools into asynchronous online courses. The learning objectives of the workshop are to:

- Explore available tools for synchronous communication;
- Discuss synchronous pedagogical approaches, applications, and instructional materials;
- Discuss strategies and rules for effectively using synchronous communications;
- Develop a plan for integrating synchronous communication into the asynchronous courses.

The Workshop Overview and Format

The workshop has been housed at Special Interest Group for Engaged Learning at Research Hub (http://bit.ly/2nl2EFV) and has a blended mode of integrating synchronous and asynchronous communications. It consists of activities over three days. On Day 1, the participants prepare themselves by reviewing instructional materials, articles, the conceptual framework, and recorded videos for using synchronous tools provided at the SIG site. On Day 2, the participants attend a synchronous webinar offered via Skype for Business. During the webinar the workshop team discuss synchronous communication benefits, tools, pedagogical approaches and applications, effective strategies, and instructional materials. Additionally, the participants will have the opportunity to engage in a live synchronous discussion and gain a better understanding about involvement in synchronous sessions. On Day 3, the participants complete and submit their implementation plans for integrating synchronous tools and surveys, and reflecting on their learning experiences at the workshop. Implementation plans play a major role in guiding the participants to apply what they learn in the workshop in their future courses. Template for the implementation plan is provided. The participants describe their selected synchronous tools, strategies, and pedagogies to be used in their online courses. They also share their course descriptions and challenges for using synchronous communications.

The workshop team reviews the participants’ plans and provide them with feedback and support to better integrate synchronous communications. The team continues instructional support for the workshop participants even after completing the workshop. The workshop is the beginning of collaboration with the participants. During the three day workshop, participants post their questions and concerns into an asynchronous discussion forum at the SIG site. They are encouraged to continue their discussion via the forum. The certificate of completion will be provided to the participants upon completion of the workshop. The participants receive scholarship engagement credits by completing the workshop.

The Workshop Attendances and Requirements

Faculty members who teach asynchronous online courses, staff who govern faculty members, instructional designers, and lead faculty area chairs may greatly benefit attending the workshop. The workshop is appropriate for the participants at beginner and intermediate level of integrating synchronous tools and strategies into online asynchronous courses. The workshop will require approximately four hours of work, including reading research-based articles, viewing presentations, attending the webinar, and submitting the assignments.

The Workshop Schedule and Further Details

The workshop is offered once a month. It was offered for the first time to College of Education administrators, lead faculty members, and instructors on July 2018. Many positive comments have been received about the first workshop. The participants were excited about enhancing their knowledge of synchronous communication applications and tools, and develop...
Scholarship Challenge and the Detroit Action Research Project
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Every challenge presents an opportunity. There are times that we set challenges individually and there are times when challenges are set for us. For many practitioners, scholarship had not been a responsibility in their businesses or for University of Phoenix (UOPX) teaching assignments. Recently, new challenges for scholarship have been set for faculty. To put it simply, to continue teaching for the UOPX, faculty must be engaged in scholarship activities.

The question may be “why is scholarship now a requirement to teach?” There are two answers to this question. The first is because it makes practical sense. We now live in a knowledge driven world and teaching responsibilities have evolved to include scholarship and research. Students at the undergraduate and graduate levels are experiencing more research in their college curricula. Every challenge presents an opportunity. The second reason for this shift is the credibility requirement in our regulatory environment. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC, 2013) has expanded criteria for faculty engagement and students’ engagement in intellectual inquiry (HLC 2013, 3:6). Responding to this scholarship challenge, leadership at the UOPX Detroit Campus created an action research project to change the culture of the scholarship at the local campus.

According to McCaslin (2016), goals for action research include: problem solving, collaboration, professional development, and enhanced professional practice. Drawing on this guidance, the Detroit Community of Scholars Action Research Project was launched in a presentation in November 2016 to a group of Detroit faculty members with specific goals that included: to encourage and support faculty scholarship engagement, to identify opportunities for faculty research collaborations, to provide faculty professional development, and to enhance faculty professional practice.

The following commentary summarizes the outcomes of the Detroit Community of Scholars Action Research Project. We are providing others with the processes, learnings, and outcomes of this initiative.

Step One, approvals. Any research project concerning University students, staff, or faculty, requires approval from the Committee on Research (COR), and all research needs approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The approval process started in March of 2016 and expanded over three months. What was learned was also shared with the Community of Scholars (COS) members – follow the COR and IRB guidelines to the letter.

Step Two, ask for input from others. Prior to launching the project, we applied and were accepted for a round-table presentation at the Association of Leadership Educators annual conference. This was our first conference experience, outside of UOPX, related to this research project. We shared the concept with attendees from other colleges and universities and asked for their input. Feedback was positive and piqued the interest of other college leaders.

Step Three, get faculty buy-in. We invited the faculty to a meeting in November 2016 to explore their interest in joining the Community of Scholars. Our special guest was Dr. Mark McCaslin (Dean of Research and Scholarship), who spoke on action research. We presented the research plan, collected consent forms, and collected information concerning faculty research and scholarship interests. With that information we identified training needs and potential research collaboration opportunities. The Detroit Community of Scholars Action Research Project was launched.

Step Four, find engagement opportunities. Boyer’s Model for Scholarship (1990) provided the theoretical grounding for the study and Elliott’s Model for Action Research (2010) provided the design framework for the study. Action research is highly participatory so we identified opportunities for Community of Scholars (COS) engagement. We had a Knowledge without Boundaries Academy local campus event scheduled in February 2017, and a General Faculty meeting scheduled in April 2017.

Step Five, keep it going. We decided that a quarterly COS engagement meeting would be the appropriate cadence, so we scheduled quarterly meetings in June 2017 and in September 2017. Also, we expanded the Community of Scholars to include School of Advanced Studies (SAS) students, alumni, and faculty.

Step Six, get some help. We created positions within the COS. A Research Liaison, a Communication Liaison, and SAS Alumni Mentor. The Research Liaison had the responsibility of helping faculty to develop research proposals. The Communications Liaison provided content for our campus-based research page. The SAS Alumni Mentor supported doctoral students.

Step Seven, find Subject Matter Experts. We called on associated research chairs and dissertation chairs to facilitate workshops for our June and September meetings. Dr. Erik Bean and Dr. Laura Migliore (both living in Michigan) graciously facilitated workshops for us.

Step Eight, tell others What We Were Doing. We applied and were accepted for the Total Quality Review Conference in January 2017. The Association of Leadership Educators (ALE) Women in Leadership Conference in June 2017, the Knowledge without Boundaries Academy (KWBA) Conference in August 2017, and the ALE Brussels Belgium Conference in October 2017. We also received notice from the Journal of Leadership Educators in September 2017 that an article based on our project will be published in an upcoming edition.

Step Nine, end the One-year Research Project. A mini KWBA Conference in December 2017 served as the official end of the action research project. Awards and recognitions were presented to our Community of Scholars.

Step Ten, write a book and share the Community of Scholars stories. The following profiles are examples of these stories.

Profile One: Not a Sprint but a Marathon – Dr. Patricia Munson’s Story

Munson’s story concerns a seven-year journey to earn a doctoral degree. Her story – not a sprint but a marathon – is not intended to discourage anyone from this meaningful pursuit, but to share the experiences encountered on the journey so that others who desire to pursue a doctoral degree will have greater insight and understanding of the process. She offers her perspective on the journey and advice for others who desire to pursue a doctoral degree.

As she traveled the road of a doctoral researcher, she not only learned new research skills, but learned more about tenacity, perseverance, and humility – the other skills needed to survive the journey. Her story culminated in June 2018 when she was hooded on the stage of Fox Theatre in Detroit, Michigan.

Profile Two: Student End of Course Surveys, A Need for Relevancy – Robert Sparks’ and Dr. Hildegard Selig’s Story

This story involves two UOPX instructors – one an online business school instructor with an urgent research need and another a local Detroit Campus science instructor and seasoned researcher looking for a collaborative project. A Detroit Community of Scholars event made this partnership happen. A successful action research project with opportunities to expand it in the future.

According to Sparks, “we received an invitation from a Detroit Community of Scholars event made this partnership happen. A successful action research project with opportunities to expand it in the future.”

Conclusion

Yes, every challenge does presents an opportunity. The opportunity found through our Community of Scholars Action Research project was that research and scholarship increases academic engagement, for faculty, that extends beyond the classroom. Engaging in research or scholarly activities also provides professional development which expands the professional identities of our industry practitioners. Our message to practitioners faculty, facing this new requirement to engage in research or scholarship, is to join any of the communities of scholarship found at local campuses or on the research hub. It’s a great starting point!
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Doctoral Program Innovations: Remaking the Traditional Dissertation
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Introduction
Unlike in Europe, early American higher education focused on undergraduate education, and did not offer graduate degrees with seriousness until the late 19th century (Archbald, 2011). The first doctorate was awarded in the United States in 1861 at Yale. But by 1990, doctoral programs in America had developed in both private and public institutions (Storr, 1953). The growth in the number of doctoral degrees granted in the United States reached 40,000 annually at the beginning of the 21st century (Golde & Walker, 2006). The traditional structure requiring full-time matriculation, two to three years of coursework, and several years writing a dissertation remains little changed since its inception. Does the doctrine and outdated dissertation still meet the needs of students and the disciplines they enter into?

Pressure to Change the Doctoral Degree
Many scholars and organizations commented with increasing fervor throughout the 20th century on problems in the doctoral program, and the dissertation requirement (Cude, 2001). For instance, a study by the The Pew Charitable Trusts (Golde & Dore, 2001) found: “the training doctoral students receive is not what they want, nor does it prepare them for the jobs they take.” Across disciplines there have been active discussions about needed changes. One of the most significant documents urging changes in doctoral programs came from the Modern Language Association (Association, 2014). In the light of persistent criticism from within the academy and from a larger public, the authors argued that doctoral programs need re-formulation to meet challenges including a median time to degree of around nine years for language and literature doctoral recipients and a job market that does not have sufficient tenure-track employment for all doctorate recipients.

The Professional Doctoral Degree and Alternatives to the Traditional Dissertation
Airing out of this ongoing criticism of the traditional doctoral degree, scholars have observed the international trend to create what are variously called professional doctorates, applied doctorates, practitioner doctorates, or clinical doctorates in various disciplines (Storey 2016). The Council of Graduate Schools (2007) identified three core characteristics of the professional doctoral degree: a focus on area of professional practice not met by other degrees, an emphasis on applied research, and including leaders of the profession who drive development of practices and standards.

A central part of the argument for changes in the doctoral degree often has to do with criticisms of the traditional dissertation as a capstone requirement. Watson and Nehis (2016) observed that very few doctoral graduates publish whole or even part of their dissertations. The authors argue that the dissertation project rarely leads to dissemination of work, and the project fails to prepare candidates for the type of writing and research that they will be engaged in subsequent careers. To help counter this reality, options recommended by these authors include the multiple paper format, which has received some support from professionals. Watson and Nehis (2016) argued for three quality principles in dissertation alternatives: that they address critical problems of practice, demonstrate rigorous research skills, and show proof of the impact of the research. American regional accrediting agencies generally have stayed away from direct guidance on professional doctoral degrees. Although there are differences among the six regional agencies who evaluate doctoral degree granting institutions, the typical focus during the review process is on the institutional level, avoiding specific proscriptions in terms of pedagogical issues. However, The Higher Learning Commission North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in 2006 formed a task force on professional doctoral degrees and published an important report (The Higher Learning Commission North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, 2006). The Commission noted that it tends to rely on its familiarity with institutional contexts in which research doctorates are delivered, and that this approach does not work very well for professional doctoral degree programs. The recommendations of the Task Force were organized into three overarching issues: institutional context, program content, and shared quality assurance. Furthermore, the authors of the report pointed out that in 2006 professional associations were thus far not providing consistent standards for quality assurance of professional degrees that accrediting agencies could turn to for reference.

Conclusion
Accrediting agencies for the most part appear cautious in changing on the policy level how alternatives to the traditional doctoral degree and alternatives to the dissertation might be evaluated in the institutional review process. Yet there is a need for explicit criteria for standards for professional doctoral degrees and dissertation alternatives. It is clear that there is wisdom in the Council of Graduate School’s recommendation that leadership on developing standards for alternatives to the dissertation need to come from specific institutional academic colleges and deans. Furthermore, as the Higher Learning Commission suggests, the role of professional associations could be important by providing consistent standards for quality assurance of professional degrees, and alternatives to the dissertation in specific disciplines.

Further research on this emerging practice is especially needed in terms of outcomes and effectiveness. Are alternatives to the dissertation in fact more effective in meeting desired degree outcomes, and the subsequent career objectives of graduates? Some options offered, such as a series of published papers, may inadvertently add unnecessary complexity and time to degree for the students. While there is certainly a history of success in the performance of professional doctoral degree programs, the benefits of alternatives to the dissertation in the traditional research doctorate have not yet been well documented.
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Distinguished Devnew Launches Successful JLS Symposium
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Dr. Lynne E. Devnew, senior fellow, Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research has recently made extraordinary contributions as an expert in her field of study, collaborating with other professionals, and publishing works that expand the body of knowledge as an expert. Dr. Devnew initiated, planned, and coordinated the Symposium on Leadership Studies. Devnew also co-authored the introductory article to the symposium with Julia Storberg-Walker, entitled: "Women in Leadership: How Do Differences Matter?" Three assertions from the Asilomar Declaration, initially published in 2013 and updated in 2017 (International Leadership Association, 2015) were the impetus for the Symposium on Leadership Studies. The assertions focused on: the value of the diversity of women and women's perspectives, the importance of sensitivity to cultural contexts, and that appropriate leadership should be defined rather than gender-defined (Devnew & Storberg-Walker, 2018).

Other notables include being awarded a Distinguished Research Fellow (2017) in the School of Advanced Studies (SAS). She also serves as an SAS associate faculty and as Chair of the Women and Leadership Research Group here at the University of Phoenix. Prior to joining the University of Phoenix, Dr. Devnew worked for IBM as a senior middle manager. She attended Boston University, Columbia University, and Simmons University.

Major Contributions & Honors
- Dr. Devnew will be co-chairing the next ILA Women and Leadership Conference in June 2019 with Ann Berghout Austin from Utah State University. Dr. Austin is also on her research team. (http://bit.ly/2AV2W6g)
- Dr. Devnew was named Distinguished Faculty Member, School of Advanced Studies in the Annual Academic Report, 2015.
- Dr. Devnew was the first recipient of the Distinguished Service Award for Scholarly Leadership in 2017.
- Dr. Devnew will be making three presentations at the upcoming ILA Global Conference in West Palm Beach, in October 2018.
- Dr. Devnew - A Body of Work
A review of Dr. Devnew's ongoing contributions to the field of study reveals a substantial body of work that is shaping the current thought process and theories associated with women's leadership and leader identity. Dr. Devnew's doctoral studies focused on the strategic responsibilities of leaders. In 2014, Dr. Devnew's research team was formed at an academic colloquium on advancing theories of women and leadership. Dr. Devnew's team has since presented at the ILA global conferences in San Diego, Barcelona, Atlanta, and Brussels. Dr. Devnew and her team are also scheduled to present in October 2018 at the ILA global conference in West Palm Beach. Dr. Devnew was program chair in 2017 at the ILA Women and Leadership Conference, and thus responsible for the call for proposals and review process and will co-chair the next conference in 2019.

Years ago, the idea for developing a symposium for the Journal of Leadership Studies (JLS) on women in leadership emerged in a conversation with Hinrich Eyleys, SAS Executive Dean and the Editor-in-Chief of JLS. In the Spring of 2017, Dr. Devnew was part of the Executive Leadership Team (ELT) for the Women and Leadership Affinity Group (WLAG) of the ILA and its research team. Dr. Devnew suggested pursuing the symposium opportunity and thus Dr. Storberg-Walker (a very experienced researcher from the George Washington University) agreed to be the co-chair for the symposium. The results of the collaboration produced the symposium, which is the focus of the article entitled, "Women in Leadership: How Do Differences Matter?"

It was an audacious initiative. It led to a collaborative effort the likes of which University of Phoenix stakeholders have never partaken in before. Where many institutions have tried a virtual conference, little celebrated success is known – until now. Within the Shindig advanced knowledge sharing platform, nearly 100 of the more than 400 registered attendees simultaneously logged onto the opening plenary Tuesday, August 14 at 9 a.m. Arizona time. That endeavor, dubbed the 2018 Knowledge Without Boundaries (KWB) Summit (http://bit.ly/2Nq4cF7) heralded by Dean of Research and Scholarship Dr. Mark McCalin (http://bit.ly/2ppPKR3) as a new level of interactive communication and camaraderie. He enthusiastically welcomed the attendees – mostly within the contiguous states, but others internationally – an eager mix of School of Advanced Studies doctoral students, faculty, chairs, and other UOPX stakeholders at all degree levels.

A pre-recorded video of UOPX President Peter Cohen awaited the attendees. Cohen hailed the effort and was followed by a live appearance of Provost Dr. John Woods who praised the Office of Scholarship Support (OSS) and the Research Hub administrators for their timeliness and execution of the four-day event. Vice Provost and Executive Dean Hinrich Dr. Eyleys, Ph.D., also hosted play to an attentive audience of subject matter expertise and scholarly presentations. However, most serviceable to the many Hub research affiliates was a review, Reflections of Methodologist on an Innovative Practice – held by Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research (CLSER; http://bit.ly/2s8ZC24) Associate University Research Chair Erin Rominger, Kebrich, and others from the Research Methodological Group (http://bit.ly/2bT59XX) – whose purpose is to help School of Advanced Studies (SAS) doctoral students and other stakeholders understand the various research practices to uphold their rigor. According to the Hub site, Research Methodology Special Interest Group (RM SIG) is a cross disciplinary community consists of committee of methodologists and members who are experts and interested in social science research methods and designs. A list of the remaining Methodological Group 2018 Webinars is available at the end of this Phoenix Scholar edition.

Rominger, Kebrich, and McCalin also presented Student Success in Online Practitioner Doctoral Programs, a reflection of the rigor and attentiveness needed to retain doctoral students. Kebrich, Rominger, and Liz Johnston (http://bit.ly/2wqRxgu) hosted Exploring Special Interest Groups (SIG), a panel discussion with several SIG leaders who support professional development in a number of subject matter expertise and scholarly leadership. The latter offering occurred on Day 4 during the afternoon workshop welcoming plenary and another nine for a late morning session and early workshop series with a fourth breakout room, as well as open hospitality center hours. Traffic meandered in and out of sessions and allowed for many networking opportunities listening to podium speakers or attending to another attendee for private video conversations.

There is not enough space to pay tribute to the quality and rigor of the numerous scholarly presentations. However, most serviceable to the many Hub research affiliates was a review, Reflections of Methodologist on an Innovative Practice – held by Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research (CLSER; http://bit.ly/2s8ZC24) Associate University Research Chair Erin Rominger, Kebrich, and others from the Research Methodological Group (http://bit.ly/2bT59XX) – whose purpose is to help School of Advanced Studies (SAS) doctoral students and other stakeholders understand the various research practices to uphold their rigor. According to the Hub site, Research Methodology Special Interest Group (RM SIG) is a cross disciplinary community consists of committee of methodologists and members who are experts and interested in social science research methods and designs. A list of the remaining Methodological Group 2018 Webinars is available at the end of this Phoenix Scholar edition.

Rominger, Kebrich, and McCalin also presented Student Success in Online Practitioner Doctoral Programs, a reflection of the rigor and attentiveness needed to retain doctoral students. Kebrich, Rominger, and Liz Johnston (http://bit.ly/2wqRxgu) hosted Exploring Special Interest Groups (SIG), a panel discussion with several SIG leaders who support professional development in a number of subject matter expertise and scholarly leadership. The latter offering occurred on Day 4 during the afternoon workshop.
KWB Virtual Summit

Faculty of the Year Award Winners

Dr. Sandra Nunn (to the right) speaking on behalf of Kristine Maze who was not present to receive her award.

Dr. Kelly Rhodes, to the right.

Dr. Scott Drexler, to the right.

Dr. Kevin Bottomley, upper left.

Dr. LauraAnn Migliore, upper left.

Dr. Liz Johnston, upper left.

Dr. James Lane, to the right.
sessions that also included a dial-a-look of Healthy Leadership presented by McCaslin and Cardwell and finally a long-awaited Professional Engagement to Publication (PEP) workshop conducted by Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research (CLEAR) website platform with three presentations that also included a dialog on the collaborative nature of UOPX.
Preparing a presentation for an academic conference can be a daunting endeavor, but the good news is you do not have to do it alone. As a special interest group (SIG) within the Center for Workplace Diversity and Inclusion Research, we at the Cultural Conflict SIG have discovered that working as a research team is beneficial in both the generation of scholarship and presenting this scholarship through various academic venues.

1) Ask for Help
Research and scholarship does not have to be a daunting task that occurs within a vacuum. We strongly encourage individuals with an idea to find like-minded individuals to develop projects and present at conferences. These hashtags are searchable in LinkedIn.

2) Share Responsibilities
While you may have been quite comfortable with writing up the conference presentation proposal, you may need some help with other aspects of the actual presentation, such as creating a poster, a PowerPoint presentation, or handouts for the audience. For example, some of the logistical considerations for a poster might include what to include on the poster, the cost of producing the poster, and the size of the poster. A PowerPoint presentation requires collective thought about the intended audience, the number of slides, transitions, and graphics. Another consideration is the technical knowledge needed to develop the presentation. There are times when faulty equipment or not understanding the parameters of the available equipment can create multiple issues.
As attending conferences can be expensive and difficult for some team members to schedule, there are different ways team members can participate. Some members may work data collection and identifying information relevant for the presentation. Others may develop visual graphics and create the PowerPoint presentation. Finally, those attending the conference present the collective work of the team within the presentation. It is a team effort!

3) Editing is a Shared Task

Having a properly edited paper and/or presentation is a necessary task within conference presenting. In our team, editing and proofreading is a task shared by all. There can never be too many eyes when it comes to creating sharable works for a presentation. There is nothing worse than being prepared to present in front of an audience and your work is not presentable.

I will never forget uploading my presentation on the large screens five minutes before the start of a conference and noticing an error. I must have read and practiced my presentation over and over again. So much until I didn’t notice my own mistake, until I saw it on the large screens minutes before I was to present.

4) Visit Your Assigned Location Ahead of Time

If possible, a good practice is to view your assigned presentation location ahead of time. Although often times, the room is fine for our presentations, we have also had instances where we have needed to make some type of adjustment or request to change something aspect of the presentation space. For instance, there may be an instance where the heat or air conditioning is not properly working. Or, the necessary equipment may not be available. In any case, it is always better to be prepared and have the ability to anticipate and correct possible issues ahead of time. Conference staff are often happy to assist presenters with alleviating issues, as a good presentation is also a positive reflection on the organization hosting the conference.

At my last conference, I was using a brand new MacBook for my presentation. Luckily, I went to my room beforehand, as I found out that there was not an adaptor for the MacBook so I could hook up to the projector. I contacted a staff member and, luckily, she was a MacBook user and let me borrow her adaptor!

5) Identify Your Intended Audience Ahead of Time

As a team, we work to ensure our presentations are developed with the intended audience in mind. Whether academic-based or practitioner-based in nature, we ensure the research or scholarship project is presented conceptually in a way it is easily relatable with our audience.

A good way to make a presentation attractive to the anticipated audience is to think about the backgrounds of the likely attendees. If this academic conference, we emphasize the supporting research designs and results by connecting the study to the field. If the focus of the conference is more practitioner-focused, we emphasize the practical application of data provided within our presentation.

I was asked to give a presentation to a group of youth and young adults. Although I was discouraged about the numbers when I arrived, I decided to focus on the quality of the presentation and provide them with useful and relevant information to use in the future. Before I arrived home, I received phone calls from people who said they saw my speech streaming live online and felt my presentation would assist them. One of the participants in the audience was recording directly to their personal page online. Before the end, my short speech the video had more views than those physically in attendance.

6) Always Have a Plan B

Technology is beautiful, when it works. Backup plans allow individual and team presentations to have fluidity no matter what happens. While planning for an effective presentation it is helpful to walk through what could go wrong. Backup plans may include the following:

• Emailing the presentation to the conference host (if appropriate) and or media department for the event;
• Cross-training of information just in case a team member is unable to present;
• Making copies of the full presentation or manuscript prior to the conference (it may be considered “old school” but copies still exist); and
• Arrive early to the location and see how the audio / visual systems are working for other presenters. If you are first, then arrive early to work out any kinks for yourself or your team.

If the control codes or setup is unique, it can be helpful to write down the special instructions needed to get the presentation up and running when the session begins. This can be a particularly important step if the presentation involves active connection to the internet or will allow access to some recorded content. You cannot anticipate every challenge within a presentation, but it helps to proactively address as many possible scenarios beforehand.

One time, a team member’s luggage was lost, which also contained a USB with the presentation. Plan B was to pull the materials from the shared Google drive, but the file formats weren’t compatible with what was available at the conference. Plan C was to wing it (which we did) and things went (sort of) well. Now, make sure that there are many avenues to access a presentation, if needed.

As we move forward in our research and scholarship endeavors, we still often reflect on these recommendations as guidance for our team. We recognize the rewards that come from working collectively on issues we see as valuable within our fields of practice. Presenting at conferences, as a team, creates a situation where it is easier to anticipate and address challenges that might arise at a presentation. In doing so, this allows for many continued success as a research team.

Dr. Michael MacDonald, SAS Alum, Striving to Make a Permanent Political Mark: An Interview with Erik Bean and Rodney Luster

VITAL STATS
Name: Michael MacDonald
Occupation: Personal Trainer and Politician
Graduated: DHA, 2015

Photo of Lauraanne MacDonald and Michael MacDonald. Lauraanne MacDonald is a figure skater and chef. They live with their rescue dog a Lhasa Apso Gizmo nicknamed Lord Gizmo.

Erik Bean:
Hello Michael or I should say Dr. MacDonald. Phoenix Scholar readers will want to first know what career decisions led you to pursuing a degree at University of Phoenix (UOPX) School of Advanced Studies (SAS)?

Dr. MacDonald:
My earliest collegiate experiences included earning a bachelor’s in exercise science. I had always had an adoration for health care. I wanted to be an exercise physiologist and did so for several years at Henry Ford Health System in the Detroit area. I was also a personal trainer. At some point I wanted to enter hospital administration, so I did an MBA and because of that I was actually interviewed by Johns Hopkins for a fellowship opportunity. It was highly competitive, and while an MBA is highly competitive, it was as a broad-brush degree. After I obtained my MBA, I decided to search for a specific degree representing my advanced administrative skills in healthcare. I read about the SAS Doctorate in Healthcare Administration (DHA). The program was rigorous and took a bit longer to complete than originally expected. The commitment was well worth it. Today, I enjoy giving back and helping mentor other SAS students.

Erik Bean:
What years did you study here at SAS?

Dr. MacDonald:
To be exact, 2009 to 2015.

Erik Bean:
Please share with our readers the topic of your dissertation and how you felt it as perhaps in your career endeavors?

Dr. MacDonald:
So, I think one of the insightful experiences in retrospect is what I learned during my second-year residency. Never attempt to engage a dissertation if it isn’t a topic that you’re absolutely passionate about. But once I settled into my dissertation topic, I drew from my experiences as a personal trainer. Something peaked my interest and passion. There had been a group during that time in my life that I really didn’t seem to able to make any progress with as a trainer, and this target group was adult women between the ages of 20 and 40 that had been obese their whole life. I never was able to really make any headway with them and before that I had been able to always make progress with various diverse populations from who I trained and most progressed. But this particular segment was tough. I had made little progress to motivate them, for example. So, I decided to explore this phenomenon via a qualitative phenomenological dissertation study. However, instead of interviewing women who were primarily obese, I actually found women who not only fit the demographic but who also possessed a cognitive understanding (awareness) by health measures, whom were categorized obese not just episodically, but for pretty much their entire life, yet could otherwise become fit. They had found a way to control their weight that I could not breach as a trainer with such a group. In fact, for me, it was very, very difficult to find these women. I had a partnership with the Detroit YMCA, which is where the search began. I think there were about 12 satellite sites and I was able to recruit out of those and was fortunate enough to find enough subjects who fit this profile to satisfy the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). When I had interviewed the women, there were some interesting indicators or emotional facets that began to emerge. The interviews all went about an hour so I had time to get to know each subject a bit and what was interesting is that all the women I interviewed had, at some point, cried during the interview. You could see the psychological affect. So, I began to see there was a whole lot more psychologically going on internal- ly with each of these women in their desire to achieve fitness, more than just the physiological. And what I found within the study was there were three components to this lynchpin that helped them get there.

One, it took some kind of negative trigger, some kind of extreme negative trigger such as a health scare. Two, it took prolonged positive motivators to overcome the profound former experiences of rel-
icule or self-image to launch the person even further into achieving their goal. Three, a binding agent such as smaller incentives or the personal example of the person themselves can lead to the achievement of goals.

Erik Bean:
Being comfortable using search tools like the Ellen B. Stephenson Company database (http://www.eproquest.com) and Dissertations, Theses, and Economic Review, is the hallmark of most doctoral degree pursuits, but was one more beneficial than another?

Dr. MacDonald:
You’re bringing me back (laughing), yes! All of these were an integral part of my search journey, but I probably spent more time using ProQuest.

Erik Bean:
Now that you have been a doctoral alumnus for three years now, what’s next?

Dr. MacDonald:
Getting my dissertation published is a priority and I look forward to tapping into the money available on the UOPX Research Hub. But I have been working on political and other community efforts. For example, I was recently named the Vice President of the Michigan Air Force Association. The organization is comprised of thousands of veterans without the Air Force. They are tied to a Washington, D.C. think tank called the Mitchell Institute. If you’re a congressman or a U.S. senator, you want any information on the Air Force to help build your platform, then they do. You do, the pursuit of my degree and the information I have access to is important. I have spoken with way more people than I can currently talk about without the military. So, in response to your question, this post-doctoral work is one aspect of my development, the other is running for and wanting to be a congressman because the United States has come a long way since the 1980s on the war on drugs. Its kind of similar with the military, but I also know that business takes advantage of things like this and can turn it in a positive way.

Rodney Luster:
I think it’s applicable to almost any area, certainly government. During my oral defense, my committee members happened to mention it was almost applicable for my own study in terms of my pregnancy and activities of the military. They said it got better gradually as I got further in education. They were actually the lowest in grade school, and then the highest in my doctoral degree. I share with people that it was during my third year residency I decided to run for office. I was told by one of my colleagues and in my UOPX residency that if you want to help change in the world, be a congressman because they pushed legislation. The seed was planted so the potentials to effect healthcare through an appeal to me.

Erik Bean:
Sounds like you would agree this to be known as healthy self-leadership?

Dr. MacDonald:
It does. Going back to those interviews and the fear these subjects typically engaged denial possibilities. However, what I recall is that one subject described that “bridge” that the fear as negative energy dissipated quickly. It was then that “push” in the bird out of nest. Any one of these subjects, and I think some of the positive elements that kept them focused, and once a positive milestone was achieved, they were able to see a good feeling, and they didn’t want to compromise it by going backward. There was one subject that was an elite athlete and they were talking about how they were feeling after such achievements and how they were not willing to go back. So, for these subjects, that initial positive milestone became the great kick starter.

Rodney Luster:
Sounds like the majority of your researched subjects didn’t want to relinquish.

Dr. MacDonald:
Negative energy can actually converse, very direct, and once a positive milestone is achieved that represented a positive state, and we get caught up in the byproduct. We have spent billions of dollars since the 1980s and we still do today use drugs they did ever in the 1980s. More people are working in the healthcare industry. I think healthcare and how we live our lives is so important because we feel like we have control of our destiny and maybe health care could be the health care that may surprise our readers regarding U.S. healthcare perspectives? What are your other thoughts on this that may surprise our readers regarding U.S. healthcare perspectives? What are your other thoughts on this? Dr. MacDonald:
I think if there is something that stands out is that there’s an unbelievable inefficiency operating within healthcare. There’s not much of a quantification of the charging for services. We are seeing an increased focus on preventative care coming from the sciences. For instance, the money spent on heart disease could be putting you just getting to people a little earlier and educating them with something like the research that you’re discussing. I think it’s an issue in the pricing mechanism. Not just that though, I mean, there’s so many preventable issues. More money seems to be tossed around within healthcare without perhaps a full regard to the potentials for preventative measures. I think that’s what I see. However, that is my biggest insight and it may seem simple, but it is simple, and it is the main thrust of possibilities with in the healthcare industry.

Rodney Luster:
Agreed Michael. When I think about this aspect, I also look at how we have evolved in the United States. I read the other day that the country is “over fat” as we have access to so many conveniences now. Do you think is happening?

Dr. MacDonald:
It’s correlated to the war on drugs in a way that there’s always this idea that we’re never going to solve this war on drugs and we get caught up in the byproduct. We have spent billions of dollars since the 1980s and we still do today use drugs they did ever in the 1980s. More people are working in the healthcare industry. I think healthcare and how we live our lives is so important because we feel like we have control of our destiny and maybe health care could be the health care that may surprise our readers regarding U.S. healthcare perspectives? What are your other thoughts on this?
Sounds like people look for the Magic Bullet.

Dr. MacDonald:
That’s a great way to say it, they’re looking for the magic pill, a panacea. And inevitably, I don’t think anything is necessarily wrong with the pill, but the pill — coupled with other regimens — is potentially better than just the pill by itself.

Erik Bean:
The clock is winding down Michael would you please share your personal daily healthcare regimen?

Dr. MacDonald:
I never miss a cardio day in the morning as my cardio tends to be actually somewhat mid-range intensity and somewhat high intensity. I’m kind of tall and lean so I don’t have to go as hard as I did a long time ago but you look anything like you. So, I just make sure I hit my cardio real hard in the morning and do a little bit of resistance training and I’m usually good to go. As for my diet, I need a lot for my metabolism as it is very fast. You know, it’s almost been become sort of a joke in our family how much I can actually put down food wise. But everyone is different and much has to do with how quick your metabolism is and what times of the day you’re eating and what your body’s needs. There’s so many variables to it and that’s why when you put together an exercise prescription for somebody you have to do a pretty long fact-finding process before you can put something together that’s truly effective for them. Bodies actually tend to slow down and your metabolism does tend to get slower as you’re older.

Erik Bean:
Thank you for your advice and insight, then what final advice do you have for anyone considering an SAS doctoral degree?

Dr. MacDonald: If you are going to pursue a doctorate have a specific purpose. Choose purpose over happiness because you know why you are doing it. I think you need to have a very solid plan and purpose in place before you do it. Understand also that school is equivalent to a full-time job when you engage a program like this. Be very serious about it, be very passionate about it, but more importantly, just have a plan how are you going to get through it. Make sure you’re working with people who’ve done it in the past who can help coach and mentor you as well and keep you on the right track, a support system.

Rodney Luster:
Thank you Michael. We hope you reach your full healthcare and political aspirations.

Erik Bean:
I have a feeling we will be hearing much more from you Dr. MacDonald.

One2One is a segment of the Phoenix Scholar that captures an up close and personal dialogue with a scholar or researcher using a very organic approach by allowing dialogue to drift where the conversation takes it. We hope you enjoy this session of One2One that focuses on how psychologists interpret and use mindfulness techniques during patient sessions.

I had the opportunity to have an informal discussion with Dr. David Engstrom recently. David and I met by chance, where a technical glitch had thrown me in the middle of a Skype meeting between David and his colleagues. For a moment I felt like a spaceman dropped on an alien planet. There was some initial confusion from the result of my sudden presence. The few people that had shown up early, including myself, had a good laugh. It took a moment, however, to gather that these were humanities folks, they spoke my language and are always some of my favorite people to talk to. So, we began a short conversation before their meeting began.

I happened to begin asking a few questions before the meeting started and found out that the two intended meetings (one that I was expected to be at) had unintentionally overlapped. As part of that pre-meeting discussion, David and I began a conversation based on our mutual interests in psychology and therapy. David had mentioned he was developing a TED Talk presentation and the subject matter intrigued me. It was through a few LinkedIn conversations after this initial introduction that we exchanged some thoughts, and I had the idea to feature David as part of the next Phoenix Scholar. I just felt as though the area of research he was engaged in might coalesce nicely with the issue’s subject and focus.

I called David around brunch on a sunny day in July. We chatted in between sips of my favorite cold brew. As David picked up, there was an immediate comfort in our conversation as we simply talked as though we were two old friends hanging out and catching up. I was interested in some of the basic formalities of his background, the psychologist, the professional. One of the things that’s always interesting to me when it comes to professionals is the historical foundations that brought the person to where he or she is now, and what trajectory was set in place that created the interest. I truly appreciate where people come from, the decisions they make, how they have arrived where they are, it’s simply a part of my own unusual disciplinary blend of psychology and sociology perhaps.

I focused on the conversation at hand, “So, David, where do you find?” David said, “Well, I was born and raised in Chicago, went to the University of Illinois for two years, ended up a bad romantic relationship and moved to Washington DC to finish my bachelor’s at George Washington State in Psychology. Then I moved on to the University of Southern California for my PhD work and finished there with sort of a specialty in health psychology. That’s been something that’s interested me a lot from the beginning, so I began practicing health psychology mostly in medical settings which sort of sets me apart from the average psychologist.” I thought this was already becoming interesting, a specialty in health psychology. I myself had always had an interest in healthcare professions, taking nutrition classes, speech therapy, and others, accumulating an eclectic blend of things when all along I was headed towards psychology.

David continued, “I’ve worked in chronic pain programs and I’ve worked with cancer patients, I most recently worked in a bariatric surgery unit where we did lots of surgeries on people who are considered obese and who have all sorts of comorbidities as a result. I just learned a lot I guess about that connection between the mind and the body. So that’s sort of been my focus and I love teaching so I added that to my roster. I’ve been core counseling faculty now for a little over a year in this area. I have taught for about nine years just independently as a faculty member in psychology as well. Currently I have two major interests where I wrote an article about a year and a half ago on Counseling Today on a behavioral health toolbox which introduced counselors to the idea that you have to look beyond the mental health conditions and really look at how they intersect in an integrative sense with physical health conditions in their own perspective.
I’ve gotten very interested in mindfulness which I’ve been practicing for many years now. And, so, we did a study. Have I gone too far off the path Rodney?"

“No, not at all David, please continue, this is fascinating how you have in your background.” I didn’t mention to David my own approach to understanding people’s mindsets and the way they interact with their environment, but I knew I was already thinking in that mode.

David continued, “We did a study just a year and a half ago, looking at the way the counseling profession is changing. Students have to come out three times during their career to do a clinical interview.”

“I was wondering how David would respond,” I thought, “I was wondering how David would respond.”

“Rodney, I’ve gotten very interested in mindfulness, in how we can look at this.”

“I was wondering how David would respond,” I thought, “I was wondering how David would respond.”

As he said this I was remembering my first time out counseling and there was so much of me still convoluting those early sessions, wondering whether I could turn that around and look at how they were worrying about what I was arguing, what they think they are doing wrong. I was wondering why I was doing this, the room was okay. So many things a room can be filled with, and you’re mindful of my solitude and it was nice! I thought this was a brilliant observation in my view mindfulness is simply being mindful of our own sense of ego and self. I then said, "So, I wanted to let him know my thoughts on this, but I was wondering how David would respond.”

David responded, “Yeah, okay, you think it’s a good label for what it was about. I mean it didn’t say this..." I thought, laugh at the coffee cup. Mindfulness I thought, laugh at the coffee cup. "It is definitely worth the excitement, these people use it for every day? Just because I really think there's a lot of things or simply believe that it's a really important tool, clinicians, helping people, dispositional mindfulness can be another component of that." David paused and said, "You know, I’m glad you appreciate it Rodney, thank you.”

After a few more pleasantries we said our goodbyes and took a moment in my office, just to be present, to acknowledge that I and my clients, really need to be present, and in a world that’s too fast paced, need to begin looking at how we tender the currency of our own lives, our own agenda. I thought this was a brilliant observation in my view mindfulness is simply being mindful of our own sense of ego and self. I then said, "So, I wanted to let him know my thoughts on this, but I was wondering how David would respond.”

David responded, “This goes way back and I really believe that there’s a clarity that we need to bring into that initial sessions, being watched by these scholars, being aware whenever I speak with clients. I thought this was a brilliant observation, being mindful of our own sense of ego and self. I then said, "So, I wanted to let him know my thoughts on this, but I was wondering how David would respond.”

David might expand this topic a bit, and in my view mindfulness is simply being mindful of our own sense of ego and self. I then said, "So, I wanted to let him know my thoughts on this, but I was wondering how David would respond.”

David responded, “Yeah sure, an example would be, well, the most obvious proba- bly would be on topics that could be called a counseling session, you could turn around, you could turn around, and you’re mindful of my solitude and it was nice! I thought this was a brilliant observation, being mindful of our own sense of ego and self. I then said, "So, I wanted to let him know my thoughts on this, but I was wondering how David would respond.”

Dr. Rodney Luster is the Senior Director of Research Strategy, Innovation and Develop- ment at the University of Phoenix and is also the Lead Researcher for the Phoenix Scholar. He also is a licensed therapist who practices in Austin, Texas. You can find him on LinkedIn as well as on Psy- chology Today profiles.
Networking the Bay Area: Continuing the Dialog to Promote Scholarship Among SAS Students, Faculty, and Alumni

Cheryl Burleigh, Ed.D.
Research Fellow
Center for Educational and Instructional Technology Research

Doctoral students have limited opportunities to collaborate and advance scholarship when conducting research and progressing through the dissertation writing process. This is especially true when completing an online program where there is a feeling of isolation. The opportunities for in-person collaboration and research may be limited by proximity, identifying collaborators, or a network of likeminded colleagues.

In any organization, opportunities to collaborate with colleagues should be a process that is readily available. The first step for an institution of higher learning is to recognize such shortcomings and develop a means for individuals to connect in-person to share experiences, offer support, and create a network of community where research and collaboration can flow freely. Just as individuals have different learning modalities, the same holds true for scholars in formulating and conducting research studies by seeking colleagues with the same and different research interests for collaboration that is meaningful. Thus, the process of conducting research within a communal cultural setting (Gardner, 1999) with colleagues becomes rewarding, camaraderie is defined, and collective accomplishment is attained and celebrated.

The Bay Area School of Advanced Studies (SAS) Networking model was inspired by alumni in San Diego with the support of SAS (S. Van Pett, personal communication, April 3, 2017) and is similar to networking events held by other academic and professional organizations in the region. The purpose of networking, as Bandura (1986) posted, “People not only gain understanding through reflection, they evaluate and alter their own thinking” (p. 21). Following the Boyer’s model of scholarship, the focus of the Bay Area program is to bring together SAS students, alumni, and faculty in a collegial environment to support current doctoral students, academic research, collaboration, and scholarship with the goal of publishing seminal works. When doctoral students are provided the opportunity to engage in an informal setting, they have the courage to share personal stories and experiences. Those stories are “not only about their dissertations, but the highs and lows” (Crawford, n.d., p. 12) of the doctoral journey where commonalities of shared experiences can be voiced in a safe environment.

The monthly evening events and biannual all-day Saturday workshops focus on specific topics driven by doctoral students ranging from residency preparation, the nuances of APA, data collection and analysis, and journal publishing. Based on doctoral student recommendations, an upcoming networking event will be held via Skype during lunch. The event will be hosted by the Bay Area SAS Networking Group but will be promoted to all SAS students, faculty, and alumni. Each of the events further the consensus of scholarship via discovery, integration, application, teaching, and learning; therefore, the ability to build knowledge through opportunities of shared experiences to broaden a network of scholars via creativity, innovation, and diversity (Braxton, Luckey & Helland, 2002).

The population served by the Bay Area program comprehensively represents each of the University doctoral programs which comprises 154 active SAS students and 95 alumni from the Bay Area, Sacramen- to, Fresno, and Los Angeles. Participants regularly drive two hours or more hours to attend the events to further their scholarship, but also to maintain the collegial bonds formed.

Success is celebrated. The program has seen numerous successes, including inspiring one doctoral student to complete and defend her dissertation within 60 days of joining the group in October of 2017, attending the national commencement, and she was the first speaker for the SAS Alumni SIG webinar series.

Over the course of the last year and a half, the Bay Area SAS Networking Group continues to be an active and innovative organization focusing on supporting our doctoral students. The doctoral journey can be difficult, frustrating, and hard work. The local SAS faculty and alumni recognize each of the potential pot holes and bumps in the road a doctoral student may encounter. Acting as local mentors, for students who may not have a dissertation chair or to supplement the relationship of a geographically distant dissertation chair and committee, the SAS faculty and alumni continue to work with our doctoral students, to help steer them back on course, pushing the limits of their understanding, and setting attainable monthly goals. In this capacity, the SAS faculty and alumni continue to motivate the doctoral students, while encouraging them to understand that their academic doctoral journey may be long and arduous, pushing their personal and academic boundaries and working at a slow and steady pace to reach the pinnacle of their program. The Bay Area Networking faculty and alumni continue to assist these students in setting and attaining realistic goals. The work includes not only the moral support as academic cheerleaders, but in the practical applications of reviewing dissertation proposals and studies as another set of “eyes” prior to posting to Quality Review Methods (QRM) and Quality Review Final (QRF), assisting in answering questions about the dissertation process, and helping each individual student navigate their doctoral journey.

The objective of the Bay Area SAS Network is to continue to champion Boyer’s model to further scholarship by “integrating ideas and connecting thought to action” (Boyer, 1990, p. 77). Scholarship and shared experiences is what binds the individuals who participate in this network. (Stobbe, Mishra & Macintyre, 2013). The role of this Bay Area SAS Network, its faculty and alumni, are to continue to support and encourage the doctoral candidates to self-understanding and the authorship of their dissertation study; the culmination of their personal academic journey (Batchelor & Di Napoli, 2006). The process of developing and supporting collective academic and research networks is essential for the future of inspirational collaborations as we continue to rise as a University.
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International Leadership Association

Authentication, Peace, and Prosperity Summon UOPX Scholars to ILA 20th Conference

Erik Bean, Ed.D.
Associate Research Center Chair
Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research

More than a dozen University of Phoenix (UOPX) scholars heeded a peer reviewed call last winter for the chance to partake in the International Leadership Association (ILA) 20th Global Conference (http://bit.ly/2AB6jEh) entitled, Authentic Leadership for Progress, Peace, and Prosperity to be held on October 24-27 in West Palm Beach. From session chairs and panels, to symposiums and roundtables, to papers and posters, the theme zeroes in on the era of fake news and the ability of leaders to authentically engage with followers and stakeholders for the greater community good. The list of research topics and conceptual discussions either led by UOPX scholars or co-authored are certain to be popular for many months to come.

For example, Janice L. Cardwell (http://bit.ly/2yB5sLs), UOPX VP will be chairing Leadership Development (LD) group and is set to take over UOPX Hawaiian Business Campus Chair Renee R. Green’s ILA LD seat next year. Both Cardwell and Green are well rep-resented throughout the conference. They will play host to a member interest group entitled, Leadership Development Member Interest Group Master Mind Meeting.

Green will chair Authentic Leadership and Cultivating Tribes to Unleash Leadership Momenta. She will also be pre-senting Is There Freedom in Forgiveness? Releasing the Past and Restarting Leadership Momentum. “Authentic leadership indicates that leaders, for the most part, are technically proficient in their jobs hiring and development are intentionally executed. Where research gaps exist are through self-awareness, character, and interpersonal interactions that cause conflict and can impair leaders. Takeaways from this presentation will provide insight on: To forgive or not, that is the question.


In addition to a roundtable listed below, conclusive visibility by the works of 2017 Distinguished Senior Fellow (CLS-ER) Lynne Devnew (http://bit.ly/2yB5sLs) have a prominent showing of Leadership Mentors. Here Devnew will chair a panel, Leading with Authenticity: Connecting Girls’ Development of Voice and Women Leaders’ Response to Silencing featuring Judith Babcock LaValley, Kansas State University; Chanda D. Ebert, Texas A&M University; Ann M. Berghout Austin, Utah State University, and Devnew. “Exploring an iterative process between leadership practice, leadership feedback, and finding one’s own voice, the panel will begin by de-scribing a collaborative autoethnography of five women leaders.” Devnew also plays host to Women & Leadership 4th Annual Conference: Information & Involvement Session (http://bit.ly/2w59W4h). That con-ference is scheduled for June 16-19, 2019 in Santa Cruz, CA. Devnew just completed the editing of the symposium section of the 12(1) 2018 edition of the JLS where she co-authored the introductory article entitled Women in Leadership-How Do Dif-fences Matter? with Julia Storberg-Walt-er (http://bit.ly/2w1fZB3).

Other formal presentations include Over-coming Physician Burnout: A Culture of Conversation for Provider Well-being and In-stitutional Prosperity by Lunthita M. Duthely (http://bit.ly/2yB5sLs) and Kevin S. Botton-mley (CLSER senior fellow and certified yoga instructor), both 2018 Distinguished School of Advanced Studies (SAS) Scholar-s, as well as with Cheryl Burleigh, Lunthita-M. Duthey, and Alkema M. Champion, CLSER senior fellow, they examine the efficacy of the ancient practice and its contemporary leadership connection. “For centuries yoga has been traditionally tied to self-leadership. Its pop-ularity and tremendous growth attest to its effectiveness. VAE: Vision, Alignment, Execution combines yoga with a behavioral leadership process model to foster a powerful intellectual, physical, and emotional capability of unleashing your full leader potential” according to ILA proceedings (http://bit.ly/2MlK2i4).

Other formal presentations include Over-coming Physician Burnout: A Culture of Conversation for Provider Well-being and Institution-al Prosperity by Lunthita M. Duthely, University of Miami Health System and SAS chair, Louise Underdahl, UOPX chair, and Terri Jones Mesneke. As well as a poster Competencies of Outstanding Executive Coaches: A Grounded Theory Approach by Kent M. Blumberg, UOPX faculty.

UOPX Scholars Prominent at Several Roundtable Sessions

Under the guise of Leadership Scholar-ship (LS), a category that helps scholars foster rigorous publication and presenta-tions tied to the literature finds a roundtable held by veteran Editor of the Journal of Leadership Studies (JLS) Mark L. Ludorf, a professor of psychology at Stephen F. Austin State University, joined by JLS Ex-ecutive Editor Henrich Elyers, UOPX exec-utive dean, and Erin Bean Leadership Per-spectives (LP) new section editor. Ludorf will lead a roundtable about publishing opportunities in JLS, CLS, and CLSER and is expected to feature a new JLS LP published session showcasing the historical works of authors Dr. Gutmann Martin, lecturer at the Chair of Negotia-tion and Conflict Management and in the Department of Management, Technology and Economics at ETH Zurich, Switzer-
What differentiates ecosystem builders? Are great entrepreneurial ecosystems truly built bottom-up, entrepreneur-led as Brown & Mason (2017), Startup Genome (2018) and others argue persuasively? Given the near-absolute policy dominance of the triple helix and clusters before that, a focus on the inherent connectivity of ecosystems is imperative. In particular, the practitioner community argues for the centrality of connecting and thus connectors. This project is part of a larger effort to understand the nature of the critical connectors in entrepreneurial communities. The Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation and others argue that a new profession has arisen, that of the “ecosystem builder” (e.g., 2017, 2018). Implicit in this is a belief that ecosystem builders are inherently more entrepreneurial. We thus seek here to characterize ecosystem builders on multiple dimensions as to knowledge, skills, and beliefs, on critical behaviors, and on the entrepreneurial mindset.

Introduction

Study of entrepreneurial ecosystems is still relatively nascent and is still dominated by top-down models that focus on institutional actors and processes, despite the growing realization that “ecosystem” is much more than a clever metaphor (Brown & Mason 2017; Krueger 2018; Stam 2016). Entrepreneurial communities are deeply and completely interconnected, not just a network but a network of networks. If so, how then should we direct our research efforts? One recent clue was a case study of the rise of entrepreneurial programming at Aalto University where the ecosystem and entrepreneurial learning activities actively and intentionally co-evolved (Bjorklund & Krueger 2016).

At the just-completed Growing Entrepreneurial Communities Summit hosted by the Federal Reserve, it was clear that we need to devote more energy to supporting connectors, especially the “super connectors” whose ability to nurture and connect other connectors seem so crucial to the growth of entrepreneurial communities. We heard the exact same call from the delegates to the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation’s Global ESHIP summit of ecosystem builders. But to support them, we need a much deeper, richer understanding of what they do and who and why they do it.

At the 2017 summit of organizers of the 100+ chapters of 1 Million Cups, the senior program officer for ecosystems asked me “What makes entrepreneurial ecosystem builders different? Do they have the entrepreneurial mindset?” Because of my research into both ecosystems and entrepreneurial thinking, it was hard to not see the opportunity here.

Connectors or Liaison-Animateurs?

We draw here on seminal work by Karen Stephenson (e.g., http://bit.ly/2Mm3nC1) who studied the super connectors in both organizational and civic communities. One striking example is the city of Philadelphia where a parallel effort had identified the 100 “most influential” Philadelphians. What was striking was that there was essentially zero overlap between the “most influential” and the top connectors. In an entrepreneurial context, it is hard to forget the clever term developed by Irish entrepreneur expert, Gerry Sweeney: “Learned optimism (resilience to adversity)” (1986). What was especially striking was that the kind who truly help build ecosystems are not just connectors or brokers, they are proactive and add energy to the system.

How do they think? (mindset)

What do they know that’s different/unique? What skills do they have? (KSA)

What do they do? (actions)

Subject Pools [PI is active participants in all of these]

ESHIP delegates (+450 individuals)

Growing Entrepreneurial Communities delegates (+200)

1 Million Cups organizers (+300)

Startup Weekend Organizers (global, >600) We have inside contacts with Techstars

Global Entrepreneurship Network (global, >10000 Global Entrepreneurship Week organizers)

And via GEC, membership of the International Council for Economic Development (+5000)

Advisory Board

Have advisory board members from each of the subject pools. I already have commitments from both ecosystem builders from Saudi Arabia to New Zealand AND academic experts from OECD, EU, China and USA.

Key Research Tools

1) Mindset: Do they share a entrepreneurial mindset? What beliefs/attitudes?

Online survey of mindset dimensions (100-200 questions) details below**. What facets of the mindset do they have—or lack? Read this for more: [http://www.oecd.org/education-practice-p1.pdf]

2) Role Characteristics: Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes/beliefs, Behaviors

Modified Delphi survey, asking what is it that ecosystem builder know that is different/unique/important, what skills do they have (or should have), and what do they do that is different/unique/important. We expect to end up with a list of 5-15 crucial KSA’s, useful for training programs, etc.

Mindset Instrument

Scales included here*: Grit (perseverance)

Learned optimism (resilience to adversity)

Action orientation (bias for action)

Cognitive flexibility (predicts dot connecting)

Role identity (as entrepreneur) ‘Entrepreneurial intensity

Entrepreneurial self-efficacy (perceived competence at key tasks)

Entrepreneurial Intent (and antecedents) and entrepreneurial background

*We can add other scales as desired/needed (e.g., Dark Triad)

Pilot Studies

Instruments were repeatedly pretested then now a formal pilot study was conducted in July 2018 [http://bit.ly/2Mm3nC1]. Next step is more formal rollout across multiple populations (see below).

Where Next?

The larger project that is this element is of is already underway and what follows here are the likely next steps.

July

First trial data: pilot results from the 2018 ESHIP summit at the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation in mid-July.

September

We will present initial results to this 2018 IPAG conference in Paris on entrepreneurial cognition. I am already keynoting and we are planning a discussion/symposium on the interface of entrepreneurial cognition and entrepreneurial ecosystems. This is an opportunity for everyone involved in this project.

Autumn 2018

Next wave of data will be fully analyzed and full-scale data collection will be underway.

Targets to submit to Babson Research Conference (Deadline October), Academy of Management (deadline January 2019) and other conferences as desired.

January 2019

Major data collection completed and analyzed, submission to Academy of Management. Also possible research symposium on entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Spring 2019

The first journal articles will be drafted. We hope, of course, make the data widely available to serious researchers.
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Innovation in Counselor Preparation and Practice Virtual Conference: College of Humanities and Sciences, and Social Sciences
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Interim Program Dean, Social Sciences
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David Engstrom, Ph.D., ABPP, FAACP
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The College of Humanities and Sciences, and Social Sciences 2018 Innovation in Counselor Preparation and Practice Virtual Conference (ICPVPVC) was held in the eCampus platform on July 10–13, 2018. This innovative professional development opportunity supports professional development of faculty’s roles as clinicians, researchers, and educators. Each day of the virtual conference provided faculty with the opportunity to engage in a variety of scholarly presentations related to the main topic of innovation in counselor preparation and practice.

The ICPVPVC provided Social Sciences faculty the opportunity to participate in faculty scholarship. The University recognizes the role and value that practitioner-scholars bring to the classroom, providing a connection between theory and practice and the professional activities of a practitioner-scholar (University of Phoenix, 2017, p. 78). Practitioner-scholars are also engaged in delivering education to maintain credentials and stay abreast of evidence-based practices in their profession; the virtual conference allowed counseling faculty to opportunity to receive continuing education toward licensure while engaging in discussions to enhance their practice.

Purpose

Practitioner-scholars may have more limited time to attend conferences for continuing education and may not be able to afford the time away from clients to attend lengthy trainings. The virtual conference provides a supportive, asynchronous vehicle for faculty to gain information and grow professionally. Additionally, faculty members were afforded the opportunity to highlight their own scholarly work and teaching strategies for their peers. Among counseling accreditation organizations such as CACREP, it is imperative that faculty articulate an identity with the professional counseling by not only credentials and licenses but also by attending and participating in conferences and workshops. The virtual conference format encouraged connection between participants and the professional activities of a practitioner-scholar (University of Phoenix, 2017, p. 78). Practitioner-scholars were encouraged to using education to maintain credentials and stay abreast of evidence-based practices in their profession; the virtual conference allowed counseling faculty to opportunity to receive continuing education toward licensure while engaging in discussions to enhance their practice.

Day 1: Creative Approaches to Teaching Counseling and Novel Approaches to Counselor Skill Development

Day 2: Methods for Evaluating Counseling Skills or Competence

Day 3: Advancements in Existing Counseling Practice Areas

Day 4: New Techniques in Counseling Practice and New Perspectives on Counseling Theory

Organizers designed the conference to mirror the virtual Content Area Meetings held by the University of Phoenix. Peer-reviews rated proposals submitted that aligned with the conference theme; presenters developed learning activities in the form of presentations with voiceover and posters coupled with reflection questions designed to engage participants with the subject matter. To continue sustained engagement throughout the conference, presenters developed two discussion questions for participants to answer. Participants were required to post two substantive responses each at least 300 words in length to earn continuing education credit for eligible presentations. Presenters were also required to continue the conversation through engaging responses to participants and substantial discussion message or responses that provided additional information regarding the topic presented. Participants were able to view presentations and participate in discussions throughout the week allowing them to pace their work according to their schedule. The self-paced learning environment allowed for more sustained interaction. Participants had the opportunity to engage in scholarly presentations such as the samples provided below.

Structured Peer Group Supervision: Making the Most of Peer Feedback – Melissa Wheeler, PhD and Mandee Bahadar, PhD

Feedback in supervision is an important vicarious experience that theoretically has the potential to increase counseling self-efficacy and behaviors related to increased performance (Bandura, 1997). Researchers have reported that supervisees perceive peer feedback to be at times more helpful than supervisor feedback yet peer feedback in group supervision was less constructive and not always helpful (Borders, Welfare, Greason, Paladino, Mobley, Villalba, & Wester, 2012). This presentation will explore the benefits and challenges of peer feedback in supervision and provide an overview of the Structured Peer Group Supervision model (Borders, 1991) as applied to counselors in training.

The Intersection of Behavioral Health, Advocacy, Identity, Partnership, & Innovation: Counseling – Monalisa Maria McGee-Baratia, PhD.

Legitimization of professional counseling emerges from efforts related to educational, professional, and regulatory credentialing standards. Counselor profession- al efficacy is at the heart of how each of these facets intersect with the outcome of quality behavioral healthcare. Objectives are to differentiate credentialing of organizations, individuals, and licensure needs; develop an enhanced understanding of counselor advocacy needs beyond graduation including managed care and industry trends; and generate discussion and collaboration on how counselor educators can advocate to further support credentialing.

The Value of Therapeutic Presence and Mindfulness in Counseling – David Engstrom, PhD and Jean Miller, PhD.

Research is shared on the importance of therapeutic presence with clients. Topics include dispositional mindfulness, the development of therapeutic presence, implications for practice, and future research opportunities. Objectives are to learn the role of mindfulness and therapeutic presence in counselor education and counselor development as well as to explore the development of therapeutic presence in counselors. Attendees will gain an understanding of the fundamentals of mindfulness and the importance in counseling as well as dispositional mindfulness as a predictor of counseling student interview skills.

The Experience and Future Plans

In multidimensional collaboration, students, the program, the communities members provide critical linkages that increase the likelihood of identifying and employing innovative and systemic approaches to a range of complex holistic behavioral health and social justice needs. Future collaborative opportunities stemming from reflection of the virtual conference include modifying the participation requirement to allow for expanded professional conversations, providing greater alignment with conference themes to support continuity across days, and expanding the conference to support other mental health professionals. Practice needs for future presentations include substance abuse counseling and distance counseling opportunities, evidence based practices to improve treatment, and co-occurring needs. In addition, given the needs relating to co-occurring diagnosis, it is imperative for planning to identify opportunities to support educators with information and strategies related to curriculum and instruction from this realm.

The conference was a multiplying investment for the University of Phoenix and from this perspective, the networking of professionals was an investment in furthering the “footprint” of our strategies to enhance the counseling field. While ways of understanding relationships vary depending on epistemological outlook, belief systems, and more, the ideas we wish to foster in this and future conferences are developmental, intentional, and generative. From this perspective, the University, contributing faculty, and conference participants will continue to foster critically supportive, nurturing relationships that actively promote learning, socialization, and identity transformation within their work environments, organizations, and communities.

References:
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A few years ago, I was at an economics conference in a session on production economics. One of the presenters provided their empirical results, and one of the audience members chastised the presenter because his p-values were “bad.” The audience member as well as other audience members provided strategies to improve the p-values rather than focus on the research design and possible data issues. Also, I assisted a counseling faculty member in the use of SPSS to implement a variation of the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). She was aghast that her p-value was p=0.044. She wanted her p-value to be 0.00 or even p<0.001, and she was visibly upset. She then became absolutely focused on how to get her p-value down. She did not seem concerned about the data and her research design. Upon careful inspection of her data, it looked like there could be concerns there. Are the audience members at the economics conference and the counseling faculty member misusing the true meaning of the p-value?

The misuse of the p-value is used to make the determination if the hypothesis is true or false. At the same time, whether it supports statistical significance. Are quantitative researchers elsewhere falling into this trap? Well the American Statistical Association (ASA) thinks so, see their statement from 2016 (http://bit.ly/267b4q). The ASA advises researchers to avoid drawing scientific conclusions based on the use of p-values. As such, researchers should carefully describe the data that was used in the study and carefully describe the statistical tests that were used in the research. If the researcher did not do the latter, these statistical results may appear to be falsely robust. Ziliak and McCloskey (2008) wrote strongly about the prevalence of this problem in the social sciences, business, and even in medicine.

Many researchers, like those mentioned earlier at the economics conference and the counseling professor, currently use p-values to test some “null hypothesis.” That is, the smaller the p-value, the less likely an observed set of values would occur by chance under the assumption that the null hypothesis is true. A p-value of 0.05 or less is generally taken to mean that a finding is statistically significant and warrants publication, which adds substantially to the scientific literature. However, the ASA says it is overly misleading, or false, to draw such conclusions based on these tests.

How Did We Get Here?

A question by some is, so how did we get to this point? These misunderstandings about what information a p-value provides often appear in the examples provided in statistics and econometric textbooks. In addition, we are taught this inadvertently in our courses. ASA as well as other researchers advocate this misunderstanding and took a stance about shifting back to the original interpretation of the p-value with a focus on the careful discussion of the research design, data, and other components to our research.

Keep in mind that the criticism for the use of the p-value has been around for quite some time. There are some examples of such research that I came across from ASA and in the research, Simmons, Nelson, and Simmons (2011) tried to raise awareness about false positives gamed in analysis to reach a statistically significant finding: listening to music by the Beatles makes undergraduates younger. Another example is that documentary filmmakers in 2015 published conclusions from a poorly designed statistical trial that resulted in a strong p-value, which concluded that eating chocolate helps people to lose weight (Bohannon et al., 2015). Can you imagine how many people would overly love such an approach to weight-loss? This paper has been retracted because a poorly designed research trial is perilous and lacks scientific merit. The editors even acknowledged in its retraction that this is an example of poor research. We need to remind ourselves that the goal of statistical inference is to learn about a hypothetical larger population, whatever that population may be.

How Bad is It?

Most empirical papers will often include tests of significance and do not look at the size of the effect and how can this effect have real empirical significance; whether it is economic, psychological, medical, or other forms of significance. To check persuasiveness of this problem, McCloskey and Ziliak (2004) examined at least 137 empirical papers published in the American Economic Review (AER) in the 1990s. These papers used a test of statistical significance and 82% of the papers mistook a merely statistically significant finding for an economically significant finding. In fact, 81% of these papers believed that looking at the sign of a coefficient would be enough in the determination of scientific accuracy, while ignoring the size of the coefficient. This interpretation, especially when used in policy-making, has caused the losses of jobs, justice, and human lives. It is not just social sciences and business that are especially infatuated with statistical significance over substantive significance, but this problem is quite prevalent in medicine too (Ziliak and McCloskey, 2008).

Current Response to this Problem

Some journals have started the practice of rejecting papers that focus on reaching conclusions based on p-values. The most notable journal, Basic and Applied Social Psychology, has adopted the practice of rejecting papers that use exclusively p-values. David Trafimow (the editor) and Michael Marks (the associate editor) posited that p-value have become an easy way for researchers dealing with poor data or a poor assembled research design. They
Regardless of the organization type, change management is an ever-increasing development need to achieve strategic objectives and sustain momentum. For the higher education organization, technological change of learning management systems (LMS) is an ongoing necessity to remain relevant in mobile applications for accessibility and to advance learning outcomes. Flawless execution of LMS implementation is the objective to mitigate risks associated with student attrition and faculty preparedness. Ideally, the ultimate outcome is an LMS that everyone can say is better to work with and helps them gain more knowledge. In this idealistic realm, the LMS platform increases the potential of the online learning environment to advance learning outcomes whenever students and faculty engage in the system. While this ideology may sound like pie in the sky, it is possible in an age of all things digital to create a meaningful leadership and learning encounters with LMS technology one student at a time. Enter Blackboard Ultra (Bb) and its amazing add on, Ally to transform the online learning experience with advanced features of technical accessibility for all learners, no matter the learning style or learning disability – to advance learning, enhance career development, and turn pie in the sky to food on the table.

Here is where theory and practice meet to inform higher-education executive leadership on best practices to mitigate student attrition during a large-scale Bb implementation. The Center for Learning Analytics Research (CLAR) of University of Phoenix (UOPX) conducted a team-based research project on this topic under the guidance of Dr. Scott Burrus, former CLAR Research Chair. Research Fellow team members included Dr. LauraAnn Migliore, Dr. Gregory Bradley, and Dr. Melanie Shaw. The study focused on two guiding questions:

1. How should the Bb LMS be implemented to mitigate student attrition?
2. What constitutes a meaningful leadership and learning encounter in the context of mitigating student attrition when implementing the Bb LMS? (Migliore, Burrus, Bradley, & Shaw, 2018, p. 111)

These questions led to the creation of a conceptual model which integrates “several theories for practical application to create meaningful leadership and learning encounters with students and faculty” (p. 111). Three themes emerged after an in-depth review of peer-reviewed literature, professional industry white papers, interviews with similar higher-education institutions and vendors. The three themes surrounding the problem were:

1. Operational effectiveness – does it work well?
2. User experience perceptions – does it make you feel smart?
3. Knowledge transfer – does it advance learning outcomes?

According to Migliore et al. (2018), best practices for addressing operational effectiveness were to implement the LMS via a staged migration. That is to apply a slow and iterative approach to identify and resolve issues immediately before launching the full Bb LMS. For example, focus the first stage on basic functionalities (look and feel) and then proceed to next stage of enhancements (videos, etc.). The philosophy for achieving operational effectiveness was centered on success with fewer functions rather than risking an over-zealous list of functions that do not work well. Thus, promote and build upon the short-term wins of the success with fewer functions.

Next, Migliore et al. (2018) recommended creating excitement early on to ensure success on Day 1 of the full launch. To build a positive user-experience, develop a well-conceived communication strategy, perform beta tests within pilot courses, obtain feedback for improving the user experience, and provide just-in-time training. In addition, anticipate technical problems and make 24/7 technical support visible and available 24/7. Empower users with relevant do-it-yourself video examples and access to the Bb sandbox to practice hands-on and gain user experience. Last, but not least, promote awareness about cybersecurity (e.g., protection in informal learning spaces such as other-than-home locations, vehicles, cafes, etc. and two-factor authentication, protocols for passwords, etc.). Creating excitement about the new platform with focus on building positive user perceptions can influence good feelings of competence in using the Bb LMS.

The third recommendation for best practices in knowledge transfer is to leverage Bb LMS functionalities by focusing on content delivery that engages the learner to advance knowledge transfers (Migliore et al., 2018). For example, rather than just transfer curriculum to the new platform, which will have to occur initially during full launch for a smooth transfer, continue the curriculum improvement process by refreshing course content over time to fit the functionalities of the new platform.

Changing LMS platforms can be scary, but UOPX is a brave, honest, and focused institution with a bright future in knowledge without boundaries to bridge the gap between operational effectiveness, user experiences, and knowledge transfers to create meaningful leadership and learning encounters with the new Bb platform.
After finishing a busy first quarter with KWBA Bootcamp (for details see Phoenix Scholar Vol 1 Issue 3, page 7), my focus for the second quarter is to prepare submissions for the KWBA Annual Symposium. One of the tasks is to identify what kind of research to share with symposium participants. On the one hand, the annual symposium can be viewed as a venue for celebrating published research and scholarship. On the other hand, conventional conference practice would encourage sharing unpublished work and work-in-progress. Another common practice of conferences such as the Academy of Management, for example, is to have professional development workshops. Integrating these various common practices, I worked with members of the Center and submitted proposals that include celebration of past research activities, reviewed lessons learned, made note of manuscripts that are in the pipeline, the work-in-progress, and some workshops. Examples of these proposals are:

1. **Bootcamp Boosts New Virtual Relationships.** A Panel Discussion Focused on Effective Research Strategies to Knowledge Without Boundaries Annual Research Symposium. This is a panel organized by KWBA Bootcamp (March, 2018 Philadelphia) where participants discuss their experiences and the value of a face-to-face intensive Bootcamp that took place concurrently with the Academy of Management (SRSA) Conference in Philadelphia. SAS, UOPX faculty and students attended both the Bootcamp and the conference. The Bootcamp essentially provided a chance for many virtual colleagues to meet for the first time in person. Extending from their experience of the Bootcamp, this panel proposes to discuss about lessons learned from the Bootcamp that can be replicated in a virtual KWBA environment. This panel is organized by Dr. Cristina Marine, Research Fellow CGBT, and UOPX Faculty.

2. **Ethical Behavior in Financial Institutions: A Leadership Imperative.** This is a timely and important research that investigates the role senior leadership plays in emitting ethically misleading signals. The purpose of this research is to investigate to the extent to which senior leaders formulate, enforce, communicate, and evaluate ethical policies and guidelines in organizations. This work is proposed by Dr. Geoffrey Magal, UOPX School of Business Faculty and a member of CGBT.

3. **American Depository Receipts (ADRs) Performance Center’s Research Fellow Dr. Subas Nandy submitted two ongoing research pieces:** “Comparison of the Risk-Free Returns of American Depository Receipts of Pharmaceutical Companies, and S&P 500 Index from 2000 through 2016” and “Is the Grass Greener on the Other Side? A Comparison of Compounded Year-to-Year Long-term Performance of American Depository Receipts and Equities of U.S. Pharmaceuticals”. One of these two pieces was accepted for journal publication (forthcoming). Dr. Nandy, UOPX Faculty, is a recipient of GSS General Research Grant.

In between KWBA Bootcamp and preparing for the KWBA annual symposium, I also find myself sharing the doctoral journey with our students through the Research Hub. The initial intention of my blogs and forum topics is to inform my audience about current research topics while at the same time stimulating research interests among members of the Center. The unintended and mostly surprising and positive consequence is that doctoral students are finding dissertation topics from these blog posts! (See below excerpt of an email correspondence.) As an educator who is dedicated to passing the knowledge baton, I am thrilled that my blogs directly contribute to a student’s doctoral journey.

**Email May 2018**

Subject: Digital Economy: Business Not as Usual

Hello Dr. Sussan,

I thank you for your posts. I have recently begun my doctorate journey. The digitalization is fascinating and I am passionate about it. My recent literature research reveals. Digital transformation is here to stay and a strong and robust process is essential to its success. What are your thoughts on a study to determine the potential gap on digitalization and how business leaders can effectively establish a —— to implement digitalization?

I thank you.

As we all know the road to a doctoral degree is challenging, demanding, and often laden with stress, anxiety, and emotional difficulties. A doctoral student not only has to deal with challenges from explicit academic and cognitive tasks but also with the underlying emotionality of the doctoral journey which is perhaps the most important antecedent to success. But yet emotionality related to this journey remains a black box without any formal process or support system to address this. Filling this gap in the system, I believe that CGBT functions as an ideal place and space and serves as a support group for our doctoral students who can share a combination of their cognitive and emotional experiences and at the same time solve implicit and explicit problems that they face. The mere fact that with just a few clicks I can connect doctoral students with like-minded researchers (alum, fellow students, external affiliates, faculty) is priceless! Below are some examples:

I would love to connect with the group, I am very new at this and it is a little lonely.

Hello Dr. Fiona,

I met Dr. James [Rice] this morning (in person), I so thank you for the connection. It has been very helpful. Dr. James guidance and assistance so far has been invaluable.

Emotionality in the doctoral journey consists of both positive and negative emotions. The key is the sharing of that emotionality in this process. For example,

Birthday today, I am 49. I have made it to be done with the dissertation by age 50.

There are many more examples that I am unable to list due to limited space. More importantly, what I did learn from sharing experiences with doctoral students via the Hub? First, the Hub is a “live” community – behind the clicks are actual people (alum, faculty, external affiliates) who care about passing the knowledge baton and empowering others. Second, if you are a doctoral student, come join a Research Center and find a home for this journey. In this “home” you will experience informal learning that adds value to your formal classroom learning (e.g., there are students who actually present in conferences or publish articles in journals prior to graduation).

The human capital behind the Hub is rich and abundant, leverage it! More interestingly, most of the members in the Hub are not your instructors in the classroom.

In conclusion, I have to thank past and present doctoral students Arh, Bibbian, Brian, Bronn, Darryl, Jasper, Jesse, Jimmy, Katherine, Lisa, Melanie, Scott, and Waleed. Your curiosity, eagerness, and proactive attitude toward learning constantly reminds me of the need to push relevant and timely research content on the Hub so that you will be stimulated to conduct research and scholarship that matters and contributes to humanity.

And of course none of this sharing with doctoral students is possible without a great team of wonderful and outstanding colleagues – Arturo Trejo, Brian Slaboda, Claude Tanco, Cristina Marine, Dena Bateh, James Rice, Kim Capehart, Lillie Hibbler-Britt, Louis Daly, Pam Gordon, Paul Wendee, Richard Hall, and Subas Nandy. Your dedicated work with doctoral students and commitment to SAS UOPX inspire me!

---

From KWBA Bootcamp Spiralling Up to KWBA Annual Symposium, and In-Between Sharing Doctoral Journey Experience

Fiona Sussan, MBA, Ph.D.
University Research Chair
Center for Global Business and Information Technology
First of all, as a UOPX alum, I am extremely proud that I am representing University of Phoenix as a Co-Chair for International Leadership Association (ILA) conference in Latin America (http://bit.ly/2P6sx5X). Second, since the School of Advanced Studies (SAS) of UOPX has a long relationship with ILA, I am honored to be able to add value and further solidify the SAS relationship with ILA conferences worldwide. I am thrilled and excited to be a co-chair of the leadership conference.

Very briefly, ILA is organized for educational purposes to serve as a global network for all those who practice, study, and teach leadership; and for all those who practice, study, and teach leadership. ILA accommodates submissions, cataloged, grouped, and organized organized blind reviews, accepted submissions, cataloged, grouped, and scheduled different sessions by common themes, and at the same time kept the flow and interest of the experienced scholars and practitioners attending the conference. This is almost like a full-time job! I am truly grateful for this learning opportunity. I feel excited and energized.

The conference theme is “Exploring the Dilemmas of Leadership in Latin America.” This conference will discuss and present research studies about the present issues faced by leaders, scholars, and practitioners, and the unique opportunities which are present in Latin America. From August 8-10, the ILA conference will be held at Universidad del Pacíﬁco in Lima, Peru. Universidad del Pacíﬁco is the most prestigious private university in Peru. More information about the conference can be found here http://bit.ly/PMDoxS4U.

Leadership is a much-needed research topic in Latin America. One of the many challenges that Latin America faces is to build leadership throughout the region at all levels of their societies. Strong leadership is indeed a pivotal step for Latin America at the national and international levels.

This year, I am proud to mention that several scholars from University of Phoenix submitted their works and were accepted and a team of University of Phoenix representatives will be present at Lima, Peru in August 2018. University of Phoenix scholars presenting this year are: Drs. Jermani Felicia Thompson (DMIST, SAS alum) and Fiona Sussan, and Art Trejo, University of Phoenix Research Fellow. They are from the Center for Global Business and Information Technology in the School of Advanced Studies.

Drs. Jermani Felicia Thompson and Fiona Sussan will be presenting “The Latina’s Long Game to Succeed in U.S. Financial Services Despite Social Class Bias.” This paper is based on Dr. Jermani Felicia Thompson dissertation. Dr. Thompson is a Principal Consultant at “Squared Management Consulting. Dr. Fiona Sussan is a University Research Chair for the Center for Global Business and Information Technology. University of Phoenix. I certainly hope that in the next conference I will see many more scholars from UOPX presenting their research. I look forward to their joining our team in spreading the works of University of Phoenix that contribute to the specific domain of knowledge of leadership and management in the Latin American region. Our works will benefit both practitioners and scholars around the globe.

From my own experience in co-chairing this conference, I highly recommend my fellow postdoctoral colleagues and the community of SAS University of Phoenix to join an organization and share your knowledge by volunteering, by presenting, and sharing your research to increase and share knowledge among scholars and practitioners. For me, it has been a rewarding experience to present and share my University of Phoenix doctoral research around the world at fine academic institutions such as University of Oxford, University of Portugal, University of Mumbai, University of Nepal, University of Argentina, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico, Universidad of Chile, and many more. I have been presenting around the world for the last three years. These presentations led me to more collaboration between scholars, universities, and organizations (such as ILA) around the globe and allowed me to mentor students in different countries with the objective in mind of sharing knowledge to help communities. During this process, I was fortunate enough and led me to an opportunity to be a TED Speaker (http://bit.ly/2KJhKMa).
Online research communities are becoming a focal point for the changing paradigms of research development and publications. Online support communities for faculty members have been in existence for several years and may vary in structure depending on the collective interests (Reilly, Vandenhouten, Gallagher-Lepak, & Ralston-Berg, 2012). Research Gate (http://bit.ly/Z80dxyP) is one of the best known of these large communities where individual researchers might share their research in nascent or published forms. Another example is a Tennessee project that engage researchers from three campuses as participants in the Critical Conversations Research Network (Renner, 2017). Network participants share similar goals, intend to engage with one another to create and co-create new insights or knowledge, and share a skill set or other resources developed through participation in the network.

The extensive research networks allow hundreds of researchers to compare notes and discuss emerging trends. SAS faculty members are using technology to change strategies for researching and publishing articles. Small teams of faculty and alumni researchers are working together in online contexts to investigate contemporary issues at the Center for Educational and Instructional Technology Research (CEITR), these small research teams are using technology-supported tools to communicate, develop, write, and publish research articles. The purpose of this article is to describe the general organization, goals, function, structure, practices and successes of one cluster of collaborative research teams.

Organization: CEITR leaders Dr. Mansureh Kebritchi and Dr. Marianne Justice started developing the general organization for collaborative team research in 2015. The labs are structured research projects related to a broad/cutting edge topic in the field of education. Teams of 3 or 4 researchers work on each project. Every team has a team leader and members play specific roles as methodologist, literature reviewer, or writer. More research labs were developed as the value of collaboration became clear.

Function: The function of the labs was to support a cluster of related projects completed within 12 months from their initiation. The goal was that each team would submit an article to peer-reviewed conferences for presentation and journals for publication. Diversity Lab was one a second generation of the labs started in late 2016. A second Diversity Lab cluster is planned for 2018-19.

Structure: The first Diversity Lab structure comprised of eight teams totaling some 30 members centered on working with public and/or secondary data related to teaching and learning. Dr. Mansureh Kebritchi and Dr. Elizabeth Johnston were the lab leaders and developed research designs in advance of setting up the teams. Practices included weekly meetings for the individual teams and one large monthly meeting for the entire Diversity Lab team that met every month for a review of overall progress. An informal atmosphere allowed team members to share ideas, share insights as to what was working and what was not, and develop some ideas about reaching the goals of presenting and publishing. Team members engaged in far-ranging discussions during the monthly meetings, where progress was reported and best practices or lessons learned were shared. Some of the best practices shared in monthly meetings included the need to establish norms for expectations and roles, the value of team members and leaders who took ownership, and the importance of step-by-step routines. Lessons learned included a clear understanding of the differences in writing a successful dissertation and writing a published article.

Successes: All of the labs have been successful in supporting faculty member and alumni research. In 2017 thirteen research teams represented SAS at the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) conference in Florida. In 2018, eleven teams represent SAS at AECT at the national conference in Kansas.

The team structure allowed multiple successes. Six Diversity lab teams have been published at the AECT conferences. In addition, four of the eight teams had articles accepted for publication by the end of 2017. Two articles are still in review and a one is still in production. One article is in a momentary pause as team members consider some structural changes. One team presented at a national conference, published an article, and a book chapter and wrote a successful grant in 2017. Most members of that same team stayed together to write a follow up article in 2018 (which has now been submitted for publication) and are beginning a practice-based article to follow up on the results from the first two. A second team presented at a conference, wrote and published an article in 2017, and is pursuing a follow up article in 2018.

These are just a few stories of success from the collaborative teams. But several conclusions have become clear to many team members. First, a strong, collaborative team can achieve successes far beyond the reach of any one individual. And second, research can be deeply engaging. The stories I shared show teams that are engaged and persisting in their efforts to learn more about a topic. The research team standard for success is passing the peer and editorial reviews for publications. Publishing occurs in a challenging, national arena and the process is demanding but ultimately deeply satisfying.
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Upcoming Events and Research Groups

Research Method Center Webinars
The committee of methodologists offer research design webinars to enhance the researchers’ research method and design understandings and skills. Webinars focus on various research designs, provide overviews about the designs, discuss when and how to use the designs, and offer opportunities for the participants to ask questions and share their design issues.

We would like to encourage you to participate in the following research design monthly webinars offered by Research Methodology Group. The webinars are offered to all UOPX researchers including students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

View the event details in the Calendar of Events (http://bit.ly/2FmzN89).


Disclaimer for Students: Best practices within a method can differ and these differences are often illuminated by the constraints of a research project or trend in the field. Materials presented in the webinars may differ from materials presented in your classroom. Information presented are views of the methodologist based on their experience and expertise. Work with your chair to determine the best method for your project.

All Webinar Times are 4-5 PM Arizona Time. Platform: Shindig; Event links will be uploaded to RMG group site, Calendar of events.

September 27, 2018:
Narrative Inquiry, leaders: Dr. Ryan Rominger and Dr. Jim Lane

October 11, 2018:
Quantitative Measurement Development of Surveys, leader: Chara Price

November 8, 2018:
Action Research, leader: Dr. Mansureh Kebritchi

December 6, 2018:
Content analysis, leaders: Dr. Erik Bean and Dr. Liz Johnston

Research Communities
Open all year round for prospective researchers, SAS practitioners, and students who are interested in topics involving diversity. The Center for Workplace Diversity Research has organized its research community efforts in order to streamline its different lines of research by creating research communities. To participate, contact the community leader or email us at WorkplaceDiversity@phoenix.edu

About the Communities
Under the leadership of one or more members of the Center, the rationale behind the Research Communities is to create clusters of excellence in specific areas, always focusing on research that can bring benefits to our academic community as well as external stakeholders. Those external stakeholders may include organizations and companies that need that research to perform better and face their marketplace challenges on an advantageous condition.

Active Research Communities
- Cultural Conflict and Society Research Community Leader: Dr. Ray Bynum (CWDIR Research Affiliate) - Tucson, AZ
- Creative Leadership in Diversity and Inclusion Research Leader: Dr. Bethany Mickahail (CWDIR Research Fellow) - Tracy, CA
- Gender and Gender Identity in the Workplace Research Group Leader: Dr. Donna Smith - Columbia, NJ
- Special Needs & Disabilities Leader: Dr. Alana Lyles (CWDIR Research Affiliate) - Springfield, MO
- Spirituality in the Workplace Leader: Dr. Maryse Nazon (CWDIR Research Affiliate)

Professional Engagement to Publication (PEP) Two-Part Workshop
Looking to get professionally published in your field aside from your doctorate? Partake in the Professional Engagement to Publication (PEP) workshop run by Erik Bean, Ed.D., Center for Leadership Studies and Educational Research (CLSER) chair and Dr. Carol A. Holland, CLSER publication fellow.

To register send an email to deadline@edu.phoenix.edu with your name, relationship to UOPX.

Format and Procedure: We provide structured support and guidelines via monthly Web-based meetings. Target journals for submission are suggested at the beginning of the workshop. The manuscripts are broken down into three major sections of introduction, method, and results. The committee of reviewers closely work with the participants to review, revise, and finalize their manuscripts. Participants submit their manuscripts to their target journal by the end of the workshop. Certificate of completion is awarded to the participants who complete and submit their manuscripts to the journals by the end of the workshop.

Participant Eligibility: University of Phoenix affiliates, including faculty, staff, graduated doctoral students, and doctoral students close to graduation, who are interested in publishing their doctoral dissertations (in all disciplines) are encouraged to participate. Dissertation chair/committee members may participate with their doctoral students.

Workshop Meeting Dates
- First web-based session: Sept 5, 2018
- Second web-based session: Oct 3, 2018
- Third web-based session: Oct 17, 2018
- Fourth web-based session: Nov 14, 2018
- Fifth/final web-based session: Submission to the target journals: Dec 5, 2018

The meeting time will be 4-5 pm Arizona Time.

For further details, please see this page: http://bit.ly/2ix99Uo

If you have any questions, contact us at: EducationalTechnology@phoenix.edu

Join us for the Winter 2019 edition as we announce the University of Phoenix presenters slated for the 10th Annual Qualitative Report Conference held in January 2019 at Nova Southeastern University. The conference is the largest and most prominent qualitative research method scholarly convergence.
Join us on the Research Hub for all Center activities, KWBA dates, and new research information!

Research.Phoenix.Edu