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DISCLAIMER

Neither this document, nor any of the information and requirements contained herein, constitute a contract or create any contractual commitments between Capella University and any student, any prospective student, or any third party. The information in this document is subject to change.

This is a provisional form that includes information for milestones 3-5. Milestones 1-2 will be added to this document and learners should check frequently for updates to this guide.
EDD MILESTONE GUIDE

OVERVIEW OF MILESTONES

This document will help you navigate the EdD Doctoral Capstone Project Milestones and estimate the amount of time learners should budget to complete each of them.

MILESTONE TIMELINE

The amount of time a learner spends in each Milestone may vary from learner to learner depending on their work style, academic preparedness, and personal life. The visual below provides a proportional approximation of the amount of time each milestone may require relative to the overall process. The Milestones are not equal in the amount of time and effort it takes to complete each one. It is probably not reasonable to expect to complete the Milestones from beginning to end in less than three quarters. Please note that is an average and some learners can complete faster or take a bit longer depending on a number of variables. For example, the amount of time is takes to receive Proposal Approval in Milestone 2 is not equal to the amount of time, effort, or resources, it takes to develop the deliverable and then write the final report for Milestone 4. Once the learner’s Doctoral Capstone Project is approved by the School (M5), there are still a few weeks to go before the degree is conferred.

A key point for mentors is expectation-setting with mentees. It is important to know all milestones are not created equal and Milestone 4 will take time to develop based on a key theoretical framework and then iterate with the mentor until a final product is ready for their institution and for Capella.

Overview of the EdD Milestones

The Milestones are not mutually exclusive; each one builds upon the previous Milestone. It is an iterative model. For example:

- **For Milestone 1 - Mentor & Program Specialization of Topic and Deliverable**, the learner identifies the topic, how it fits within the specialization, and names the deliverable for the Doctoral Capstone Project.

- **For Milestone 2 - Mentor & School Approval of Capstone Proposal** builds on Milestone 1 in that the learner describes the topic in more detail, provides a framework of literature to support the topic, and proposes a deliverable that will address a problem identified in their setting or organization.

- **To achieve Milestone 3 - Ethics Review & IRB Screening**, the learner demonstrates an understanding of ethical issues in research and how the ethical issues are being addressed in the deliverable.

- **For Milestone 4 - Mentor & Committee Approval**. To complete this Milestone, the learner builds on the framework developed for Milestone 2, and develops both the deliverable and final report, relying heavily on information presented in Milestone 2, where the framework was proposed.

- **Milestone 5 - School Approval of Capstone** is the final School approval of the Capstone Project. The purpose of this approval step is to assure high standards have been met in terms of Doctoral Publication’s standards, doctoral level writing and APA formatting. (For more information on Doctoral Publication standards, refer to [Appendix A of this document](#).)
# MILESTONE PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Major Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Milestone 1 | Mentor & Program Specialization of Topic and Deliverable | - Identify topic  
- Align it with EDD specialization  
- Select type of Deliverable |
| Milestone 2: | Mentor & School Approval of Capstone Proposal | - Elaborate on approved topic  
- Provide background information  
- Develop a theoretical framework  
- Develop work plan  
- Iterate with mentor |
| Milestone 3: | Ethics Review & IRB Screening | - Write Ethics Paper  
- Iterate with mentor  
- Submit for IRB Screening |
| Milestone 4 | Mentor & Committee Approval | - Develop deliverable  
- Iterate with mentor  
- Write final report  
- Submit for Committee Approval  
- Possible iteration with committee |
| Milestone 5 | School Approval of Capstone | - Doctoral Support submits the project for Doctoral Publications Review  
- Doctoral Support submits the project for School Approval  
- Learner makes presentation to Mentor |
| DSC | Process After the School Approval and Presentation | - Once approved, project sent to Dean  
- Once approved, project is uploaded to repository  
- Once uploaded, Degree Audit conducted at the end of the quarter to record the Capstone course.  
- Degree conferred |

## DOCTORAL SUPPORT CENTER

Throughout this document, you will see references to the Doctoral Support Center (DSC). The DSC is a support team that includes Doctoral Publications, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), Doctoral Advising and the Doctoral Success Program (DSP). If you have any questions, email doctoral@capella.edu and your inquiry will be routed to the appropriate DSC team member.

Emailing doctoral@capella.edu is the most effective way to obtain answers to your questions and acquire reliable information. Please note that communication with the DSC should flow through the mentor, not the learner. Learners should contact either their mentor or their advisor for capstone-related information.
**MILESTONE 1 AND 2**

Milestone 1 and 2 information will be updated at a later date. For now capstone learners should refer to the information located on iGuide for milestones 1 and 2.
MILESTONE 3 PART 1: ETHICS REVIEW

This Guide offers learners resources and guidance for the completion of Milestone 3. Learners using this guide should have already achieved topic approval (Milestone 1), Capstone proposal approval (Milestone 2), before carrying out an ethics review in anticipation of Institutional Review Board (IRB) screening and approval (Milestone 3).

Capella University is committed to the responsible conduct of research and fostering research that is both sound and ethical. Capella University carries out its institutional responsibility to respect and protect the rights of individuals involved in research as human participants by facilitating review by the Institutional Review Board (IRB), providing education relating to best practices for safeguarding participants, and engaging in monitoring and quality improvement initiatives. All doctoral projects are required to undergo review by the IRB. Although EdD Doctoral Capstone learners are not conducting traditional research per se, their projects are subject to IRB Screening.

Milestone 3 occurs in two stages:
- Stage 1 - Ethics Review Paper
- Stage 2 - EdD Capstone Ethics Screening (details in chapter 2 of this guide)

STAGE 1: ETHICS REVIEW PAPER – THREE STEPS

1. After completing a draft of the paper, the learner submits the paper for feedback through the assignment dropbox in their Capstone courseroom. This will be an iterative process until the paper meets the criteria in all categories for a “Proficient” rating.

2. The learner also submits their paper to Turnitin and sends the Matching Report to the mentor through the dropbox for Milestone 3. Again, this is an iterative process and the learner may have to make changes to their paper and resubmit it to their mentor for final review. Continue to submit the paper to the dropbox for feedback.

3. When the mentor approves the paper, they will send an Ethics Paper Approval form to the learner. This approval form will be submitted as one of the required documents in the IRB Screening stage.

STAGE 2: IRB SCREENING QUICKGUIDE – SIX STEPS

1. Register for an IRB Manager account. Follow these directions.

2. When you have been successfully registered for an IRB account, login.

3. On the left-side of the screen, click on Doctoral Capstone Screening Form.

4. The Doctoral Capstone Screening form is the ONLY form you should select. The others will take you to full IRB reviews which are not necessary for most Doctoral Capstone Projects.

5. Complete the IRB Screening form.

6. Attach the four required documents (Doctoral Capstone Proposal, Ethics Review Paper, Mentor Approval of Ethics Paper, and Site Permission)

7. Submit the form and attachments to IRB.

CLARIFICATION ABOUT WHY SITE PERMISSION IS NEEDED

Doctoral Capstone (DC) projects cannot be based solely on the literature or on definitions of sites that are essentially conceptual. So, projects cannot be such things as the development of curriculum for or an evaluation of an imaginary program that could be targeted at a type
of institution. An example would be writing a curriculum for 'any undergraduate institution offering general education' or for 'high schools offering STEM programs.' Instead, all DC projects have to occur at or be based on REAL institutions with real people at real points in space and time. Those could be past or present (and in some sense future), but they cannot just be conceptualizations.

Because the DC is based in a real situation, the target audience for the deliverable also has to be real, usually some stakeholder(s) of an actual institution. The DC has to be developed in cooperation with the real stakeholders - whoever they may be - and the learner has to define and delineate exactly who those stakeholders are to be. The cooperation also has to be real i.e. the stakeholders have to know that the DC project is about them, and they therefore have to signify in some written way that they are agreeable to the cooperation.

Thus, in the DC, the IRB term 'site permission' refers to a written agreement from the site of cooperation with the learner. In some cases, depending on the policies of the site, this can be designated as 'site permission' and there are official forms for it. Often, it is simply some written communication that the site has agreed to participate in the DC and to provide access to its resources.

Of course, in the rare instance where data are to be collected from vulnerable populations, the permissions process becomes much more complicated. For the DC, however, learners may want to work toward the simpler and more general situation by avoiding studies that collect data from people. Remember, collecting information from participants in a developmental project is not the same thing as collecting research data from 'subjects.'

WRITING THE PAPER

STAGE ONE: ETHICS REVIEW PAPER

The learner will develop an analysis of ethical principles typically related to any and all professional projects. The expectation of Milestone 3 is that the learner will demonstrate a general understanding of a series of ethical issues that must be considered when planning and carrying out professional projects. This understanding should be rooted in the literature of the professions, and should be applied to the capstone project that the learner intends to undertake. Understanding these ethical issues is an expectation that a professional at the doctoral level should possess. You will develop your paper independent of whether or not your Capstone Project carries with it the need to address these ethical issues.

The five ethical issues are:

1. Human Participant Risk
2. Site Permission
3. Conflict of Interest
4. Intellectual Property
5. Bias

Each ethical issue should include:

1. An overall analysis that should include:
   a. Historical, philosophical, legal, or moral basis that may make up each ethical issue.
   b. Relate each ethical issue to the capstone project
2. An analysis of whether or not the issue is one that the Doctoral Capstone Project will need to address and, if so, how it will be addressed.
3. The analysis will result in an 8-10 page paper that demonstrates a conceptual and practical understanding of the five ethical issues, and the way in which the capstone project will deal with them or an explanation of why the issue is not pertinent to the project.

The paper should include

1. A Cover Sheet
2. An introduction
3. A discussion of the five ethical issues with at least three citations from professional sources for each issue
4. A conclusion
5. References in APA Formatting and Style

Once the paper is complete, the learner will submit the paper to Turnitin and forward the Matching Report to their mentor. Again, this may be an iterative process until necessary changes have been made.

The paper will be assessed by the mentor using the Ethics Paper criteria below. If the paper is graded ‘Proficient’ for all of the criteria and the paper is free of plagiarism the learner will move on to Stage Two. If one or more criteria are graded as less than ‘Proficient’, the paper will be revised until all criteria are met. At that point, the learner will move to Stage Two.

Below are the proficient criteria for the Ethics Review Paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Participant Risk</td>
<td>Discusses ethical concerns relating to human participant risk; explains how such risks pertain to the capstone and identifies strategies for mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Permission</td>
<td>Discusses ethical issues relating to working with sites and the process for obtaining site permission; explains how such ethical issues pertain to the capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>Discusses ethical issues associated with conflicts of interest; explains how such ethical issues pertain to the capstone and identifies strategies for mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Discusses ethical issues relating to intellectual property and provides a specific strategy for addressing such issues within the capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias</td>
<td>Discusses the importance of examining potential bias and provides a strategy for mitigating or managing any personal bias relating to the findings or outcomes of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Organization &amp; Structure</td>
<td>Write with logic, flow, structure, and content focus to cohesively, comprehensively, and clearly explain the ethical issues relating to the capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA and GUM</td>
<td>Write with proper grammar, usage, and APA format and style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ETHICS PAPER REVIEW MATERIAL**

The following material is taken from a variety of iGuide and external resources and is intended to assist learners as they prepare their ethics review. This portion of the study guides provides information for those who have not gone through the CITI review.

**RESEARCH ETHICS EDUCATION THROUGH CITI COMPLETION**

Capella University expects all of its doctoral learners to have a solid understanding of research ethics to design and conduct ethical studies that protect the rights of study participants. Understanding the history of research ethics, including past research abuses of human participants, is essential for the responsible conduct of research. As part of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) (which you likely completed in an earlier course), you learned about the historical events that lead to the development of the Belmont Report and the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46) aka the Common Rule. **If you have already completed the CITI training, after June 2013, you do not have to do it again. If you completed CITI prior to June 2013, you do not need to retake the modules that you took prior to June 2013, but will have to take the new modules added in June 2013. Contact the IRB Office for more information.**

NOTE: While there is no requirement that you re-take the CITI training, you will find it a good refresher for the ethics principles about which you will be writing.

The eight CITI modules provide basic information on the ethical principles and federal regulations that protect human participants in research. Completion of CITI training ensures that researchers and mentors understand key concepts such as informed consent and conflict of interest.

CITI modules may be reviewed and quizzes retaken as many times as needed until a passing score is obtained. For researchers, a minimum score of 85 percent correct overall is required to obtain the certificate of completion for the CITI modules. As you prepare to carry out your ethics review, using the CITI course as a refresher can be of significant benefit.

Complete the required modules and associated quizzes; it works best to complete them in the sequence provided. You may also choose to complete optional modules that are pertinent to your research or may be of interest to you. The Basic Course will require 2-4 hours to complete. You are encouraged to use multiple log-on sessions.

**If you have NOT completed the CITI training:**

1. Go to the [CITI web site](#).
2. Complete the steps to register on the site. For assistance use the [CITI Registration Guide](#).
3. In Select Curriculum, if you not have completed CITI through Capella University before choose, Group 2--Learners in the Basic Course area of section 1.
4. Click No on the following screen (Choose an additional institution).
5. On the next screen under the heading "Capella University," you should see a line that includes "My Courses," "Status," "Voluntary Satisfaction Survey." Click on the link under "Status" that reads "Not Started - Enter."

6. That should bring up a screen that lists the Basic Course modules.

THE FIVE ETHICAL ISSUES

Learners seeking an EdD at Capella and are completing a Doctoral Capstone Project will not be conducting research in a traditional sense. However, it is critical that anyone pursuing a doctoral degree, regardless of whether or not they are conducting a research study or a capstone project, it is important to understand ethical issues associate with research as they advance in their careers.

As you proceed through the five ethical issues, be prepared to discuss the ethical issues at two level:

1. Historical, philosophical, legal, or moral basis that may make up each ethical issue which demonstrates your understanding of the ethical issue as a general concept.

2. Then, relate each ethical issue to the capstone project and describe how the issue will be mitigated if it applies to the project.

IMPORTANT: Refer to the scoring criteria above to review how your paper will be evaluated.

ETHICS ISSUE #1: HUMAN PARTICIPANT RISK

Any capstone project that involves human interaction has some degree of risk for participants. It is important to consider the risks your capstone may present and to minimize these risks. These risks can range from the mere inconvenience of having to participate in a project or grapple with a change to more significant risks associated with greater-than-minimal risk human subjects research.

Capella University is committed to its institutional responsibility to respect and protect the rights and welfare of human participants and their records in research and promoting excellence in research through its commitment to ethical and responsible conduct of research. Ensuring the highest standards of ethical conduct in research and the protection of the rights and welfare of human research participants is a shared responsibility between the Capella University research community, the IRB, and the Dissertation Support Center.

In compliance with the federal-wide assurance on record with the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) within the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Capella University's IRB is established and maintained to ensure that appropriate provisions exist to protect the rights and welfare of human research participants and their records.

In fulfillment of these responsibilities, the IRB reviews all doctoral projects that have a direct bearing on the rights and welfare of the human research participants and their records.

DEFINITION OF A HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

A human research participant is a living individual about whom a researcher (whether professional or student) conducting academic research obtains data through intervention or interaction with the individual or identifiable private information. A human research participant is referred to as a human research subject in federal regulations and guidance material, but referred to as a participant within Capella University resources.

1. Intervention includes both physical procedures by which data is gathered and manipulations of the subject or the subject’s environment that are performed for research purposes.
2. Interaction includes communication or interpersonal contact between researcher and subject.

3. Private information includes information about behavior that occurs in a context in which an individual can reasonably expect that no observation or recording is taking place, and information that has been provided for specific purposes by an individual and which the individual can reasonably expect will not be made public (e.g., a medical record). Private information must be individually identifiable (i.e., the identity of the participant is or may readily be ascertained by the investigator or associated with the information) in order for obtaining the information to constitute research involving human subjects (participants).

CAPELLA POLICY 3.03.01 HUMAN RESEARCH PROTECTIONS

All learners conducting academic research under the program requirements at Capella University, including all doctoral learners conducting dissertation research and all employees or agents conducting academic research pursuant to institutionally designated authority or responsibility of Capella, are required to obtain Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval prior to beginning research-related interactions with human participants/subjects and/or their records.

They are also required to comply with the policies and procedures outlined in Capella University’s Human Research Protections (HRP) Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

In the review and conduct of academic research involving human participants and/or their records, Capella University’s IRB is guided by the ethical principles established in the Title 45 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46, the Nuremberg Code, Declaration of Helsinki, and The Belmont Report. Also, Capella’s IRB must review all research proposals in accordance with the policies and procedures outlined in Capella University’s Human Research Protections (HRP) Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs).

Researchers should review both the HRP SOPs and Capella Policy 03.03.01 in full.

RESOURCES

- University Policy 03.03.01 Human Research Protections

THE CRITERION FOR A PROFICIENT RESPONSE

Discusses ethical concerns relating to human participant risk; explains how such risks pertain to the capstone and identifies strategies for mitigation.

ETHICS ISSUE #2: SITE PERMISSION

Capella University requires researchers to secure site permission for research conducted at institutions and organizations such as universities, schools, hospitals, clinics, businesses, non-profit organizations, and military organizations. Permission is also required if you obtain data or participant contact information from a site.

Researchers may submit their IRB materials to the IRB without the letter of permission, but will not obtain full IRB approval until site permission has been obtained. To be considered sufficient, site permission letters must be:

1. Written on the organization's official letterhead.
2. Signed by an authorized official within the organization (authorized officials will vary by site, but generally is director level or above).
3. Dated within six months of IRB submission.
KEEP IN MIND THE FOLLOWING WHEN OBTAINING SITE PERMISSION

Consider feasibility when exploring potential research sites. Be familiar with how to obtain site permission, network with key stakeholders at the site, and have several sites in mind for your research. Though the signed permission letter must be dated within six months of IRB submission, you need to explore site permission early in the milestone process to avoid delays at IRB review.

Be certain to consult the IRB Feasibility Guidance as navigating these processes can be challenging and if not planned for appropriately can cause significant delays in your project implementation and IRB approval.

If the site has an IRB or formal research review process, you may be required to obtain IRB approval from the site. Contact the IRB Office for guidance on negotiating this process.

You must determine who has the authority to grant permission to conduct research at the site. Failing to obtain appropriate permission can be considered a form of misconduct and could put your study at risk.

It is important to adhere to all policies and procedures relating to obtaining permission to conduct research at the site. Capella's IRB may require you to submit additional documentation (such as organizational charts or policies and procedures) or may consult with the site directly to verify that the appropriate permissions have been obtained.

RESOURCES

- iGuide – IRB Site Permissions

The criterion for a proficient response: Discusses ethical issues relating to working with sites and the process for obtaining site permission; explains how such ethical issues pertain to the capstone.

ETHICS ISSUE #3: CONFLICT OF INTEREST

It is important to determine and disclose any conflicts of interest presented by your capstone and to develop a strategy for addressing the conflicts. A potential conflict of interest in research occurs whenever you have competing interests that may impact your judgments and decisions, personal bias, or an investment in obtaining particular findings.

You may also have a conflict of interest if you stand to benefit financially from your research. Conflicts of interest are often the result of dual roles. For example, conducting research within your workplace or with your clients or employees. If unaddressed, conflicts of interest may lead to an increased risk of harm to research participants and can undermine the validity of your research findings.

There are two strategies for addressing conflicts of interest in research:

1. Eliminate the conflict of interest. Whenever possible, the best course of action is to eliminate the conflict of interest. For instance, conducting research in your workplace creates a conflict of interest. The most effective way to handle such a conflict is to eliminate it by conducting research at a site where you do not have an affiliation.

2. Reduce and manage the conflict of interest. When a researcher cannot eliminate the conflict of interest, he or she should take appropriate measures to reduce and manage it. For instance, a researcher conducting research at his or her workplace might recruit participants from a department in which she has no affiliations or interactions. In such cases, it is very important to disclose the conflict and give participants the opportunity to determine whether or not to participate without undue influence.
It is important that you familiarize yourself with Capella's Conflict of Interest Policy and to manage the potential conflict.

RESOURCES:
- Capella IRB Site on iGuide
- Conflict of Interest Guidance

THE CRITERION FOR A PROFICIENT RESPONSE
Discusses ethical issues associated with conflicts of interest; explains how such ethical issues pertain to the capstone and identifies strategies for mitigation.

ETHICAL ISSUE #4: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

It is important to grapple with issues of intellectual property when working on your capstone project and to discuss these issues with your site. What challenges do you foresee related to intellectual property and how will these be addressed?

According to the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), Intellectual Property (IP), “...refers to creations of the mind, such as inventions; literary and artistic works; designs; and symbols, names and images used in commerce.”

WIPO has excellent resources for understanding IP, copyright, and industrial property. They also have a WIPO Intellectual Property Handbook, which offers a comprehensive guide to the policy, law, and use of IP.

If you are developing a research monograph or an evaluation, the expectation is that you will develop a publishable paper. If you are developing a professional product, there is no requirement for publishing your product. However, the professional doctorate carries with it the expectation that you have the knowledge about how to publish your work whether it is a research paper or monograph or a “turnkey” project. A turnkey project is a project ready to be distributed to the professional community to be used in their setting.

In addition to being aware of IP considerations, ethical considerations should be taken into account. The publisher Wiley provides a free resource called Best Practices Guidelines on Publishing Ethics. This resource includes information about research integrity, ethics in journal articles, editorial standards, etc.

RESOURCES:
- World Intellectual Property Organization

THE CRITERION FOR A PROFICIENT RESPONSE
Discusses ethical issues relating to intellectual property and provides a specific strategy for addressing such issues within the capstone.

ETHICAL ISSUE #5: BIAS

It is important to acknowledge your bias and determine a strategy for managing it as you carry out your capstone. When creating a project to address real issues in authentic settings, both implicit and explicit biases are important to address. The resources suggested for this ethical issue will be helpful to you as you explore the concept of biases.

The Capella Library’s statement on bias is helpful to learners:

Researchers sometimes demonstrate significant bias, which undermines the integrity of their findings and decreases the likelihood that the study will contribute meaningfully to the field. Your school and the IRB will take into account whether you will be able to achieve unbiased results, based on whether you evidence bias in your research plan.
and have in place a plan to manage any bias. You should select a different topic if your bias cannot be managed and you believe you already know the answers to your research questions. (Capella Library, nd)

RESOURCES

- Addressing Implicit Bias
- Gender Identity/Variance
- Implicit Bias
- Sociocultural Biases and Discrimination
- Stereotypes and Prejudices

THE CRITERION FOR A PROFICIENT RESPONSE

Discusses the importance of examining potential bias and provides a strategy for mitigating or managing any personal bias relating to the findings or outcomes of the project.

SCHOLARLY WRITING

The paper you submit should be free of mechanical and grammatical errors and written in a manner that reflects a personal commitment to professional excellence that meets the criteria for Capella University’s expectation for graduate learners. Organize your paper using a logical structure that transitions from one section to the next. Include an introduction and conclusion that contribute to the understanding of the paper.
MILESTONE 3 PART 2: IRB SCREENING

INTRODUCTION

Capella University’s IRB uses IRBManager, a third party system, to manage the IRB process. Applications in IRBManager are web-based forms (called xforms). The IRB applications have built in skip logic and supplemental questions, meaning that answers to some questions/sets of questions are only required based on your study design.

The IRB screens all capstone projects to determine the level of IRB review, if any, required by the federal regulations. Studies that involve greater than minimal risk to participants require a robust review by the full IRB committee. Minimal risk studies, including those that involve existing records, tend to present fewer ethical concerns, but are still reviewed by the IRB regulations.

Studies that involve greater than minimal risk to participants require a robust review by the full IRB committee. Minimal risk studies, including those that involve existing records, tend to present fewer ethical concerns, but are still reviewed by the IRB. Studies with significant risk may not be appropriate for novice dissertation researchers.

To complete Stage Two, have the following documents ready to submit:

- The approved capstone proposal
- The completed and approved ethics review paper
- Mentor Approval of Ethics Review paper
- The signed site agreement or a description of the process you will use to secure it.

STEPS

1. Complete the EdD Capstone Screening Form, providing all of the necessary supporting documentation.

2. Your Screening Form will be reviewed within approximately 5 business days. The IRB will determine if your study meets the criteria for human subject research or not.

3. If the IRB determines that your does not involve human subjects research, no further action is required, and you may proceed to Milestone 4, the carrying out of your capstone project and the creation of your deliverable. You and your mentor will receive a notification to this effect.

4. If your study does involve human subjects research, the IRB will provide you with instruction on how to complete the IRB Application. Your IRB Application will have to be reviewed and receive approval before you may move onto milestone 4.

REGISTER FOR IRBMANAGER AND COMPLETE THE EDD CAPSTONE SCREENING FORM.


Tips for registering for IRBManager: Follow these instructions.

- Use your primary email address
- Have your learner ID handy as you will need it during the registration process

Once you have registered, you will access and complete the Doctoral Capstone Screening Form:

1. Login to IRBManager
2. Follow these instructions.

3. Under ‘actions’ in the left hand navigation window, click on Doctoral Capstone Screening Form.

4. Complete the form. Be prepared to attach the following:
   a. Proposal Form
   b. Ethics Review Paper
   c. Approval of Ethics Review Paper from Mentor (in Appendix A)
   d. Site permission on letterhead

5. Once you’ve completed the form, submit the form by using the submit button on the last page of the form.

6. The IRB Office will review your screening form to determine if IRB Review is necessary.

**SUBMITTING AN IRB APPLICATION OR RECORDS BASED RESEARCH APPLICATION**

You will receive an email from the IRB Office if you need to complete the IRB application (or Records Based Research Application). Follow the instructions for how to complete the application given in that email. It is important to follow these instructions. The IRB will inform you which application you need to complete.

If your study is determined to involve human subjects participants, you must complete the IRB Application to obtain IRB approval to conduct your capstone.

**RESOURCES:**

- Tips for completing the IRB Application
- Site Permission Guidance
- Recruitment
- Informed Consent

**MILESTONE 3: COURSEROOM RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEARNERS AND MENTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Responsibilities</th>
<th>Mentor Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completes an ethics review of the proposed doctoral capstone in accordance with program requirements.</td>
<td>Grades the Ethics Review and returns it to learner via the u03a1 assignment drop box area until it meets mentor requirements for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submits completed ethics review to u03a1 assignment area.</td>
<td>Provides learner with Ethics Review Mentor Approval Form, found in instructor resources for this course, to submit with the IRB Screening form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews u03s2 While You Wait recommendations while awaiting feedback.</td>
<td>Assists learner in completing IRB Screening form, as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews mentor feedback, revises and resubmits ethics review as necessary.</td>
<td>Reviews IRB determination and assists learner in determining and completing next steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once mentor has approved ethics review, completes IRB screening form in IRB manager. Uploads approved proposal/research plan, ethics review, ethics review approval form, and site</td>
<td>If learner’s doctoral capstone is determined by IRB to involve human subject research, assists learner in completing the IRB Application, as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Responsibilities</td>
<td>Mentor Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permission within IRB screening form.</td>
<td>necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awaits IRB determination. The IRB may determine that additional revisions are needed to the screening form or attached materials, that the capstone does not involve human subject research and that IRB screening requirements have been met, or that the capstone involves human subject research and requires additional IRB review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revises and submits IRB screening form as necessary according to IRB instructions. Consults IRB by e-mailing <a href="mailto:irb@capella.edu">irb@capella.edu</a> if clarification is needed concerning next steps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If doctoral capstone is determined to involve human subject research, completes IRB application in accordance with IRB's instructions. Verifies that Milestone 3 has been updated on the milestone transcript 3-5 days following notification of having met IRB requirements or obtained IRB approval. Contacts <a href="mailto:irb@capella.edu">irb@capella.edu</a> if milestone has not been updated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: Obtaining proposal/research plan approval will likely require multiple reviews of your work by your mentor and the school and you should expect several rounds of revision of your work.
MILESTONE 4: MENTOR & COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Milestone 4 is a three-step process:

The Doctoral Capstone Project consists of two parts: the Deliverable and the Final Project.

1. Learner Develops Doctoral Capstone Project
2. The Deliverable
3. The Final Report
4. Mentor Reviews and Approves the Project.
5. The Deliverable
6. The Final Report
7. Mentor Submits Doctoral Capstone Project to the Committee (both parts)

STEP 1: LEARNER DEVELOPS DOCTORAL CAPSTONE PROJECT (MENTOR REVIEWS THE PROJECT & TURNITIN MATCHING REPORT)

The two components of Milestone 4 are the deliverable and the final report. These two components are referred to as the Doctoral Capstone Project. The mentor will work iteratively with the learner to develop the Deliverable and final report and when the Doctoral Capstone Project has met the guidelines for the Deliverable and the Final Report, the mentor will approve it for Milestone 4.

The audiences are different for each part:

- The audience for the deliverable is the learner’s setting or organization. For that audience, the focus is on the professional finish, the practicality, and the immediacy of usefulness of the deliverable for improving the institution.
- The audience for the final report is the Capella academic community. For that audience, the focus is on the scholarly background of the project, the detailed step-by-step account of the development of the deliverable, and an explanation of how the deliverable will improve the institution and the profession.

Important: Learners should use the EdD Doctoral Final Report template with fidelity and use Turnitin to ensure appropriate use of summarizing, paraphrasing, direct quoting, and source citation.

TURNITIN (TII)

Before the mentor submits the Doctoral Capstone Project for Screening, the learner should submit their Doctoral Capstone Report to Turnitin. The Turnitin link can be found in the course room. The mentor should review the Matching Report and have the learner address any issues. For example, deliverables may contain links to Internet resources that are intended to direct users to resources. Often, these links are described briefly using words taken from the resource. Turnitin will count such words toward an Internet percentage unless the words are enclosed in quotes and cited. The link itself is NOT a legitimate citation. Adding quotes and a citation will solve this problem.

Consult the TurnItIn tutorials for assistance using Turnitin, click here.

Refer to these resources for more Turnitin information.

- Revising Plagiarized Text
- It’s Not About the Number
Mentor Tip: It is important to review the Turnitin report to ensure the document is free from plagiarism (intentional or unintentional). Incorrect paraphrasing is the most noted issue seen in the Turnitin report so careful screening of the report is critical.

**DELIVERABLE RESOURCES**

Research Paper
- [Action Research Monograph](#)
- [Evaluation](#)

Professional Product
- [Change Management Plan](#)
- [Curriculum](#)

The deliverable is typically developed before the report is written. However, sometimes the two parts are developed simultaneously. The deliverables can be either a Research Paper or a Professional Product.

- The two options for the Research Paper are the:
  - Action Research Monograph and
  - Evaluation Paper
- The two options for the Professional Product are:
  - Change Management Plan
  - Curriculum

Note: Doctoral Publications does not review Deliverables (Doctoral Publications only reviews the Final Report). However, the deliverable must be professional, according to standards acceptable to the professional setting or organization for whom the deliverable is being developed and based on a model.

**FINAL REPORT RESOURCES**

For more information about guidelines for the final report, refer to iGuide. The final report will be held to the highest doctoral level writing standards with precise alignment to APA formatting. The learners must follow the EdD Capstone Report Template. The final report must contain an abstract and three major sections. While there is no required minimum or maximum length for the Final Report sections, the level of depth and rigor of each report section needs to be generally equivalent to a dissertation chapter.

The mentor might consider suggesting the learners seek out an editor to read the final copy of the report to check for errors such as logic and flow, formatting, grammar, word usage, and mechanics. It’s important to clarify that Capella does not endorse any specific outside editing services and cannot guarantee the quality of the services provided; additionally, use of an outside editor does not guarantee that a learner’s work will be more readily approved.”

Even though the learners are not writing a dissertation, the suggestions are appropriate for the Doctoral Capstone Report. The following guidelines should be followed for the final report.

**GENERAL FORMATTING**

- The learner should observe APA formatting throughout the paper.
• **Font:** Times New Roman in a 12-point font is recommended. Use the same font throughout the manuscript (but see the discussion of text in tables in Chapter 2 of the APA Manual). Do not use ornamental font elements or script fonts. Do not use boldface or underlining for emphasis.

• **Margins:** To make sure that page numbers and other text are not too close to the edge of the page, writers are encouraged to use the Doctoral Capstone Template.

• **Refer to the most current Final Report Template for specific formatting.**

**MENTOR REVIEWS DOCTORAL CAPSTONE PROJECT (DELIVERABLE AND FINAL REPORT)**

• During critical junctures the mentor will review and provide constructive feedback to the learner. The feedback should be based on the Deliverable Guidelines, Report Guidelines, the Report Template, and the Milestone 4 Rubric.

• Refer learners to the [Capella Writing Resources](#) as needed.

• The mentor should be very familiar with the Milestone 4 Rubric as both the mentor and the committee will use it to evaluate the Doctoral Capstone project.

• In addition to understanding the Milestone 4 Rubric, mentors should have an understanding of what the expectations are before submitting the project for a Pre-Screening consultation (see below).

**STEP 2: COMMITTEE REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Specialization Chair or their designee provides the names of committee members.

• The mentor will send the final report and the deliverable to the committee members.

• Committee members will use the Milestone 4 Rubrics to evaluate the Doctoral Capstone Project. (Both parts - the final report and the deliverable).

• The role of the Doctoral Capstone Committee is similar to that of the Dissertation Committee. The two Doctoral Capstone Committee members are encourage to assist the mentor as needed. The Committee members also serve as reader/reviewer(s) of the finished document. They review the Deliverable and the Final Report and assess whether or not they meet the Proficient level of the Milestone 4 rubrics.

• For each part of the Project, the Reviewer can:
  • Approve the Doctoral Capstone Report and/or Deliverable
  • Defer and ask for major revisions to the Report and/or Deliverable. Mentor will then need to resubmit the appropriate part(s) to the committee members.
  • Conditionally Approve with minor revisions to be made with the Mentor as noted on the document(s) and rubrics – does not have to be resubmitted.

• The Committee Reviewer should send the approval form and documents back to the mentor.

• Asking for major revisions and a resubmission requires the Reviewer to provide formative feedback to the learner in the form of not only what is wrong, but also what needs to be done to bring about improvement. If you have made comments in the actual documents, return the documents along with the rubric form to the mentor.
• If the committee members ask for revisions to the Capstone Project, it is the mentor’s responsibility to work with the learner and the committee to reach consensus to attain Milestone 4 approval.
  o The mentor will continue to resubmit revised capstone to the committee for re-review until capstone has been approved.
• If issues arise and consensus cannot be reached between committee members, the mentor should consult with the Specialization Chair for advice.

Use the two rubric grade recording forms below to record your scores of the learner’s Doctoral Capstone (Final Report with Deliverable). The full rubrics are below the scoring forms at the end of the document.

Include comments on the scoring forms to assist the learner in meeting the proficient criteria. Return this form to the mentor (via email).

DELIVERABLE SCORING GUIDE FOR MENTOR AND COMMITTEE

Must Receive a Proficient rating for all five criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proficient Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Components</td>
<td>Meets the structural requirements of the school for the capstone deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Requirements</td>
<td>Meets the academic requirements of the school for the capstone deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic and Flow</td>
<td>Writes with logic, flow, structure, and content-focus to cohesively, comprehensively, and clearly explains the capstone and present the deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and APA</td>
<td>Writes with proper grammar, usage, and APA format and style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing</td>
<td>Writes with proper paragraph development, transitions, and academic tone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FINAL REPORT SCORING GUIDE FOR MENTOR AND COMMITTEE

Must Receive a Proficient rating for all eleven criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Proficient Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structural Requirements</td>
<td>Meets the academic requirements of the school for the capstone report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Requirements</td>
<td>Meets the academic requirements of the school for the capstone report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Basis</td>
<td>Describes the theoretical basis for the capstone, drawing on theories appropriate to the specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command of the Literature</td>
<td>Demonstrates a command of the scholarly literature related to the capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and Impact</td>
<td>Explains the significance and impact of the completed capstone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Proficient Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Described</td>
<td>Describes the problem that was solved with clarity and comprehensiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Use</td>
<td>Uses data appropriately in accordance with the type of capstone deliverable, demonstrating the need for and impact of the capstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Rationale</td>
<td>Provides outcomes/findings and recommendations related to the problem statement or research question that appropriately demonstrate scholarly rationale and evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic &amp; Flow</td>
<td>Writes with logic, flow, structure, and content focus to cohesively, comprehensively, and clearly explain the capstone and present the deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar and APA</td>
<td>Writes with proper grammar, usage, and APA format and style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Writing</td>
<td>Writes with proper paragraph development, transitions, and academic tone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MENTOR SUBMITS APPROVED DOCTORAL CAPSTONE PROJECT

When the committee members approve the project, the mentor submits it to doctoral@capella.edu to begin the process of Milestone 5 review.

The body of the email for Milestone 4 approval should read:

Learner Last Name, Learner First Name has received committee approval for Milestone 4. Please update Milestone 4 and submit the attached document(s) to Doctoral Publications for review. Thank you. Mentor’s Name

Include the following attachments:
- Doctoral Capstone Final Report
- Deliverable
- Rubrics from both committee members

GRADUATION

When Milestone 4 is approved the learner should apply for graduation. Learners will receive a notice from the Graduation Office once they have been approved for graduation and may attend commencement.

COMMENCEMENT

When learners have been approved for graduation, they may choose to attend the commencement ceremony. The learners must RSVP to let Capella know they will be attending commencement.

This is the time to manage expectations. The processes that take place for Milestone five can take several weeks after Milestone 4 has been achieved. The mentor will receive instructions for Milestone 5 processes that involve actions on the part of the mentor or learner.
If mentors have questions about where a learner is in the Milestone process, email the Doctoral Success Center. If a learner wants to know where they stand, they should contact their doctoral advisor.

If learners have questions, they should contact their mentor or advisor.

**MILESTONE 4: COURSEROOM RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEARNERS AND MENTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Responsibilities</th>
<th>Mentor Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Completes capstone deliverable in accordance with program requirements.</td>
<td>• Grades the capstone deliverable and reviews Turnitin Originality Report submitted to the u04a1 assignment area for mentor review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submits deliverable as a draft to Turnitin. (Find Turnitin under Course Tools in the left navigation bar.)</td>
<td>• Grades the capstone report and reviews Turnitin Originality Report submitted to the u04a2 assignment area and returns it to learner via the assignment drop box area until it meets expectations for mentor approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submits Turnitin Originality Report with deliverable to the u04a1 assignment area for mentor review.</td>
<td>• When the work is ready to be reviewed by the committee, the mentor will send the Final Report and the Deliverable, and the rubrics to the committee members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Begins work on capstone report while awaiting feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews mentor feedback, revises and resubmits until capstone deliverable meets expectations for mentor approval.</td>
<td>The mentor then:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submits capstone report as a draft to Turnitin. (Find Turnitin under Course Tools in the left navigation bar.)</td>
<td>• Reviews committee feedback and, if need be, negotiates with committee to come to consensus about the revisions needed. Engages chair if reasonable consensus cannot be achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submits Turnitin Originality Report with capstone report to the u04a2 assignment area for mentor review.</td>
<td>• Synthesizes and shares feedback with learner via private group and conference call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews mentor feedback, revises and resubmits until capstone report meets expectations for mentor approval.</td>
<td>• Resubmits revised capstone to committee members for re-review until capstone has been approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirms that mentor has submitted capstone deliverable and report for review by committee.</td>
<td>Once the mentor and both committee members have approved the project, the mentor:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews committee feedback, revises and resubmits to mentor for routing for review by committee until approval is obtained. Submits committee-approved capstone report and deliverable in the u04a3 assignment area. Your mentor will validate that you have met the requirements for Milestone 4 Completion by checking the Yes box in the scoring checklist to indicate that Milestone 4 has been completed.</td>
<td>• Validates that committee has approved Capstone Report and Deliverable in the u04a3 assignment area by checking the Yes box in the scoring checklist to indicate that Milestone 4 has been completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verifies that Milestone 4 has been updated on the Milestone transcript 2-3</td>
<td>• Submit committee approved capstone to <a href="mailto:Doctoral@Capella.edu">Doctoral@Capella.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Subject line: (specialization) CAP Milestone 4 Approval for Learner Last,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Responsibilities</td>
<td>Mentor Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| days after uploading documentation to assignment area. Contacts mentor and advisor if milestone has not been updated.  
  • Following completion of Milestone 4, submits an application for graduation. | **Learner First**  
  • **Body of email:** (Learner Last), (Learner First) ID number, has received mentor and committee approval for Milestone 4. Please update Milestone 4 and Specialization Chair's name:  
  • **Attachments:**  
    • Approved Report and Deliverable, which includes Statement of Original Work.  
    • Committee member approval forms. |

**Note:** Obtaining capstone approval will likely require multiple reviews of your work by your mentor and committee and you should expect several rounds of revision of your work.
Milestone 5 has three steps.

1. The first step is for the learner to prepare the Doctoral Capstone report for publication by reviewing the feedback from the Doctoral Publications team and making the necessary revisions to the report.

2. The second step is to gain school approval for the doctoral capstone project.

3. The third is for the learner to complete a presentation to their mentor about the doctoral capstone project. Note: the learner should work on the presentation while awaiting the results of the reviews described in steps 1 and 2.

STEP 1: DOCTORAL PUBLICATIONS REVIEW

Upon receipt of the committee-approved capstone, the Doctoral Success Center (DSC) staff sends the capstone report to Capella’s Doctoral Publications Team for review to ensure it is ready for publication, which includes a review for consistency with APA standards. The report is also checked for identifying information, which might put the site or participants at risk, and run through Turnitin to ensure academic integrity. Note – the deliverable is NOT reviewed – only the report. The initial review of the report can take up to 14 days.

When the Doctoral Publications Team completes the review, the report will be returned to the learner and mentor along with notes about the revisions needed. Instructions will be provided for revising and resubmitting the report. In some cases, the report will be deferred, which means the Doctoral Publications Team will want to review the report a second time prior to approval. In other cases, the report will be approved, which means that the Doctoral Publications Team will not need to review it a second time. However, even in these cases, additional revisions will likely be required to ensure the doctoral capstone report is ready for publication. Mentors will work with the learner to make revisions and should validate that all of the revisions requested by the Doctoral Publications Team have been completed. The final revised capstone report should be submitted back to the Doctoral Success Center so that it can be subsequently sent for school approval.

STEP 2: SCHOOL APPROVAL

The DSC will send the doctoral capstone project, including the final report and the deliverable, to the school’s designee for School Approval. The rubrics used to evaluate the project for Milestone 5 are the same ones the committee uses for Milestone 4. While the learner is waiting for school approval, the learner should create their final presentation.

STEP 3: DOCTORAL CAPSTONE PROJECT PRESENTATION

After the Doctoral Capstone Project receives school approval, the learner will prepare a presentation outlining capstone findings and recommendations. The purpose of the presentation is to showcase the Doctoral Capstone project. The learner will develop a cogent presentation that synthesizes the rationale, theoretical framework and scholarly literature that served as the foundation for the deliverable. Information presented should include the data used for decision-making throughout the development process. A systematic description of the identified problem and the data used to demonstrate the need for the project should be included to provide the background and context for the project. The presentation should include the significance and the intended project impact accompanied by a discussion of the findings and recommendations. The presentation should follow effective design principles and represent doctoral level work with clear organization, logic and flow.
After the learner develops the presentation, it should be submitted to the mentor for feedback through the assignment dropbox in the courseroom. This can be an iterative process. When the presentation is finalized, the learner should schedule a conference call with the mentor in a Connect Meeting Room to deliver the capstone presentation in preparation for delivery to key stakeholders.

As an option, the mentor should consider inviting the committee members to attend the final presentation conference call. The conference call could present the opportunity for the mentor and the committee members the opportunity to congratulate the learner on accomplishments as showcased in the Doctoral Capstone Presentation. The mentor grades the presentation using the Mentor Approval of Capstone Presentation Scoring Guide.

The Presentation Rubric can be found in the courseroom. The learner must earn a “Proficient” rating on all nine criteria. The criteria for attaining a proficient rating are:

1. Presentation demonstrates the learner’s command of the scholarly literature related to the capstone.
2. Presentation describes the theoretical basis for the capstone, drawing on theories appropriate to the specialization.
3. Presentation explains the significance and impact of the completed capstone.
4. Presentation describes the problem that was solved with clarity and comprehensiveness.
5. Presentation uses data appropriately in accordance with the type of capstone deliverable, demonstrating the need for and impact of the capstone.
6. Presentation provides outcomes, findings, and recommendations related to the problem statement or research question that appropriately demonstrate scholarly rationale and evidence.
7. Presentation materials represent doctoral-level work including quality design, good organization, appropriate citations, and consistent formatting.
8. Presentation delivery represents doctoral-level work including clear communication, logical flow, conciseness, scholarly tone, and appropriate pace.
9. Presenter is able to address questions in a clear and coherent manner

*The questions are the questions that the mentor and/or committee members ask.

Important: Please note, the key stakeholder’s presentation is not graded but is an important part of the capstone process. The learner schedules the presentation and, if appropriate and schedules permit, the mentor may be able to participate in the presentation to key stakeholders.

REMAINING IN THE CAPSTONE COURSEROOM

When learners receive a notice that they have passed Milestone 5, School Approval, learners no longer have to register for a capstone course for the next quarter. However, learners have to remain enrolled in their current capstone course as a participating member of the course. Participation can be tracked if learners participate in discussions.

In order to pass the final degree audit, the learner’s transcript must reflect a passing grade on the final capstone course. Department of Education rules indicate that learners must maintain ongoing participation in order to remain enrolled in a course; as a result, learners must continue to participate through the end of the quarter in order to remain enrolled and receive the final grade necessary to pass the degree audit.
An ideal role for the learners during this period is to engage in peer mentoring in the courseroom with learners coming through the system.

**SEQUENCE OF EVENTS AFTER SCHOOL APPROVAL AND PRESENTATION**

After school approval, the rest of the processes take place largely behind the scenes. The DSC shepherds the doctoral capstone project through most of the next steps.

1. Dean’s Approval
2. Uploading the Doctoral Capstone Report to the Repository
3. Degree Audit and Conferral

Keep in mind that when School Approval is obtained for Milestone 5, the three steps that follow can take several more weeks to complete. It is important to understand that it will still be a number of weeks until the degree is conferred and the diploma is mailed.

Protocols such as the degree audit are standard in higher education and are necessary to uphold academic integrity and ensure the value of the degree.

**DEAN’S APPROVAL**

Once the learner has obtained School approval, the doctoral capstone project will be sent by DSC staff to be approved by the Dean of the school. This typically takes ten days.

**UPLOADING TO THE REPOSITORY**

When the Dean has approved the doctoral capstone project, DSC staff will upload the doctoral capstone report to the University’s repository on the learner’s behalf. Only the report is uploaded to the repository, not the deliverable.

**DEGREE AUDIT**

After the doctoral capstone report is uploaded, the learner will go through a degree audit to ensure that all program requirements are met before the degree is be conferred. The degree audit team reviews the learner’s transcript to ensure that all course and credit requirements have been fulfilled and also validates the completion of the capstone by checking the milestone transcript. The degree audit could be more than 20 days. In rare cases (if the learner is short credit needed for conferral, for example), a compliance audit may also be undertaken as part of this final audit, which could add an additional 10 days to the process. The mentor does not have to manage any of this process.

**DEGREE CONFERRED**

When the audit is complete and there are no issues, the degree will be conferred. The learner will be able to access their unofficial transcripts online or request official ones, and the learner will receive their diploma several weeks from the date of conferral. If there are issues, Capella will work with the learner to bring about a resolution. Please keep in mind that after Milestone 5 is approved, there is still a lengthy Capella process before the degree is conferred. The degree will be conferral in the last month of the quarter in which all degree requirements have been met.

**MILESTONE 5: RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEARNERS AND MENTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Responsibilities</th>
<th>Mentor Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be sure that you have submitted an application for graduation!</td>
<td>Step 1 - Doctoral Publications Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Approval of Capstone</td>
<td>• Note: The DSC will submit the committee-approved work for Doctoral Publication once it has been received from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Responsibilities</td>
<td>Mentor Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1 - Doctoral Publications Review</strong></td>
<td>the mentor following committee approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confirms that mentor has submitted the committee-approved capstone to the DSC.</td>
<td>• Shares Doctoral Publication Team decision and feedback with learner via private group and conference call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews u05s3 University Doctoral Capstone Audit while awaiting feedback.</td>
<td>• Provides feedback on revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews Doctoral Publications Team feedback on capstone report.</td>
<td>• Resubmits the revised work to <a href="mailto:doctoral@capella.edu">doctoral@capella.edu</a> for routing for re-review (if initially deferred), or for School review (if initially approved).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revises and resubmits to mentor for review until revisions have been finalized and mentor routes for re-review (if initially deferred) or for School review (if initially approved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2 - School Approval</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews u05s3 University Doctoral Capstone Audit while awaiting feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews school feedback on capstone, revises and resubmits to mentor for routing for review by school until approval is obtained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Verifies that Milestone 5 has been updated on the Milestone transcript 3-5 days following notification of having obtained school approval. Contacts <a href="mailto:doctoral@capella.edu">doctoral@capella.edu</a> if milestone has not been updated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Obtaining school approval will likely require multiple reviews of your work by your school and you should expect several rounds of revision of your work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3: Final Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepares presentation outlining capstone findings and recommendations, in accordance with program requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schedules conference call with mentor to deliver capstone presentation in preparation for delivery to key stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attends conference call and delivers presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Submits completed presentation materials to the u05a1 assignment area for mentor review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviews mentor feedback on presentation, revises and resubmits until presentation meets expectations for mentor approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When submitting for re-review:

- **Subject line:** (specialization) CAP Milestone 5 Resubmission for Learner Last, Learner First
- **Body of email:** (Learner Last), (Learner First) ID number, Specialization chair:
- **Attachments:** revised Report and Deliverable, which includes Statement of Original Work.

<p>| <strong>Step 3: Final Presentation</strong> | |
| • Attends conference call with learner to preview capstone presentation. | |
| • Grades the presentation based on observations of presentation and review of materials and provides feedback to learner via the u05a1 assignment drop box area until presentation meets expectations for mentor approval. | |
| • Participates in presentation to key stakeholders if feasible (optional). | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Responsibilities</th>
<th>Mentor Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Delivers final presentation to key stakeholders. Note that key stakeholder presentation is not graded but is an important part of the capstone process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A: FINAL REPORT FORMATTING ISSUES

REMINDER: Learners should use the EdD Doctoral Final Report template with fidelity and use TurnItIn to ensure appropriate use of summarizing, paraphrasing, direct quoting, and source citation.

Another good resource for the learners is the Dissertation Format Guidelines. So, you are asking yourself why to refer to a dissertation resource for a Doctoral Capstone Project. Before you decide it is not an appropriate resource, let’s take a look at the information in the manual and you might find that much of it directly relates to the Doctoral Capstone. Learners will benefit from the things that are applicable to them.

Chapter 1 contains the “nuts-and-bolts” overview for formatting, beginning with the title page and ending with the appendix. Sample pages illustrate page margins, headings, lists, block quotes, and the reference list. Many Doctoral Capstone Projects need this guidance.

Chapter 2 discusses formatting tables and figures. This chapter, too, includes illustrative samples and tips for formatting tables and figures. Many Doctoral Capstone Projects need this guidance.

Chapter 3 covers copyright compliance. There is much attention in the publishing world on issues of plagiarism, accidental plagiarism, and ownership of intellectual property. Writers planning to incorporate tables, figures, or surveys from outside sources will find this chapter crucial, but all writers should be well versed in copyright issues. Many Doctoral Capstone Projects need this guidance.

Chapter 4 highlights two critical ethical issues in the dissertation: the protection of human participants and keeping information confidential. Many Doctoral Capstone Projects need this guidance.

Chapter 5 covers frequently asked questions, such as why APA and Capella guidelines sometimes differ; common problems, such as working in Word; trouble spots noted by the Capella editors; a list of useful resources for writers; proofreading tips; and a final checklist.

Learner might find the Revisions Toolbox below not only helpful for any revisions but for developing the Doctoral Capstone Report from the beginning.

Revisions Toolbox

- Brief Overview of Source Citations
- Creating and Using a Style Sheet
- Site DE identification Guidelines
- Summarizing and Paraphrasing
- Revising Plagiarized Text Using TurnItIn
- TurnItIn: It is not about the number
- Revising Your Own Writing
- Working With a Usage Manual
- Writing Ethics: Plagiarism
- Fixing the Page Numbering in the Dissertation
- Reprinting Copyrighted Materials in the Dissertation
- Revising the Manuscript After the Format Editing Review
- What is the Dissertation Format Editing Review?