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The Ed.D. at Sacramento State

Executive Order 991, effective September 26, 2006, allows California State University the authority to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Educational Leadership. The doctorate degree is only offered in the discipline of education and shall focus on the knowledge and skills needed by administrative leaders for possible service in either California public elementary and secondary school (PreK – 12) or community college settings. Much of the material described in this faculty handbook has its roots in the language of this order. A full copy of the order is contained in this handbook following the appendices at its end.

The mission of Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program is to address the urgent need for well prepared individuals to assume key leadership positions in California’s PreK – 12 schools and community colleges. Three curricular themes achieve this mission:

- **Transformational Leadership.** Transformational leaders understand, implement, and evaluate strategic choices based on various theories, models, and approaches for achieving organizational transformation. Our students become facilitators of such transformation.

- **Critical Policy Analysis and Action.** Students engage in critical analysis of policy at the local, state, and national levels.

- **Informed Decision Making.** Students learn skillful decision-making strategies in the context of multiple competing interests, problem situations, and influences of power and control.

The Ed.D. in Educational Leadership at Sacramento State maintains distinctive features reflecting its location at the center of California’s State Government and in one of the United States’ most ethnically and racially diverse cities. Classes intentionally possess integrative connections that focus on transformational leadership, critical policy analysis and action, as well as informed decision-making. Students can choose to specialize in either a PreK – 12 or a community college focus.

This doctorate program is the result of collaboration between the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (EDLP) in the College of Education and the Department of Public Policy and Administration (PPA) in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies. Interdisciplinary expertise of the faculty enables students to examine educational issues from broad frameworks. Particular attention is paid to the cultural and community contexts of education, impacts on equality of educational outcomes, and equity and policy implications. While faculty members from EDLP and PPA make up the majority of Ed.D. faculty, the Program also has faculty from departments across the university.
Faculty expertise includes transformational leadership, organizational analysis and change, cross-cultural education, ethnic studies, economics, politics, and policy. Faculty possesses a strong record of scholarship with a focus on applied research, professional experience, and experience in academic and dissertation advising.

Core and Affiliate Faculty members are eligible for a wide variety of roles in the Ed.D. Program. These include serving as primary doctoral course instructors; members of qualifying and examination committees; advisors and mentors to doctoral students; chairs of examination and dissertation committees; and members of governance groups. All faculty members are selected for a three year appointment and are eligible for renewal. While Core Faculty may have positions in different departments and colleges on campus, they need to have expertise and a scholarly record relevant to leadership and/or policy in PreK – 12 and/or community college settings.

Ed.D. courses at Sacramento State are primarily taught by full-time tenure or tenure track faculty employed on campus that are granted Core Faculty status. However, system-wide provisions also enable faculty holding adjunct appointments to serve as instructors or co-instructors in courses, mentor students, and serve as members of Ed.D. qualifying examination or dissertation committees. Affiliate faculty may also participate in Ed.D. governance groups. Part-time faculty members may be assigned to teach courses because of their unique skills, but they would need to be first appointed as Affiliate Faculty members.

The table below offers the existing or prospective faculty member an understanding of the academic progression that a Sacramento State Ed.D. student follows.
## Program Benchmarks for Incoming Students Beginning in Fall Semester
(Three Semesters in Academic Year: (1) Fall, (2) Spring, and (3) Summer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date Submission</th>
<th>Responsible for Filing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File a Program of Study</td>
<td>Work with Director</td>
<td>First summer semester</td>
<td>Director submits to the Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of course</td>
<td>Work with academic Advisor and Director and Associate Director</td>
<td>Second spring semester</td>
<td>Graduate Studies and Program Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement to Candidacy</td>
<td>Students secure necessary signatures</td>
<td>Second spring semester</td>
<td>Director submits to the Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination of Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>Student and Primary Advisor decide on the composition of this committee</td>
<td>Second fall or second spring</td>
<td>Student’s Primary Advisor of dissertation submits to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>semester</td>
<td>Director and the Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense of Dissertation Proposal</td>
<td>Student submits the defense of dissertation proposal form</td>
<td>Beginning of third fall semester</td>
<td>Student submits to Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Approval (If needed)</td>
<td>Student works with IRB office to obtain Human Subjects Committee Approval</td>
<td>No later than the beginning of</td>
<td>Student notifies Primary Advisor of dissertation and all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>third fall semester</td>
<td>committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin dissertation research</td>
<td>Consults with Primary Advisor and committee members on chapters</td>
<td>No later than the beginning of</td>
<td>Student must maintain communication with dissertation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>third fall semester</td>
<td>advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit application for graduation</td>
<td>Found at <a href="http://www.csus.edu/uld/graduate/graduation_app.htm">http://www.csus.edu/uld/graduate/graduation_app.htm</a></td>
<td>Beginning of third fall or third spring semester</td>
<td>Student submits to Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>Student prepares final draft of dissertation to present to dissertation committee after student has met committee expectations</td>
<td>Beginning of third spring semester</td>
<td>Student submits to the Office of Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information for Those Desiring an Association with Ed.D. Program

Types of Ed.D. Faculty

As detailed next, there are two ways by which faculty can become associated with and participate in the delivery of Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program. These provisions exist in all education doctorate programs offered through California State Universities and were the product of a committee formed by the California State University Academic Senate.

Core Faculty are defined as full-time, tenured or tenure track, faculty at Sacramento State whose disciplinary expertise pertains to the study and teaching of leadership and/or policy at the PreK – 12 and/or community college level. This group includes individuals from the two departments (EDLP and PPA) administering the program and other relevant departments on campus. Core faculty can serve in all of the primary roles allocated for faculty in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program. These roles include: (1) instruction, (2) academic advising, (3) primary and/or secondary supervision of a doctoral student’s dissertation committee, (4) program evaluation, (5) governance, and (6) admissions. An Affiliate Faculty is defined as a professional whose disciplinary expertise pertains to leadership and/or policy at the PreK – 12 and/or community college level. The Affiliate classification is reserved for those who do not hold full time teaching appointments at Sacramento State.

For the purpose of WASC Accreditation, a distinction will be made between Core Faculty who have 100 percent of their teaching responsibility dedicated to the Ed.D. Program and those with less than that. As of fall 2009, only the Director can be considered a Core Faculty with all of his/her teaching responsibility in Ed.D. Plans are in place to hire one more Core Faculty member during the 2009-10 academic year, and another during the 2010-11 academic year. Both of these new Core Faculty will teach in the Ed.D. Program alone.

A faculty member with research and teaching interests in educational leadership from another California State University campus or other university may serve as a secondary advisor of a doctoral dissertation committee if requested by the candidate and that person’s primary advisor. Such an arrangement must also be approved by the Ed.D. Director, in accordance with graduate education procedures at Sacramento State.
Methods for Choosing Ed.D. Faculty

Based upon a system-wide policy on doctoral faculty qualifications, Core Faculty in Sacramento State’s doctoral program must meet all of the following criteria:

- have specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by Sacramento State’s Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership,
- exhibit a strong professional record of published scholarship or applied research pertinent to educational leadership or the theoretical or methodological underpinnings of study related to the field,
- possess a doctoral degree in the appropriate discipline,
- be tenured or have a tenure-track appointment,
- be previously involved in teaching at the graduate level, and
- have previously demonstrated ability in directing others in research activities.

To be considered for Core Faculty status, a Sacramento State faculty member must submit an application packet that describes how required qualifications are met, identifies the specific courses that a prospective faculty member is interested in teaching, and includes their curriculum vitae. The submission of this application packet can only come after the faculty has discussed the application with their department’s chairperson.

This application packet is to be submitted to the Steering Committee. Existing Core Faculty will review and offer comment to the Steering Committee on these application packets regarding their opinion on the qualification of candidates. Steering Committee members will review the materials and comments of Core Faculty, and offer their recommendations to the Director. The Director, in consultation with the Associate Director, has the sole responsibility of making a recommendation of Core Faculty appointment.

Core Faculty members will be reviewed each year in accordance with the program’s bylaws. At the end of these three years, a review of Core Faculty status occurs in accordance with a procedure described later.

Affiliate Faculty in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. must have expertise relevant to the program. To be considered for Affiliate Faculty status, someone from outside Sacramento State must submit an application packet that describes how required qualifications are met, identifies the specific courses that a prospective faculty member
is interested in teaching, and includes a vitae or resume. Existing Core Faculty will be allowed to review and offer comment to the Steering Committee on these letters of interest and vitae regarding an opinion on the qualification of candidate. Steering Committee members will review the materials and comments of faculty, and offer their recommendations to the Director. The Director, in consultation with the Associate Director, has the sole responsibility of making a recommendation of Affiliate Faculty appointment to the Deans of the College of Education and College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies who have the joint final responsibility for making the appointment. If a faculty member wishes to appeal their denial of Affiliate status, the appeal should be made in writing to these Deans. It is intended that substantial and meaningful participation by public school and community college partners occur through the governance structure. Each of the three governance bodies (identified later in this document) call for representatives from both the PreK - 12 and the community college communities. This governance structure complies fully with the provisions of California Education Code 66040 ff.

**Method of Choosing an Instructor for an Ed.D. Course**

As detailed in Appendix 1 of this document, which describes the course of study for a student in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program, 18 separate courses make up the Program’s curriculum. If a Core or Affiliate Faculty of Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program desires full consideration in regard to teaching a specific course in the doctoral curriculum; they are required to notify the Director of this interest a full two semesters before the course is scheduled to start. This notification must come in the form of a written or electronic letter that details the specific course(s) interested in, the candidate’s background/expertise/experience in teaching this course, and a copy of their vitae.

In consultation with the Associate Director, the Director will review the applications and may choose to solicit others. As in all other academic departments at Sacramento State, who will teach a course in the Ed.D. Program is at the discretion of the Director. Nevertheless, the Director will solicit the opinions of the Associate Director, Steering Committee, Advisory Committee, and the Deans of the College of Education and Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies in making a decision. The Director will also contact the department chairperson of the applicant to make sure they have the required room in their schedule to do the requested Ed.D. teaching.

Some consideration will be given in the desirability of giving an instructor the ability to teach the same course for at least two consecutive years and for drawing instructors from the pool of Core and Affiliate faculty members. Having academic year workload space to accommodate a teaching assignment – as opposed to having to
teach a course as an overload – is another important variable used in determining teaching assignments.

The Core Faculty developed the following suggestions on the process for determining teaching assignments in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program:

- All core faculty members will be given the opportunity to express interest in the course(s) they feel most qualified to teach.

- A basis for rotating teaching assignments among qualified and interested faculty members will be established.

- While faculty expertise and interest are necessary prerequisites to any teaching assignment, student and program involvement will receive the most weight when determining assignments.

- Student evaluation of courses will be an important variable used in determining teaching assignments.

- As is the case with department chairs of academic departments, the Ed.D. Director - in collaboration with the Associate Director - will have final authority in determining teaching assignments.

Instructors will be notified at least a semester prior to when they are scheduled to teach a course. Upon notification, they will have one week to tell the Director of their intent to teach the course. The Director may choose an alternate instructor if this notification does not come in the specified period. Upon acceptance of a teaching assignment, the instructor must immediately begin the preparation of a syllabus in the manner described below. All syllabi must be electronically delivered to the Director at least six weeks before the class is scheduled to begin so they can be passed onto students in a period that allows for the necessary pre-classroom preparation required in an intensive program. All submitted syllabi will be posted on the Program’s web page.
Information and Requirements for Faculty Working in Ed.D. Program

Compensation

Sacramento State will provide its faculty six weighted teaching units (WTUs) for each three unit doctoral course taught. These six units will be based upon three additional WTUs provided for each three unit doctoral course taught. The specific purpose of these additional units is to allow the instructor to pursue a research agenda appropriate for a doctoral faculty (see specifics on this later). The College of Education will transfer funds to the college that the faculty has primary teaching responsibilities. Currently, departments are reimbursed at $1725 per WTU for faculty that are assigned to teach, conduct research or develop and implement programs in other cost centers within the University. Faculty working outside the university and hired as temporary faculty are compensated at a specified university contract rate commensurate with experience/skills/knowledge.

Each faculty member serving as the Chairperson (Primary Advisor) of a dissertation committee will be compensated one unit a semester for every semester that he or she serves this role. In a given semester, a faculty member may serve as a primary advisor to no more than three students, and a secondary advisor to no more than three students. Since a teaching assignment is normally three units, these assigned units can be banked until they are accumulated at a level that allows course relief. A faculty member can receive no more than a course reduction (for chairing three dissertations) in a semester for dissertation supervision.

All Sacramento State faculty members teaching in the doctoral program will receive a reduction in their teaching load or assignment during the semester or term in which they are scheduled to teach. Each faculty member who teaches in the program will be expected to teach no more than three courses (or nine units) during the semester in which that individual teaches in the doctoral program. Listed below is an example of what this reduced teaching load might look like.
Example of Ed.D. Faculty Workload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Weighted Teaching Units</th>
<th>Type of Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three WTUs</td>
<td>Undergraduate or Master’s course outside of Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three WTUs</td>
<td>Undergraduate or Master’s course outside of Ed.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three WTUs</td>
<td>Ed.D. Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three WTUs</td>
<td>Faculty member will engage in two or more of the following activities during a given academic term: (1) development of new Ed.D. course material, (2) conduct research, (3) produce a publication, (4) present at a refereed or invited conference or professional setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three WTUS</td>
<td>Normal required governance and service activities to university and community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Core Faculty are also eligible to apply for a $500 to $750 travel grant to fund the presentation of their research at an academic conference. The form that must be completed for this application is in Appendix 2 of this document. Note that no more than $750 can be received in this form over the course of two academic semesters.

Teaching Requirements

If a faculty member accepts a teaching assignment in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program, that individual must submit a full and final syllabus to the Director in electronic form at least six weeks prior to the start of the course. The Director will then immediately post this syllabus on the Ed.D. web site (http://edweb.csus.edu/edd/curriculum/syllabi_samples.html) so that students can have adequate lead time to prepare for the course.

When crafting a syllabus for an Ed.D. course that is to be taught for the first time by an instructor, we suggest that the instructor use a previous syllabus from this course as a base from which to begin. The previous syllabus should only be altered in a manner that it keeps it in line with the course description (contained in Appendix 1) and the learning goals for the course (listed in Appendix 5). An instructor of an Ed.D. course
is required to look at the catalog description of the course, the learning objectives for the course (as given in Appendix 5), and the previous syllabus developed for the course before creating their own syllabus. In crafting their syllabus they must adhere to the catalog description and learning objections when designing their own delivery of the course.

A template that show the elements essential for all Ed.D. syllabi at Sacramento State is provided in Appendix 3. Please follow this template to the best of your ability to ensure consistency in the presentation of course materials to students across the doctoral program. The Director reserves the right to ask a faculty member to rewrite their syllabi if it does not sufficiently match the content requested on this template.

A committee composed of Core Faculty developed the following recommendations in regard to reading expectations in a doctoral course:

- In general, doctoral students should expect one to two hours of preparation for every hour of class time.
- Some of this time will be devoted to completing writing requirements or group work with the balance on reading.
- The quantity of reading will vary across courses depending upon the material being delivered.
- Students are expected to be conversant in seminal articles and books in the discipline.

Students in Sacramento State’s Program are expected to regularly read and interpret peer reviewed journal articles for courses. Following are examples of academic journals from which faculty members may draw in developing their syllabi:

- Community College Journal (http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Pages/default.aspx),
- Community College Journal of Research and Practice (http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/10668926.asp),
- Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis (http://eepa.aera.net),
- Educational Researcher (http://er.aera.net),
- Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics (http://jebs.aera.net),
• Review of Research in Education (http://rre.aera.net),

• Public Administration Review (http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0033-3352),

• Journal of Policy Analysis and Management (https://www.appam.org/publications/jpam/online.asp),

• Thought & Action Journal (http://www2.nea.org/he/tanda.html).

Students in the doctoral program are also expected to use materials that are both classic and current. They should be exposed to foundation readings in subject matters as well as emerging critical discussions. Given the shortened time period for course meetings, reading will normally be expected to be completed before the first classes begin. Readings should be clearly differentiated from Masters level work as appropriate.

Many professional organizations produce publications that warrant our students’ attention. These might include Education Week, Chronicle of Higher Education, or other professional periodicals related to PreK – 12 and/or community college education. There are also a myriad of reputable think tanks that are directly related to education policy, such as the Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice at Stanford (http://www.stanford.edu/group/irepp/cgi-bin/joomla/index.php), Public Policy Institute of California (http://www.ppic.org/main/home.asp), and Policy Analysis for California Education PACE at UC Berkeley (http://pace.berkeley.edu). Please consider drawing course materials from their applied research.

We believe that writing is a key component of how doctoral students express themselves now, and later as education professionals with a doctorate. Thus we recommend to all instructors that writing is an integral component of their teaching and assessment of student performance. To this end, faculty members are expected to further the writing ability of their students, and to introduce them to ideas and methods that can be used in dissertation research.

The expectation is that all courses begin on time, allow 15 minutes of break for every two hours of course time, allow no more than an hour for lunch, and meet fully until the time listed on the course schedule for dismissal. Faculty should also note in their syllabus that students are required to attend all classes, to read all appropriate assignments before each class meeting, and to participate in class discussions. It should also be noted that incompletes may only be given in the case of an emergency and only if arranged before grades are due.

Of utmost importance is the requirement that all faculty teaching in Sacramento State’s doctoral program administer a student-based teaching evaluation found in
Appendix 4. These will be prepared by the Ed.D. Administrative Assistant and delivered to all faculty at least two weeks before a class is expected to end. If at all possible, evaluations are to be left to the last day of class. The administration of this instrument is to be turned over to a student who administers it while the instructor has left the room. The same student is to gather the completed student surveys and return them to the Ed.D. Administrative Assistant with the instructor seeing the results only after the final grades have been submitted. It is the responsibility of the Director to compile all teaching evaluation results and get the summary information back to the instructor within one semester of the completion of the course. The results of these evaluations become a crucial component in decisions about course instruction and reappointment to the Core Faculty member after three years. Since this requirement is beyond the UARTP policy of required course evaluation, these evaluations will only be used for the evaluation of whether the individual will continue to teach in the Ed.D. Program. It will be up to individual instructors, and the rules they face in their home department, if whether they wish to submit these for their department’s RTP procedures.

Note that anything less than a B (3.0) grade assigned as a final grade in an Ed.D. course at Sacramento State is considered a failing grade and the student will need to repeat the course to receive credit toward the degree.

Research Requirements

We recognize the utmost importance of building a respected doctoral culture in the Ed.D. Program at Sacramento State. Funds for reduced teaching loads and subsequently greater research productivity for Core Faculty exist and will be used to support faculty research. With a reduction in teaching load, Ed.D. Core Faculty have the opportunity to develop enhanced research agendas and further increase their record of publications. Hence, all Core Faculty members who teach doctoral courses and/or serve on doctoral dissertation committees are expected to develop, conduct, and publish a research agenda related to PreK – community college education leadership and/or policy issues. This scholarly work is expected to be above and beyond that of a non-doctoral faculty member at Sacramento State.

The following expectations for a Core Faculty member concerning research output has been set by Core Faculty Members and must be met every academic year (for example, fall 2009 through summer 2010 semesters):

- present results of scholarly research at a minimum of two academic conferences or other scholarly/professional/community forums (local, state, national, or international);
- be prepared to present a seminar to Ed.D. students on their academic research every year through our own Higher Education Leadership Seminar Series, but only be required to have actually done it once every three years;
• submit at least one manuscript to an academic journal or other appropriate research outlet within a time line of one calendar year from the start date of teaching in the doctoral program and continue this submission schedule every year after; and

• actively participate in at least one Ed.D. Program committee (i.e., steering, workload and compensation, evaluation, qualifying exam, etc.).

To document scholarly activities, a Core Faculty member must submit a one-page report on these activities for the previous academic year within the first week of the fall semester. The Core Faculty members who have taught in either of the first two years of the program will be required to submit their first one-page report within the first week of fall 2009. This report will describe how they have met the scholarly expectations described above. The reports will be reviewed by the Director and Associate Director and will be part of their assessment regarding whether faculty members will continue to teach in the program, and ultimately be reappointed to the Core Faculty.

In addition, within two years from the date of beginning teaching in the Ed.D. Program, a Core Faculty member must publish at least one article, chapter, report, or book related to his or her research. This expectation (a minimum of one publication every two years) will continue as long as one remains a Core Faculty. We do not strictly require that the minimum of one publication be in a peer-reviewed outlet (e.g., a peer reviewed academic journal, an academic book publisher); however we strongly recommend that this be the case.
Review Process for Core Faculty Desiring a Continued Association with Program

With the clock starting in the fall of 2009, a Core Faculty member who has completed three years in Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program will be subject to review regarding their reappointment as a Core Faculty. If in this situation, the Director will contact the faculty person and ask for no more than a two-page report that documents the individual’s teaching, research, and service activities completed over the past three years. This report must document how the faculty member has met the requirements for maintaining Core Faculty status that have been described previously in this document.

The three-year report from a Core Faculty member must be submitted within two weeks of it being requested by the Director and will go to the Steering Committee for review and comment. By majority vote, the Steering Committee will make a recommendation regarding reappointment as a Core Faculty member for another three years. This recommendation will go to the Director who, in consultation with the Associate Director, will decide whether or not to recommend the faculty member for reappointment to the Deans of the College of Education and College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies. After discussing this reappointment with the faculty member’s home chairperson, the Deans will ultimately decide if reappointment is to be given. An appeal of the Deans’ decision should come in the form of a letter describing the basis of the appeal to them.
Faculty Role in Assessment

The Ed.D. Program in Education Leadership has established an integrated plan of assessment that is now in place and scheduled to run its first yearly cycle in the 2009-2010 academic year. This assessment plan is rooted in the assessment matrix that is included as Appendix 5 in this document. The assessment matrix has seven goals in the areas of critical analysis, integrative thinking, effective communication, understanding professional role, practical applications, leadership, and equity. These goals in turn are based on the three cornerstone principles of the Sacramento State Ed.D. Program: (1) transformational leadership, (2) informed decision making, and (3) critical policy analysis and action.

Under each of the seven broad learning goals in the assessment matrix, there are five or six specific goals that need to be reached to achieve the broad goal that they fall under. After deciding upon these broad and specific goals, they were then mapped back to how they are achieved through the 17 courses that consist of the doctorate offerings. For Ed.D. courses 600 through 616, a "P" is assigned if the specific goal receives primary coverage in that class, “S” for secondary coverage, and a blank if not covered. All of the specific goals receive primary coverage in at least one course (most in multiple courses).

Our assessment strategy begins by making this assessment matrix widely known to administrators, faculty, and students in the program. Beginning in the fall of 2009, all instructors are required to include specific learning goals on their syllabus that relate to the “Ps” assigned to their course in the assessment matrix. (See how this is done in the sample syllabus contained as Appendix 2).

Faculty will also be required to administer an end-of-semester survey to students that asks them to specifically assess how well each of the primary learning goals was achieved in that class. An example of such a survey, based on the learning goals included on the sample syllabus in Appendix 3, is given in Appendix 6. The metric to do this is an “a” to “e” scale with: a (not accomplished), b (poorly), c (satisfactorily), d (very well), and e (excellently). The Ed.D. Administrative Assistant will be responsible for the preparation and delivery of these surveys to instructors at least two weeks before a course is scheduled to end. They should be administered with the student evaluation of teaching and in the same manner.

Faculty members who teach Ed.D. courses 614, 615, and 616 (which are all related to dissertation preparation and completion) will be required to place learning goals on their syllabi that relate to all of the seven broad learning goals in the assessment matrix. They will also need to administer the end of semester student-based evaluation that is described above. The Ed.D. Administrative Assistant will then
collect all student based surveys and maintain a permanent record of the average and standard deviation achieved in a class under each of the primary learning goals assigned to it. This data will become an important input to the yearly assessment that will be required of our Ed.D. Program.

Assessment data for Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program will also come through a pre- and post-writing assignment administered to all students. “Pre” here refers to before the students have taken any Ed.D. courses. “Post” here refers to after the completion of all Ed.D. core courses with the exception of dissertation preparation courses. As described in Appendix 7 to this handbook, the assignment is based upon the student selecting a PreK - 12 or community college educational issue of their choice, describing it based upon specific considerations, and recommending a course of action to help resolve the issue. For the “pre” aspect of this, they will be given 90 minutes to complete this exercise as part of the application process to the program. For the “post” aspect of this, they will also complete the identical exercise as part of a course (Ed.D. 614) they begin after taking all but their dissertation preparation courses in the program. A committee consisting of the Ed.D. Director, Associate Director, and four Core Faculty members will read all of the essays. Each student essay will be reviewed by at least two distinct members of the committee. Committee members will then complete an assessment on each essay based upon the rubric that is also part of Appendix 6. A score will be tallied for each essay and these scores will be permanently recorded by the Ed.D. Administrative Assistant. An average score will be calculated for each entering and exiting cohort of Ed.D. students.

The purpose of these pre- and post-essays is to gauge the average degree of value added (in terms of our seven broad learning objectives) that the program has contributed to students who have completed it. By determining the average performance of each entering and exiting cohort in terms of all seven learning objectives, we will be able to reach an overall assessment of how much overall value added learning has occurred, and how much has occurred in each of the seven categories. This will provide valuable feedback to an assessment committee looking to improve the program to better achieve its learning goals.

The final, and perhaps most important, component of our assessment plan is the convening of an annual retreat that will first occur in early June 2010, and then for every June after that. The Director and Associate Director will organize this meeting and all faculty who taught in the past year will be asked to attend, as will all members of the Core Faculty. At this meeting, data from the past academic year on the end of semester surveys offered to students regarding the achievement of learning goals will be available, along with scoring information on the pre and post writing assignments, and syllabi from all courses. Administrators and faculty will discuss these results with an eye to learning what broad learning goals have been satisfactorily achieved and
what still needs to be worked on. Specifically, the group can look to how curriculum, pedagogy, and/or content can be changed in courses to try and better achieve the learning goals that are not being achieved to an appropriate level of satisfaction.

We will have a fully functional assessment procedure in place for the 2009-2010 academic year that will continue indefinitely. This assessment plan is tied to an assessment matrix that fits on one page and easy to understand. The data accumulated through these yearly assessments will also provide the information necessary for the forthcoming internal and WASC program reviews.
Faculty Involvement in the Governance Structure

The delivery of the Sacramento State Doctorate in Educational Leadership represents a collaborative effort undertaken by representatives of the university; area public elementary, middle, and secondary schools; and area community colleges. Three main governing bodies (Program Board, Steering Committee, and Advisory Council) provide an opportunity for membership by representatives from each sector of the education community. The table below illustrates the composition and responsibilities of these three bodies.

Sacramento State's Doctorate in Education Leadership
Governing Bodies, Responsibilities, and Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Body</th>
<th>Program Board</th>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th>Advisory Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
<td>The Program Board is the formal body for governance and liaison among the campus community, the Ed. D. Program, and the public school and college partners. It provides for communications among the program, the broader campus administration and faculty, and the education partners, and it serves as a forum for planning and evaluation.</td>
<td>The Steering Committee provides oversight to all aspects of program operations, including: faculty selection, admission standards and processes; required and elective courses within the program; the student experience, including the cohort structure; requirements for examinations and the dissertation; and program assessment and evaluation.</td>
<td>The Advisory Council represents the regional partnership in matters related to the Ed. D. program. It provides for ongoing collaboration between the program and the region’s public school and community college communities, and it appoints regional representatives to committees and bodies associated with the Ed. D. program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Body</td>
<td>Program Board</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
<td>Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Ed.D. Director</td>
<td>Ed.D. Director</td>
<td>PreK-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D. Associate Director</td>
<td>Ed.D. Associate Director</td>
<td>Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Central Administration</td>
<td>One Core EDLP Faculty</td>
<td>Community College Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Education Dean and SSIS Dean</td>
<td>One Core PPA Faculty</td>
<td>Other education community and professional groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDLP Chairperson and PPA Chairperson</td>
<td>Two non-PPA or Non-EDLP Core Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One At-Large Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One PreK-12 Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Community College Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Current Ed.D. Student or Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The EdD, Administrative Assistant will attend all meetings of these three governing entities and keeps minutes for each meeting.*

As shown in the table above, wide membership opportunities exist for faculty for participation in the governance of Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program. The interaction between the Program Board, Steering Committee, and the Advisory Council allows for inter-segmental and intra-segmental participation. The governance structure meets the requirements in SB 724 (the enabling legislation that allowed the offering of the Ed.D. by the CSU System) for substantive participation by our partners in the doctoral program.
Information on Core Faculty Participation on Ed.D. Qualifying Exam

Doctoral students in Education Leadership at Sacramento State must take a qualifying examination by the end of the second year of the program. The timing of the qualifying examination allows for fair evaluation of the student’s mastery of the essential core leadership and methodological program elements and is consistent with the student’s readiness to begin dissertation research. The qualifying examination will be a written assessment of student knowledge that must be passed prior to the student’s advancement to candidacy.

The purpose of the qualifying examination is to assess the student’s breadth and depth of knowledge in solving and analyzing challenges at the PreK – 12 or community college education levels and serves as a determining factor as to whether he/she should be advanced to candidacy. This is accomplished by applying the theories, strategies, and information learned through the program curriculum to assess and analyze, in written form, a specific case study scenario.

Using the qualifying exam, students will be evaluated based upon how well they demonstrate their mastery of the seven general objectives of Sacramento State’s Ed.D. Program: critical analysis, integrative thinking, effective communication to K-14 stakeholders, understanding professional role, practical applications, leadership, and equity (as described in more detail in Appendix 5). Responses contained in a student’s Ed.D. qualifying exam must also demonstrate evidence of knowledge of the field, originality, adherence to the context of critical and independent thinking, and appropriate form and organization to derive conclusions and recommendations.

The important elements of the qualifying exam given to doctoral students at Sacramento State includes:

- a six-hour timed written examination;
- a student chooses in advance whether they wish to a case study pertaining to PreK – 12 or community college;
- an exam that is open book and open notes and is to be completed on a computer with no access to the internet;
- an honor system under which students individually answer questions without consultation with others;
- on-site lunch break allowed (students may bring their own lunch, however lunch will be provided);
• no discussion of exam questions during breaks;

• an evaluation rubric shared with students prior to examination (shown in Appendix 8); and

• possible outcomes (1) Pass, (2) Revise, or (3) Fail.

Eight Core Faculty members will serve on the Qualifying Examination Committee. These faculty members will consist of faculty from EDLP and PPA, and additional faculty representing other departments. Every effort should be made by the Director to insure that this representation comes from faculty who has taught courses over the two previous years that students taking the qualifying examination have attended. Each student's qualifying exam will be read by two faculty members. In the event of disagreement on the outcome to be assigned, a committee consisting of the Ed.D. Director and Associate Director will read the exam and break the tie.

Before the administration of the qualifying exam, faculty members should meet once again and discuss the three options. After grading, faculty members should meet and discuss their observations. The Core Faculty on the Qualifying Examination Committee has three decision options:

• First, it may judge the examination to be a “Pass,” having met program standards. Such a decision must be by unanimous vote.

• Second, the committee may determine that the examination is capable of receiving a passing evaluation with sufficient revision. At the discretion of the qualifying exam committee and based on student performance in the qualifying exam, a student whose answers on the qualifying exam are determined to “Need Revision,” shall be provided by the committee with the opportunity to revise his/her exam response through a written revision. The time scheduled for students to present the response to qualifying examinations determined to “Need Revision” must occur within two weeks of notice to the student of the committee’s initial determination. Upon completion of a student’s examination revisions, the committee must vote to give the revised examination a passing or failing grade.

• Third, the committee may determine that the examination does not meet standards and warrants a “Fail.” A candidate who receives a Fail on their qualifying examination will have one more opportunity to gain a Pass. Four calendar months must pass before the second attempt. A student who fails at first, but then passes their qualifying exam, can rejoin the program when the next cohort gets to this point in their program. A student who fails the examination a second time is dismissed from the program.
Information on Ed.D. Faculty Participation as a Primary or Secondary Dissertation Advisor

The dissertation in Sacramento State's Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership serves an integrative role in a student's education, requiring the candidate to incorporate ideas and skills from various parts of the program. Additionally, the dissertation allows students to demonstrate that they can compose an original research project, moving from a research question to an in-depth response to that question. Success in completing the dissertation demonstrates a student’s ability to be an independent educational leader.

Appendix 9 summarizes requirements for doctoral advisement throughout all California State Universities offering an Ed.D. Appendix 10 contains a description of criteria and standards established for education doctorates completed at Sacramento State.

A student’s dissertation is expected to cover as many of the seven learning goals (see Appendix 4) that form the basis of our program as possible. Depending on the topic and methods chosen for a student’s dissertation, and understanding that not every dissertation necessarily requires the satisfaction of all the specific goals listed under the seven broad goals, a student’s primary dissertation advisor (in consultation with secondary advisors) is expected to insure that as many as possible of the relevant elements listed in the rubric are satisfied.

Each Ed.D. candidate must complete a dissertation. The primary purpose of the dissertation is to generate knowledge that contributes to the understanding of educational leadership practices, policies, reforms, or improvements. The dissertation is to be a significant scholarly work. It is normally expected to include a comprehensive review of the literature, a carefully chosen and appropriate methodology for addressing the research question, analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data, interpretation of the findings, and discussion of the implications for practice and further research. Variants of this model may be appropriate, but only with the approval of the primary dissertation advisor.

The dissertation serves an integrative role in a student’s education, requiring the candidate to incorporate ideas and skills from various parts of the program. Additionally, the dissertation allows students to demonstrate that they can put together an original research project, moving from a research question to an in-depth response to that question. Success in completing the dissertation demonstrates a student’s ability to be an independent educational leader.

Students will choose their own dissertation topics in consultation with a primary dissertation advisor. It is permissible and may indeed be desirable for a student to choose a topic that is directly relevant to his or her work setting.
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Each doctoral candidate will have at least a three-person dissertation committee. A fourth member may be added if the student and dissertation chair believe a benefit is achieved from the additional expertise. The Chair of the committee (also known as the Primary Advisor) plays the most significant role in guiding the dissertation, and it is expected that the chair will be the first committee member chosen. Except under extraordinary circumstances and with the approval of the Director, the Primary Advisor must be a member of the Ed.D. Core Faculty.

The dissertation candidate and that person’s Primary Advisor will collaborate on choosing additional members known as Secondary Advisors. Secondary Advisors may come from the Core Faculty. With the approval of the Program Director, a tenured or tenure-track faculty member from another institution of post-secondary education may be included on the dissertation committee. Such a person must possess special expertise relevant to the candidate’s dissertation research and be approved by the Director.

Additionally, at least one member of the dissertation committee at Sacramento State must be a non-academic expert in educational practice or policy from California’s PreK – 14 school or community college education communities. The choice of a dissertation advisor is a mutual one, reflecting considerations of interest, expertise, time availability, access, and a comfortable working relationship. While this is not the norm, it is possible to change one’s primary advisor by mutual consent, but only if for some reason circumstances change and another advisor would be more appropriate.

While the candidate’s Primary Advisor exercises primary guidance over dissertation preparation, all committee members must approve the final document. It is expected that the candidate will make revisions to draft portions of the dissertation in accordance with input from the chair and other members.

Early in the dissertation writing process, candidates must produce a prospectus that summarizes the research question, the approach taken in answering the question, the data and methods used, and the importance of the topic to educational policy and/or leadership at the K-12 and community college levels. In essence, the proposal is a work plan. It sets forth tasks to be completed, the reasons for identification of these tasks, and the anticipated results. Most proposals include a scope of work, a list of activities, a time line for completion, and if necessary a budget. These elements indicate how the student plans to proceed. The work plan allows faculty to judge the investigation’s importance, feasibility, efficiency, and likely success.

A Primary Advisor may ask for a proposal that amounts to a partial dissertation draft. That is, the proposal would include the first three chapters covering an introduction to the topic and statement of the problem, review of the literature, and description of methods to be used. Keep in mind that specific advisors have their own preference in structuring the dissertation proposal, and that the proposal requirements may also depend on the nature of the topic. However, the conventional approach is often to request “mini versions” of the opening three chapters.
At the end of the dissertation process, each candidate prepares an oral defense of the dissertation before his/her committee. Core Faculty members will be invited to attend, as well as additional interested individuals (e.g., community members, students, family members). The candidate will respond to questions from the committee regarding research goals, theory, literature, methods, findings, implications, and other topics. Following the defense, the committee may vote to approve the dissertation and recommend conferral of the degree (such a decision must be by unanimous vote). The committee may also request major or minor changes, in which case the final vote on approval will be delayed until the changes are completed. Finally, the committee may vote to reject the dissertation. The dissertation defense will only be scheduled if the advisor is confident that the dissertation is capable of gaining approval. Appendix 11 in this document offers a timeline for dissertation completion for an Ed.D. student that began in the first cohort (fall 2007).
### Appendix 1

**SACRAMENTO STATE’S**  
**DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**  

**PROGRAM OF STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 600: Transformational Leadership (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 601: Organizational Leadership and Change (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 616: Dissertation I (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td><strong>EDD 602: Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders I (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 603: Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders II (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 604: Data-based Decision Making in Educational Leadership (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 606: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods II (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td><strong>EDD 607: Community and Communication in Educational Leadership (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 611: Legal Issues for Educational Leaders (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 617: Dissertation II (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 608: Diversity and Equity in Complex Organizations (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 612: Student Services in Education (2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 605: Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods I (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 613: Finance and Budget for Educational Leaders (2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 614: Issues in Educational Leadership - Application and Synthesis (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qualifying Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Defense and Graduation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td><strong>EDD 610: Curriculum &amp; Instruction (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDD 615: Dissertation Proposal Seminar (6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDD 609: Human Resource Management (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Proposal Defense</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Year 1, Fall Semester (9 units)**

- **EDD 600 Transformational Leadership (3 units):** This course is designed to engage students in understanding, implementing, and evaluating strategic leadership practices based on various theories, models, and approaches for achieving organizational transformation. Students will become skilled facilitators of the organizational transformation process by initiating, implementing, sustaining, and evaluating transformation/change efforts. Students will build a solid foundation through the integration of theory and practice in order to implement a planned change process in their home institution.

- **EDD 602 Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders I (3 units):** This course develops in students the skills for informed analysis of educational policy in order to positively influence the educational policy in the K-12 or community college setting. In addition to studying the historical perspectives pertaining to educational policy, practice, and reform, students will investigate the mission of public education. Students will also study governance and inter-governmental relations through contemporary policy development with particular reference to current law, local board policy, shared governance, and working with a variety of constituencies.

- **EDD 604 Data-driven Decision Making in Educational Leadership (3 units):** This course studies the use of quantitative and qualitative data by K-12 and community college leaders to improve student and organizational outcomes. Students will develop enhanced data literacy and analytical skills to facilitate data-based decision making in the identification of problems and development of solutions and evaluation plans. General concepts and techniques of data analysis, generation, and presentation will be learned with specific application to educational issues including program assessment and evaluation, resource planning and allocation, and strategic planning.

**Year 1, Spring Semester (9 units)**

- **EDD 607 Community and Communication in Educational Leadership (3 units):** This course presents theories and frameworks concerning organizational, interpersonal, and cross-cultural communication in educational and community contexts. The coursework includes developing written and verbal skills for specific contexts, including strategic planning, evaluation, presentations, formal and informal texts, technology, crisis management, and public relations. Through research and practical application, the course will enhance communication skills needed for creating inclusive systems and positive results for all stakeholders.

- **EDD 608 Diversity and Equity in Complex Organizations (3 units):** This course is designed to engage students in self introspection of awareness and advocacy in applying theoretical frameworks and research to promote equitable, excellence in schooling. Students will demonstrate the ability to develop cross-cultural relationships across multiple constituents for the purpose of improving student performance and promoting social justice. Students will develop the capacity to be courageous change agents in assuring academic excellence for all students.

- **EDD 605 Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods I (3 units):** This course will introduce educational leaders to concepts in qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-methods research in preparation for conducting independent research. This course will enable students to critically understand research methodology and apply it
appropriately to various educational issues. Course topics will include the framing of research questions, identifying data and data sources, and using theory in the design process. This course will enable educational leaders to critically understand research methodology and apply it appropriately and effectively to educational issues.

Year 1, Summer Session (6 units)

- **EDD 610 Curriculum and Instruction (3 units):** This course presents curriculum and instruction from a leadership perspective within the contexts of K-12 schools and community colleges. Students examine contemporary issues in school curriculum, including policy initiatives and reform efforts affecting curricular decision-making. The course prepares students to analyze and design appropriate strategies for implementing and evaluating DISTRICT AND school curricula, and to investigate implications of the curricula for educational programming. Students also learn specific foundations and procedures for professional development that have well-documented effects on student achievement.

- **EDD 609 Human Resource Management (3 units):** This course examines how to manage human resources effectively in the dynamic legal, social, and economic environment currently impacting educational institutions. Topics included are: formulation and implementation of human resource strategy, job analysis, methods of recruitment and selection, techniques for training and development, performance appraisal, compensation and benefits, and evaluation of the effectiveness of human resource management frameworks and practices. Class participants will be expected to demonstrate understanding of Human Resource Management (HRM) competencies through assignments, exercises and case analyses.

Year 2, Fall Semester (9 units)

- **EDD 601 Organizational Leadership and Change (3 units):** This course builds and expands on candidates’ knowledge of systems thinking, personal and organizational behaviors, and leadership approaches to the change process. Candidates will demonstrate ethical thinking and action in organizational settings by re-conceptualizing leadership roles and organizational structures. In coursework and related fieldwork component students will apply concepts and theories to improving their respective educational institutions. The course is highly practical and applied in nature, and it invites the student to dig deeply into some of the most pressing areas in the field. Among the interactive pedagogies used in this course are: case studies, experiential exercises, dialogues, and group activities.

- **EDD 603 Policy and Practice for Educational Leaders II (3 units):** This seminar is designed to engage students in critical analyses of policy at the local, state, national, and international levels. Specific California and federal policy environment structures and processes will be examined. Students will learn about how public policy is generated, potential consequences, ethical dilemmas, social justice, and equity issues.

- **EDD 606 Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods II (3 units):** The course will focus on the design, conceptualization, interpretation, and application of qualitative, quantitative, and mix-method research procedures. This course will also help students acquire skills and gain knowledge in using a wide range of methodological and analytical
research techniques with an eye towards students’ dissertation projects and field application in educational leadership.

Year 2, Spring Semester (9 units)

- **EDD 612 Student Services in Education (2 units):** This course will provide a comprehensive insight into the student services. It addresses both practical and theoretical perspectives intended to build a sense of vision and passion to transform the profession of student affairs and leadership. In particular, the course examines four distinct arenas: 1) historical and philosophical foundations of student affairs and leadership 2) management and organizational issues, 3) essential skills and professional development in building an equitable organization, and 4) the synthesis of practice and theory.

- **EDD 613 Finance and Budget for Educational Leaders (2 units):** This seminar analyzes two related topics with respect to public educational institutions: funding and internal budget management. The course provides a state and national overview of the economics and finance of K-12 and higher education, including private and public benefits of education, methods of financing public education, and contemporary policy issues regarding school and college finances. The course will also focus on how educational leaders can most effectively manage resources to further the vision, goals, and philosophy of the organization.

- **EDD 611 Legal Issues for Educational Leaders (2 units):** Educational leaders at the highest levels of influence and responsibility must be thoroughly familiar with both the laws that govern their educational institutions as well as the complex political, legislative, and cultural forces that shape these laws. A major emphasis in this joint doctoral program is also on influencing the legislative and policy formation process towards positive educational change. Educational leaders must also understand how federal, state and local laws, policies, practices, case law, and precedent all interact in today’s educational institutions.

- **EDD 614 Issues in Educational Leadership: Application and Synthesis (3 units):** This problem based seminar integrates the three themes of the program. The seminar includes conducting a review of the literature that will later be integrated into the candidates’ proposal. In addition, each student will study and select theoretical frame/s that supports their doctoral topic. Students will also work in teams formed by research interests. They will present findings to classmates in forums that they facilitate and they will critique each other’s work. The rationale for the course is twofold: 1) to prepare the students for their qualifying exams, and 2) to integrate proposal preparation into the coursework. The teams will work with each other in a format that builds upon prior knowledge and increases leadership potential.
Year 2, Summer Session (6 units)

- **EDD 615 Dissertation Proposal Seminar (6 units):**

Year 3, Fall Semester (6 units)

- **EDD 616 Dissertation I (6 units):** Each candidate will work with a dissertation advisor (dissertation committee chair) to conduct independent research leading to the completion of a dissertation. Twelve units of dissertation study will be required for completion of the program.

Year 3, Spring Semester (6 units)

- **EDD 617 Dissertation II (6 units):** Each candidate will work with a dissertation advisor (dissertation committee chair) to conduct independent research leading to the completion of a dissertation. Twelve units of dissertation study will be required for completion of the program.
Appendix 2

SACRAMENTO STATE’S
DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

FACULTY REQUEST FOR
TRAVEL FUNDS

Date______________

Name_________________________________ Employee ID #________________________

Travel:

Departure Time: ______________ Return Time: ______________
Date: ______________ Date: ______________

Dates of Meeting/Conference: ____________________________________________________

Location of Meeting/Conference: _________________________________________________

Type of Transportation:__________________________________________________________

Purpose of Travel: (Check One)

_____ To attend a meeting of professional association or society to actively participate by:

____ Presenting a single-authored paper*
____ Presenting a multi-authored paper*
____ Session discussant*
____ Panel Member*

*Include a brief statement describing the purpose of trip and how it relates to the Ed.D.
program. Please attach verification regarding your role as a presenter or session discussant.

Expenses: (Original Receipts/Boarding Passes REQUIRED for reimbursements of
$25.00 or more.)

Registration Fees: $ ___ Airline/Other: $ ___
Airport Shuttle: $ □  Car Rental: $ □  
Taxicab: $ □  Parking: $ □  
Mileage - Enter # of miles: # □  Tolls: $ □  
x $0.550 per mile = $ □  

**Accommodations**

**Meals and incidental expenses:**

Lodging cost per night, incl. taxes: $ □  
Enter number of nights: # □  
Total Lodging Expense: = $ □  

**TOTAL ESTIMATED TRAVEL EXPENSES:** $ □

[ ] Approved  
[ ] Denied

List other sources of funding for travel:  
______________________________________________________________________  
______________________________________________________________________  

[ ] Ed.D. Director's signature and date

To submit requests for **Faculty Travel** funding, please complete this form and submit it with travel documentation at least 3 weeks before the travel date to the Director’s office, Eureka Hall #328. Awards will fall within the range of $500 to $750. One travel funding award per academic year.

The Steering Committee will review all requests and recommend action to the Director.

1. Primary consideration is for faculty presenting a scholarly paper(s) at a state or national conference.
2. Secondary consideration is to faculty (i) chairing a session or (ii) serving as a discussant for a session.
3. Proof of acceptance and attendance is needed before receiving the funding. You are expected to cover your own expenses and save receipts. You will be asked to submit a travel claim with receipts and other supporting documents.
Appendix 3

SACRAMENTO STATE’S DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

SYLLABUS TEMPLATE

(Material noted in italics and parenthesis filled in by instructor.)

EdD 6(XX) – (COURSE NAME)

DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN EDUCATION LEADERSHIP
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO
(Term Year)

Professor: (Name)

E-Mail: (Address)

Home-Page: (If available)

Class Location: (Room number)
(Dates and times)

Office: (Room number)

Office Phone: (XXX XXX-XXX)

Office Hours: (Day and time)

Required Texts:
(Record each required text using APA citation.)

(Make sure they are available for purchase at the University Bookstore. Note if also available from another source.)

(Supplemental readings noted in the schedule below.)

SacCT: (If using)

(Note how you will use SacCT and your expectations on how often student will check.)

Course Description:

(Offer a one-paragraph description, similar to catalog copy, which provides an overview of this course to the student.)
Learning Objectives:

(Base the learning objectives upon the items given a “primary” assignment in EdD Assessment Matrix. There should be no more than six of these and written in a form that uses language drawn from the objectives, but adopted to the specifics of the topic taught. A student survey administered at the end of the class will assess how well each was achieved. An example for EdD 602 is below.)

“At the end of EdD 602, a student that attends all meetings will be able to:

1. Explain the theories of public and private benefits of education
2. Explain and evaluate the roles in policy making for education in view of theories of governmental intervention in society.
3. Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
4. Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.
5. Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
6. Communicate effectively in writing and in person in a public policy environment.

Basic Rules:

Students are required to attend all classes, to read all appropriate assignments before each class meeting, and to participate in class discussions. Incompletes may only be given in the case of an emergency and only if arranged before grades are due.

Method:

(Describe the primary pedagogical methods you will employ in and out class. An example for EdD 602 is below.)

“To measure your attendance, and prepare you for participation in class discussions, I ask that you submit a typed, double-spaced, two-page maximum answer to discussion question(s) provided to you on SacCT the week before a meeting occurs. Each person will be responsible for one discussion question for every four-hour session. I may ask students to do different discussion questions based upon a number assigned by e-mail before the first day of class.

You can only turn in discussion questions on the day of the meeting you attend. I will look them over and return them to you by the next class meeting with either a check minus, check, or check plus assigned based upon not just a “right or wrong” answer, but the writing style (grammar, punctuation, organization, etc.), thought, effort, and thoroughness that we judge you put into your answer. I will assign a plus if both information and writing are well done. I will assign a check if there is weakness in either
the information or writing. I will assign a minus if there is weakness in both. Your overall grade on these discussion questions is based on the highest seven assigned grades (out of a possible nine) you can receive. One of these write ups is due at the first meeting. Please feel free to turn in the full nine requested. I will only count your best seven grades, but I will not accept late or early submissions. Your final grade in this course depends on overall grade assigned to these discussion questions, a “CAM” analysis, and a literature review on a policy topic of your choice.

If concepts or ideas are covered in a class session that you do not understand, it is important to your overall success in the course that you get these misunderstandings resolved before the next time we meet. You can do this by talking to your fellow classmates (I encourage you to form study groups or electronic study networks), visiting me in office hours, sending an e-mail question to address listed above (please do not send through SacCT because I check less often), or phoning me at the number listed above. My promise to you is that if I am not in the office, I will respond to your Monday through Thursday e-mail or call within 24 hours.

Questions, comments, and discussion about material assigned for a class are always encouraged during that class. Other questions answered in the manner discussed above. Office hours are also for a suggestion on how I teach, a general discussion of K-12 or community college education policy, the Doctorate in Educational Leadership Program at Sacramento State, or your career plans. As part of your consideration on your course participation grade and to write your literature review, please plan on stopping by to visit me at least once during office hours. If this is not possible, we can chat during a class break.

The course consists of nine, four-hour course meetings. Three of these meetings are in the form of single sections that meet on Friday October 31, November 14, and December 5. Six of these meetings are in the form of double sections that meet on Saturday November 1, November 22, and December 6.

The structure of the four-hour course meetings are in two parts. For the part of class, you break up into assigned groups and discuss the answers to the discussion question(s) that applies to the first half of the class. Amongst your group, I will also ask you to come up with two additional topics covered in the assigned readings not covered in the discussion questions. Appoint two people to be the spokespeople on these issues for later in class. After about 30 minutes, we will reconvene as a class and discuss the answers to the discussion questions amongst us all. After a short break, we will come back and cover additional material. In the coverage of this additional material, you should raise the additional topics brought up in your groups.

Grades:

(Offer the details on how the final grade for the course is calculated. An example from EdD 602 is below.)
“The average grade assigned your discussion questions account for 30 percent of your final course grade. Your CAM analysis is weighted at 30 percent and your literature review is weighted at 30 percent. The remaining 10 percent of your grade is based on classroom participation.”

Schedule:

(For each meeting describe where it is located and the material covered in class through required and supplemental readings. Be sure to describe where supplemental readings are located. List assignment that are due and/or when exams are given. List the learning objectives addressed in each session. An example from EdD 602 is below.)

“This class meets for six dates throughout the semester (October 31, November 1, November 14; November 22, December 5, and December 6). Below is information on the readings for each week. Discussion questions for each date are assigned at least a week before a meeting through a SacCT e-mail to you.

Meeting 1, October 31, 2008; 5:30 - 9:30 p.m.

(1) Introductions
(2) Review WebCT
(3) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions
(4) Group Discussion on New Material:
Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chapter 1, “Policy Analysis as a Profession and a Process,”
(5) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

Learning objectives achieved:
(3) Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
(5) Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
Meeting 2, November 1, 2008; 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

First Half

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(3) Group Discussion on New Material:


Reed, The Growing Importance of Education in California, (available at http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/op/OP_703DROP.pdf),

Munger, Analyzing Policy, Chapter 2, “Deciding How to Decide,”


(4) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

Learning objectives achieved:
(1) Explain the theories of public and private benefits of education.
(2) Explain and evaluate the roles in policy making for education in view of theories of governmental intervention in society.

Second Half

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(3) Group Discussion on New Material:


From First to Worst video - video shown in class, (described at [http://www.pbs.org/merrow/tv/ftw](http://www.pbs.org/merrow/tv/ftw))

(4) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

(5) CAM assignment given out (due November 22 in class)

Learning objectives achieved:
(3) Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
(4) Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.

**Meeting 3, November 14, 2007; 5:30 - 9:30 p.m.**

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(3) Group Discussion on New Material:


(4) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

(5) Paper assignment given out (due December 12)

Learning objectives achieved:
(5) Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
(6) Communicate effectively in writing in a public policy environment.

**Meeting 4, November 22, 2008; 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.**

**First Half**

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions
(3) Group Discussion on New Material:

Galvin, *Writing Literature Reviews*, Chapters 1 – 7,


(4) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

Learning objectives achieved:
(3) Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
(5) Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
(6) Communicate effectively in writing and in person in a public policy environment.

Second Half

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(3) Group Discussion on New Material:

Galvin, *Writing Literature Reviews*, Chapters 8 – 13,


Zau and Betts, *Predicting Success, Preventing Failure*; (available at [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_608AZR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_608AZR.pdf)).

(4) Questions on additional topics not covered through group discussion

(5) CAM assignment due

Learning objectives achieved:
(2) Explain and evaluate the roles in policy making for education in view of theories of governmental intervention in society.
(5) Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
(6) Analyze proposed legislation affecting California education.
(7) Communicate effectively in writing and in person in a public policy environment.
Meeting 5, December 5, 2008; 5:30 - 9:30 p.m.

(1) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(2) Group Discussion on New Material:

Professor Nancy Shulock is planned guest,


Shullock, Moore, Offenstein, and Kirlin, It Could Happen (available at http://www.csus.edu/ihe/PDFs/R_ItCouldHappen_02-08.pdf),

Chubb and Moe; and Shrag, Controversies in American Public Policy, Chapter 1, “Yes and No: Would ‘School Choice’ Improve the Quality of American Public Education,” (on reserve at Sac State Library’s Reserve Room).

(3) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

Learning objectives achieved:
(3) Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
(4) Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.

Meeting 6, December 6, 2008; 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Second Half

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) Student Discussion on Assigned Questions

(3) Group Discussion on New Material:


Wassmer, Policy Lessons from California Public Schools that Achieve Higher than Expected, (available at http://www.csus.edu/indiv/w/wassmerr/apiall.pdf ),
(4) Questions on Additional Topics Not Covered Through Group Discussion

Learning objectives achieved:
(4) Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.
(6) Analyze proposed legislation affecting California education.

Second Half

(1) Questions from Last Meeting?

(2) 10 Minutes Each Student PowerPoint Presentations on Paper Topic (Details Forthcoming)

(3) Paper Assignment Due Friday, December 12.

Learning objectives achieved:
(6) Communicate effectively in writing and in person in a public policy environment.”
Appendix 4

SACRAMENTO STATE’S
DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

TEACHING PERFORMANCE TEMPLATE

**INSTRUCTIONS:** You are being asked to evaluate this course and the instructor. For each question there is a scale which runs from 1 to 5. A "1" represents a low rating and a "5" represents a high rating. The "NA" response provided on the scantron should be used for items that are not applicable to the course or have not been observed. Please use the lower half and the back of the scantron for specific comments regarding the course content, instruction, class activities, textbooks and assignments. Your instructor will not see the results of this survey until final semester grades have been recorded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. COURSE OUTLINE AND SYLLABUS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No course outline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major objectives seldom mentioned or made apparent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course outline distributed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major objectives mentioned but not clearly explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course outline distributed. Major objectives clearly explained and referred to throughout course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. CLARITY OF COURSEWORK REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount, quality of work and assignments are vague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount, quality of work and assignments are generally clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount, quality of work and assignments are consistently clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. PREPARATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seldom properly prepared; class activities/ lectures, etc., disorganized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually well prepared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently well prepared; class activities/ lectures, etc., well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. ORGANIZATION OF LECTURE/DISCUSSION/CLASS ACTIVITY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material has little apparent structure or goal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material usually well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material is consistently clear and well organized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. MANNER OF PRESENTATION</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to understand. Class lectures/ discussions/activities inappropriate and seldom enhance student knowledge and/or skill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations usually are understandable. Moderate enhancement or knowledge and/or skill from lecture/discussion/ class activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistently clear and easy to understand. Lectures/discussions/ activities accomplish purpose and provide sense of substantial personal growth in knowledge and/or skill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTS/IDEAS/SKILL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Does little to clarify difficult concepts and ideas and/or to enhance skill development.</td>
<td>Provides some help in making difficult ideas and concepts understandable and/or in enhancing skill development.</td>
<td>Consistently makes difficult concepts and ideas easy to understand and/or enhances skill development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **INSTRUCTOR INVOLVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seems bored with the class; uninterested in subject matter, teaching or learning.</td>
<td>Appears neither bored nor enthusiastic about the subject matter, teaching or learning.</td>
<td>Definitely interested in and enthusiastic about subject matter and teaching; generates a sense of excitement in students for learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **INSTRUCTOR/STUDENT INTERACTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shows little respect and concern for students.</td>
<td>Usually treats students with respect and concern.</td>
<td>Consistently treats students with respect and concern.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **FACILITATION OF DISCUSSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seldom encourages discussion related to classroom topics.</td>
<td>Usually stimulates interesting and relevant discussion.</td>
<td>Consistently stimulates and facilitates interesting and relevant discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **REVIEWING AND SUMMARIZING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inadequately reviews &amp; summarizes lecture/discussion material.</td>
<td>Minimally reviews and summarizes lecture/discussion material.</td>
<td>Regularly reviews and summarizes lecture/discussion material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **AVAILABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Often unavailable during office hours.</td>
<td>Generally keeps office hours.</td>
<td>Consistently keeps office hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **PROMPTNESS OF RETURNING PAPERS AND/OR EXAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Returns exams and/or papers late or not at all; often not graded.</td>
<td>Generally returns exams and/or papers promptly; usually not graded.</td>
<td>Consistently and promptly grades and returns exams and/or papers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **GRADING FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Few comments and/or little useful feedback.</td>
<td>Some useful comments and feedback.</td>
<td>Many useful comments and extensive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. **GRADING PRACTICES**
15. APPLICATION OF MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makes little effort to illustrate theories with useful examples.</td>
<td>Usually illustrates theories with useful examples.</td>
<td>Consistently illustrates theories with useful examples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. OVERALL RATING -- INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor instruction.</td>
<td>Good instruction.</td>
<td>Excellent instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 5

**SACRAMENTO STATE’S DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>601</th>
<th>602</th>
<th>603</th>
<th>604</th>
<th>605</th>
<th>606</th>
<th>607</th>
<th>608</th>
<th>609</th>
<th>610</th>
<th>611</th>
<th>612</th>
<th>613</th>
<th>614</th>
<th>615</th>
<th>616</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Critical analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem definition</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delineation of options</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research design</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>causal and correlation analysis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethical implications of choices</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Integrative thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(interdisciplinary skill sets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic concepts and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought to bear on K-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socio-political environment and analysis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy and administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgeting concepts and budget analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational analysis/change/development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural context and analysis</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legal context and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Effective communication to K-14 stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional writing (reports, memos, e-mails)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public presentation (information and technical)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective use of presentation technology</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>writing in academic contexts</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>601</th>
<th>602</th>
<th>603</th>
<th>604</th>
<th>605</th>
<th>606</th>
<th>607</th>
<th>608</th>
<th>609</th>
<th>610</th>
<th>611</th>
<th>612</th>
<th>613</th>
<th>614</th>
<th>615</th>
<th>616</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### (4) Understanding professional role

- federal/California policy context
  - P
- role of public/private/non-profit sectors in education
  - S
- education workplace and role ethics
  - S
- parent/community engagement
  - P
- accountability to all stakeholders
  - S

#### (5) Practical applications

- data collection -- how and where to get data
  - S
- analysis of qualitative and quantitative data
  - S
- implementation of data-based decisions
  - S
- supervision, evaluation, and professional development
  - S
- collective bargaining, appraisal, and compensation
  - S

#### (6) Leadership

- development/oversight of organization’s mission
  - P
- strategic planning
  - P
- management, problem solving, and conflict resolution
  - P
- collaboration and team building
  - P
- characteristics effective leaders (courage, commitment)
  - P

#### (7) Equity

- promote access, retention, and equity
  - S
- undoing institutional barriers of racism, sexism, classism
  - S
- setting high expectations for all students
  - S
- culturally responsive instructional leadership
  - S
- intersection of language & educ processes/structures
  - S

**Key:** P = primary coverage, S = secondary coverage, Blank = not covered
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COURSE ASSESSMENT EXAMPLE FROM Ed.D. 602

The syllabus for this course contained a number of learning goals. As part of the Ed.D. core curriculum, this course’s learning goals are part of an overall plan for what a PPA graduate should have learned upon graduation. This survey displays the COURSE learning goals.

How well was the learning goal accomplished for this class:
   a = not accomplished
   b = poorly
   c = satisfactorily
   d = very well
   e = excellently

1. Explain the theories of public and private benefits of education
2. Explain and evaluate the roles in policy making for education in view of theories of governmental intervention in society.
3. Identify the major policy issues affecting public K-12 and community college education in California; develop and defend positions on them using a clear theoretical framework.
4. Explain institutional education policy characteristics unique to California.
5. Analyze and explain the key issues of equity, efficiency, and political acceptability in relation to policymaking.
6. Communicate effectively in writing and in person in a public policy environment.

Comments:
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SACRAMENTO STATE’S
DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

PRE- AND POST-ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION AND RUBRIC

Assignment Description:

1. Identify a current educational leadership or policy issue in which you have some interest. The issue should be identified as pertaining to any sector (public or private) of education across the PreK – community college spectrum. Fully describe the issue as it exists in education today and its impact on students and communities.

2. Provide a decision making body with a description of the issue, including at least three of the following considerations:
   – Articulate the potential effects of the issue in all sectors of communities, particularly those considered “disenfranchised populations” in school communities.
   – Articulate fiscal/financial concerns or aspects.
   – Discuss legal implications of the issue.
   – Discuss economic considerations.
   – Discuss the implications of the issue for school leaders; for community leaders.

Craft your argument in support of, or in conflict with, the issue you have selected.

3. As appropriate, consider those dimensions of the issue that you believe to be important for the decision making process. Help the reader understand the complexities of the issue as well as how the issue may be understood differently by different groups of interested people. Be careful to distinguish between fact and opinion in your analysis.

4. Recommend a course of action based on your arguments.
Rubric For Evaluating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Missing/unsatisfactory (Zero Points)</th>
<th>Satisfactory (One Points)</th>
<th>Very well done (Two Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Is the problem/issue well defined? If research exists is it referenced?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Is the research design considered? Are possible options described?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Are implementation issues considered? Are ethical issues raised?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Are political, economic and or administrative perspectives considered as appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Are fiscal issues considered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Is the paper well written?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Overall structure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Basic grammar, appropriate citations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Is the paper analytical in nature?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Does it integrate the CA political, social and educational environments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical applications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Does the paper offer practical suggestions for action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Does it use data as appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments?
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QUALIFYING EXAM ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

This rubric for the evaluation of the Case Study Response, that is the Sacramento State’s EdD students qualifying examination, is based on the Program’s seven broad learning objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) Critical Analysis | The response demonstrates a clear and convincing critical analysis evident by the following:  
- demonstrates understanding and explanation of the problem;  
- provides a argument to either support or refute the case study's research design/application, when one is not provided or refuted, an appropriate and comprehensive alternative research design is provided;  
- provides consistent evidence of recognizing the interchange between theory and practice and practice and theory;  
- addresses the ethical implications of choices; and  
- identifies and effectively addresses critical issues/facets not readily apparent in the case study | There is limited evidence of recognizing the need to include critical analysis evident by the five elements. | There is little or no evidence of recognizing the need to include critical analysis in the response. |
| (2) Integrative Thinking | Where appropriate, response clearly incorporates the following elements:  
- economic concepts and analysis;  
- socio-political environment and analysis;  
- budgeting concepts and analysis | There is limited evidence of recognizing the need to include integrative thinking evident by the five elements. | There is little or no evidence of recognizing the need to include integrative thinking in the response. |
(3) Effective Communication to K-14 Stakeholders
The response demonstrates the student’s mastery of the following:
- professional writing;
- public presentation;
- public relations; and
- writing in this context.

There is limited evidence of effective communication to K-14 stakeholders evident by the four elements.
There is little or no evidence to support the student’s mastery of effective communication in this context.

(4) Understanding Professional Role
If warranted, the response offers a clear explanation in terms of the following:
- federal/California policy context;
- role of public/private/non-profit sectors;
- education workplace role and ethics;
- parent/community engagement; and
- stakeholder accountability.

There is limited evidence of an understanding of professional role evident by the five elements.
There is little or no evidence of recognizing the need to include effective communication issues in the analysis of the case.

(5) Practical Applications
Where relevant, the response clearly recognizes the role of the following:
- data collection and analysis;
- the relationship and significance between the influence of data on decision and policy making processes;
- supervision;
- professional development;
- evaluation elements in implementing suggestions; and
- the role of collective bargaining.

There is limited evidence of practical applications evident by the six elements.
There is little or no evidence to support the student’s mastery of effective communication in this context.

(6) Leadership
If appropriate, response clearly demonstrates the following:
- the role of an organization’s leadership

There is limited evidence of leadership
There is little or no evidence to support the
mission; strategic planning and management; conflict resolution, and problem solving; and collaboration and team building, and characteristics necessary for effective leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components evident by the four elements.</th>
<th>Student’s mastery of leadership concerns in addressing the issue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### (7) Equity

The response clearly and convincingly demonstrates consideration of the following:
- diversity and equity implications/issues;
- promoting access, retention, and equity;
- undoing institutional barriers, setting high expectations, culturally responsive instructional leadership; and
- the intersection of language and education structures.

There is limited evidence of attention to equity issues evident by the four elements. There is little or no evidence to support the student’s mastery of equity concerns in addressing the issue.

### SCORING GUIDELINES

- Students are given a pass, revise, or fail on each of the seven main elements in the rubric.

- Students need a passing score for six of the seven criteria, and no fails, in order to have an overall passing grade for the qualifying exam.

- If less than six passing scores on the seven criteria, and no fails, student given the opportunity to revise her response to bring all of the revise evaluations up.

- The opportunity to revise is only given once.

- The same criterion for achieving an overall pass applies the second time.
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SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES FOR DOCTORAL ADVISEMENT

1. Objectives of Advisement of Ed.D. Candidates

   A. Advisement by university faculty is governed by the principle that enhancing the academic and professional development of students in the Ed.D. program is a central purpose of the program and goal of the faculty.

   B. Advisement by university faculty is aimed at: (i) promoting a well-planned and efficient Ed.D. course of study that can be completed within three years by working professionals; (ii) providing academic discussion and dialogue that fosters embedding of dissertation research within each component of the curriculum; (iii) providing expert supervision to Ed.D. candidate in the conduct of rigorous dissertation research; (iv) providing guidance and information fostering professional development; and (v) facilitating advocacy on behalf of students and their needs.

2. Roles of Faculty Advisor

   A. The Program Advisor is responsible for normal graduate advising functions, including identifying sources of information regarding credential requirements, utilizing procedures that follow established campus graduate standards and requirements.

   Assignment of Faculty Advisors

3. Service as Faculty Advisors

   A. Each core faculty member in the Ed.D. Program Faculty as defined by the program by-laws will normally be available to serve as a Program and Academic Advisor.

   B. Student advisement will be distributed among core members of Ed.D. Program Faculty Group proportionate to their appointment in the program to the greatest extent possible.

4. Appointment of Program Advisor

   A. The Program Advisor will be appointed at the time the candidate accepts an offer of admission to the program.
B. Every effort will be made to ensure that the Program Advisor is a suitable fit for the candidate and that the assignment is agreeable to both the student and the faculty member.

5. Selection of Academic Advisor

A. At the time the candidate is prepared to begin planning his/her dissertation research, the candidate will identify from among the core faculty an individual who he/she believes would serve effectively as the Dissertation Chair, based upon the correspondence between the research area of interest to the candidate and the expertise of the faculty.

B. If the faculty member who is identified is available to serve as Dissertation Chair for the candidate and agrees to serve in this role, the faculty member will be designated as the Academic Advisor/Dissertation Chair for the student, utilizing the appointment procedures of the campus.

C. Faculty members will make every effort to serve as Dissertation Chairs when requested by students. If, however, it is not possible for the faculty member to serve in this role or if the faculty member does not consider his/her expertise appropriate, the candidate will identify another core faculty member to serve as Academic Advisor/Dissertation Chair.

D. Program Advisors shall assist Ed.D. candidates in identifying core faculty members well-suited to serve as Dissertation Chairs based on the topics of interest to the respective candidates.

6. Review of Advisor Assignments on an Annual Basis

A. Once each year, Program Advisor assignments shall be reviewed by the Ed.D. program administration.

B. A change in Advisor may be made at any time if requested by the candidate or the Advisor. The action may be based on a request initiated by either of the individuals or may derive from a recommendation of the Ed.D. faculty or program administration aimed at facilitating progress to degree completion.
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**SACRAMENTO STATE’S DOCTORATE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR DISSERTATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Expectations of Quality Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>• A convincing argument that includes multiple perspectives on the selected topic is made&lt;br&gt;• The study rational is developed and variables/phenomena articulated in historical context&lt;br&gt;• The conceptualization of the study is focused and clear&lt;br&gt;• The topic is grounded on a historical context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature Review</td>
<td>• The literature review is comprehensive and up to date with appropriate coverage and synthesis of key variables&lt;br&gt;• The review is well organized and presented with a keen focus on the study’s purpose statement&lt;br&gt;• The researcher analyzes and synthesizes the literature to develop new ways of conceptualizing major literature themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>• Writer makes explicit his/her theoretical framework that guides the research study&lt;br&gt;• The researcher uses the selected theoretical framework to conceptualize his/her own topic&lt;br&gt;• The researcher illustrates a comprehensive review of theories related to the study’s focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>• The methodology is rigorous and appropriate for the study&lt;br&gt;• The methods and research design is appropriate for the purpose of the study&lt;br&gt;• The researcher explains the advantage and disadvantage of utilizing the study’s selected research design&lt;br&gt;• The methodology and analysis are reliable, valid, and replicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis and Findings</td>
<td>• The results and findings of the study are consistent with the data collected and reflect a critical analysis of the data&lt;br&gt;• The results are presented in an organized way and address the purpose of the study&lt;br&gt;• Data presentation is used to further explore the issue and to build an argument for findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations</td>
<td>• Discussion, conclusion and recommendations are effectively developed and are aligned and are informed by the data analysis&lt;br&gt;• The significance of the study is assessed and explored&lt;br&gt;• Recommendations offered have practical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style and Format</td>
<td>• The dissertation follows the APA format&lt;br&gt;• Sentences are well constructed and free of grammatical errors&lt;br&gt;• Transitional phrases are well developed and add to the thoughtful flow of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Program Mission and Expected Student Outcomes</td>
<td>• Research demonstrates achievement of the three program goals:&lt;br&gt;  1. Transformational leadership&lt;br&gt;  2. Critical policy analysis and action&lt;br&gt;  3. Informed decision-making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DISSEYERTATION COMPLETION TIMELINE FOR 2007 COHORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date Submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement to Candidacy</td>
<td>Secure necessary signatures</td>
<td>February 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select Dissertation Chair</td>
<td>Work with advisor/director</td>
<td>March 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination of Dissertation Committee</td>
<td>Student and chair decide on the composition of this committee</td>
<td>April 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB Approval</td>
<td>Student works with IRB office to obtain Human Subjects Committee Approval</td>
<td>Before October 16, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense of Dissertation Proposal</td>
<td>Student submits the defense of dissertation Proposal form</td>
<td>Before October, 30, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for Graduation</td>
<td>During semester they intend on graduating</td>
<td>February 1, 2010 (deadline for Spring graduation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>Once students meet committee expectations, a final draft is presented to the dissertation committee.</td>
<td>May 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Order 991

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210
(562) 951-4672

Executive Order: 991

Title: Doctor of Education Degree Programs

Effective Date: September 27, 2006

Supersedes: No Prior Executive Order

This executive order is issued in conformity with Sections 66040 through 66040.7 of the California Education Code and Sections 40050.1, 40100, 40511, and 40512 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations. This executive order establishes minimum requirements, policies, and procedures that shall apply to all Doctor of Education degree programs offered solely by the California State University (CSU). This executive order does not address requirements of Doctor of Education programs offered jointly with other institutions. Campuses may establish policies in addition to those stated herein.

Article 1. Authorization
In accordance with Education Code Section 66040.3 and Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations Section 40050.1, the California State University is authorized to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Educational Leadership. The degree shall be offered only in the discipline of education and shall focus on the knowledge and skills needed by administrative leaders for possible service in either California public elementary and secondary school (P-12) or community college settings.

Article 2. Partnerships
CSU Ed.D. degree programs shall be offered through partnerships in which representatives from California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges, as appropriate, shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, dissertation development, and program assessment and evaluation.

Article 3. Program Governance
3.1 Each CSU Ed.D. degree program shall develop a governance structure, processes, and bylaws that comply with Education Code Section 66040.3 and that allow for substantial and meaningful participation by Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 12 (P-12) and community college partners as specified in Articles 2 and 12 of this executive order.

3.2 Program bylaws shall include the qualifications, roles, and terms of appointment for core and affiliated doctoral faculty, as defined in Article 12.1. The bylaws shall also include provisions for allowing other individuals to undertake educational roles in the
Ed.D. program, pursuant to Articles 12.2 and 12.3.

3.3 Program bylaws shall stipulate the appropriate campus authority required for actions specified in Articles 4.1.e, 4.3, 7.3.2.4, and 9.

Article 4. Admission

4.1 In accordance with Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 41020, each campus offering a program leading to a Doctor of Education degree shall establish requirements for admission to the program. Admission shall be granted on a competitive basis; meeting the minimum requirements qualifies an individual for but does not guarantee admission to the program. Requirements for admission shall apply to all Ed.D. applicants and shall include, at minimum, the following:
   a. The applicant holds an acceptable baccalaureate and master’s degree earned at a regionally accredited institution or institutions, or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority.
   b. The applicant has attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.0 in upper-division and graduate study combined.
   c. The applicant was in good standing at the last institution of higher education attended.
   d. The applicant has demonstrated sufficient preparation for, experience in, and potential for educational leadership, including: successful experience in leadership in school, postsecondary, or community contexts, and/or policy leadership; academic excellence; problem-solving ability; technological proficiency; interest in critically assessing current educational policies and practices; and interest in improving current educational policies and practices. Evidence considered in the admission process shall include but not be limited to:
      1. Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores from the three sections of the General Test, taken within five years of applying to the Ed.D. program;
      2. three letters of recommendation attesting to the leadership and scholarship potential of the applicant;
      3. a written statement of purpose reflecting an understanding of the challenges facing the public schools or community colleges in California;
      4. a personal interview; and either
         i. a statement from the applicant’s employer, indicating support for the applicant’s doctoral studies; or
         ii. a statement from the applicant, describing the applicant’s plan for meeting professional responsibilities and the demands of the program.
   e. The applicant shall meet any additional requirements prescribed by the appropriate campus authority identified in the program bylaws.

4.2 Classified Standing
Applicants who have met all admission criteria and who have been recommended by the program for admission shall be placed in classified graduate standing.

4.3 Admission by Special Action
An applicant who does not qualify for admission under the provisions of Article 4.1 may be admitted with classified graduate standing by special action if on the basis of acceptable evidence the applicant is judged by the appropriate campus
authority to possess sufficient academic and professional potential pertinent to educational leadership. The number of applicants admitted by special action shall not exceed fifteen percent of the applicants regularly admitted to the program in any one academic year.

4.4 Admission with Conditionally Classified Graduate Standing
An applicant who is ineligible under the provisions in Article 4.1 because of deficiencies in prerequisite preparation that in the opinion of the program faculty can be rectified by specified additional preparation, including examinations, may be admitted with conditionally classified graduate standing. The student shall be granted classified graduate standing upon rectification of the deficiencies.

Article 5. Curriculum
5.1 CSU Ed.D. degree programs shall enable professionals working full time to earn the degree within three calendar years (including fall through spring terms and summer study).

5.2 CSU Ed.D. programs shall have a cohort structure whose curriculum shall balance research, theory, and practice, including field experiences.

5.3 Student work in support of the dissertation shall be embedded throughout the Ed.D. curriculum.

5.4 All Ed.D. programs shall include a core curriculum providing professional preparation for leadership, including but not limited to theory and research methods, the structure and culture of educational institutions, leadership in curriculum and instruction, equity, and assessment. Campuses developing Ed.D. programs shall be expected to integrate core educational leadership program concepts when designing the curriculum. Core educational leadership concepts are identified in Addendum A.

Article 6. Degree Requirements
6.1 Program of Study
To be eligible for the Doctor of Education degree, the candidate shall have completed a program of study, including examinations and a dissertation, that is both consistent with the requirements specified within this executive order and approved by the appropriate campus authority. Examination and dissertation requirements are specified in Article 7. Each campus shall establish policies and procedures for creating and amending a student’s plan of study and shall disseminate them in its Ed.D. program student handbook or manual, pursuant to subdivision j of Article 11.3.

6.1.1 Grade Point Average
A grade point average of 3.0 (grade of B) or better shall have been earned in the coursework taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree, except that a course for which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average.

6.1.2 Unit Requirements
The program of study shall be composed of at least 60 semester units earned in graduate standing and is expected not to exceed 60 required semester units earned in graduate standing. At least 48 semester units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, and the remaining units required for the degree shall be in courses organized primarily for master's and doctoral students. Not more than 12 semester dissertation credits shall be
applied toward the degree program requirements.

6.2 Academic Residence
At least 42 semester units shall be completed in residence at the campus or campuses awarding the degree. The appropriate campus authority may authorize the substitution of credit earned by alternate means for part of this residence requirement.

6.2 Transfer of Units
The Ed.D. program shall establish a policy allowing transfer of units earned in relevant graduate coursework. At a minimum the policy shall require that:
   a. the student was matriculated in the graduate program within which the coursework was completed, and
   b. the graduate program was appropriately accredited at the time the coursework was completed.

6.4 Petitions for Variance in Academic Requirements
Each Ed.D. degree program shall establish and implement policies regarding student petitions for variance in academic requirements. Student handbooks or manuals shall specify policies and procedures by which a student may petition for a variance in academic requirements.

Article 7. Ed.D. Program Student Examinations and Dissertation
7.1 Ed.D. degree conferral shall require successful completion of three major examinations and a dissertation. Students shall be required to pass each major examination within two attempts.

7.1.1 The qualifying examination shall include a rigorous written assessment of student knowledge; the examination must be passed prior to the student’s advancement to candidacy. Policy governing qualifying examinations appears in Article 7.2.

7.1.2 The dissertation proposal examination shall evaluate the candidate’s readiness to proceed with the dissertation research. Passing this examination shall constitute formal approval for the candidate to proceed with the proposed dissertation research, subject to Institutional Review Board approval as necessary. Policies governing dissertation proposals and dissertation proposal examinations appear in Articles 7.3.4 and 7.3.5.

7.1.3 The dissertation shall be the written product of systematic, rigorous research on a significant educational issue. Policy governing dissertations appears in Article 7.3.

7.1.4 The final examination shall be an oral defense of the candidate’s dissertation.

7.2 Qualifying Examination
7.2.1 Content
The content of the qualifying examination shall be determined by the members of the Ed.D. program faculty.

7.2.2 Timing
The qualifying examination shall be administered at a time in the program sequence when the student’s mastery of essential elements of the core leadership and methodological concepts can be fairly evaluated and when the
student is considered ready to begin formal dissertation research.

### 7.2.3 Function of the Qualifying Examination Committee
A qualifying examination committee shall evaluate student performance on the examination. Unanimous agreement of the qualifying examination committee is required for the candidate to pass the examination.

### 7.2.4 Membership of the Qualifying Examination Committee
The qualifying examination committee shall have a minimum of three members, including the chair. The qualifying examination committee chair shall be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member of the campus administering the Ed.D. program and except in special cases shall be a member of the Ed.D. program faculty. Special cases shall be reviewed and decided by the core doctoral faculty. At least two members of the committee shall be members of the Ed.D. program faculty whose primary affiliation is with the CSU campus administering the Ed.D. program, at least one of whom shall be a member of the core doctoral faculty as defined in Article 12. The committee may include a member who holds an appropriate professional position in a P-12 institution, a community college, or another postsecondary educational institution.

### 7.3 Dissertation Proposal Examination, Dissertation, and Final Examination

#### 7.3.1 Dissertation Requirements
In accordance with Section 40511 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations, CSU Ed.D. programs shall require the completion of a dissertation conforming to the following minimum criteria:

a. The dissertation shall be the written product of systematic, rigorous research on a significant educational issue and in accordance with a proposal that has been approved pursuant to Articles 7.3.4 and 7.3.5. The dissertation is expected to contribute to an improvement in public P-12 or community college professional practices or policy, generally or in the context of a particular educational institution. It shall evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and a rationale for the research problem examined.

b. The dissertation shall identify the research problem and question(s), state the major theoretical perspectives, explain the significance of the undertaking, relate it to the relevant scholarly and professional literature, set forth the appropriate sources for and methods of gathering and analyzing the data, and offer a conclusion or recommendation. It shall include a written abstract that summarizes the significance of the work, objectives, methodology, and a conclusion or recommendation.

c. **Opportunities for students to complete work in support of the dissertation shall be embedded throughout the Ed.D. curriculum.**

#### 7.3.2 Dissertation Committee

##### 7.3.2.1 Function of the Dissertation Committee
The dissertation committee shall provide guidance and supervision for development and completion of the dissertation.

##### 7.3.2.2 Membership of the Dissertation Committee
The dissertation committee shall have a minimum of three voting members, including the chair, and all committee members shall have appropriate expertise in educational practice or policy. The committee shall include at least two tenured or tenure-track faculty members of
the CSU campus administering the Ed.D. program, and at least one
member who is primarily affiliated with a California P-12 institution or
community college. The tenured or tenure-track faculty members shall
be drawn from the core doctoral faculty or affiliated doctoral faculty, as
defined in Article 12.1, or shall meet the standards of Article 12.2.1.
The campus program director may approve an exception to the
membership criteria stated above, pursuant to Article 12.2.2 or Article
12.2.3, if the individual nominated has expertise particularly relevant
to the candidate’s dissertation research.

7.3.2.3 Dissertation Committee Chair
The dissertation committee chair shall provide primary supervision for
dissertation research. The chair shall be a tenured or tenure-track
faculty member on the campus administering the Ed.D. program, and
in most cases shall be a member of the core doctoral faculty, as
defined in Article 12.1.1. Special circumstances may arise in which a
tenured or tenure-track faculty member who is from the campus but
who is not a member of the core doctoral faculty may serve as the
dissertation committee chair if such service is approved by the core
doctoral faculty in accordance with program procedures.

7.3.2.4 Appointment of Dissertation Committee
The student and advisor together shall propose the membership of the
student’s dissertation committee. The proposed membership shall be
forwarded to and determined by the campus official authorized to
approve composition of the committee.
The Ed.D. program director may allow the replacement of a committee
member, based on the evaluation of a rationale provided by the
student or committee member making the request.

7.3.3 Institutional Review Board Approval
Appropriate Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval shall be obtained to
conduct any research involving human subjects. Failure to obtain required IRB
approval prior to collection of data on human subjects may disqualify a student
from further use of those data. The dissertation committee chair shall advise
the student regarding human subjects review requirements and compliance with
IRB regulations.

7.3.4 Dissertation Proposal
A student shall submit a dissertation proposal for approval, following the
procedures and format established by the Ed.D. program faculty and the
campus. The dissertation proposal shall contain, at a minimum, a description of
the problem, a review of the relevant literature, a statement of the research
question, and a description of the research methodology. The proposal shall
contain either:
a. human subjects research documents that have been submitted to the
   Institutional Review Board regarding the proposed dissertation research or
b. required materials pertaining to human subjects research that have been
   completed but not yet submitted to the Institutional Review Board.

7.3.5 Dissertation Proposal Examination
7.3.5.1 Function and Membership of the Dissertation Proposal
   Committee
The dissertation proposal examination shall be conducted by a three-member dissertation proposal committee, all of whom shall have appropriate expertise in educational practice or policy. The membership shall include two tenured or tenure-track faculty members from the CSU campus administering the Ed.D. program and at least one member who is primarily affiliated with a California P-12 institution or community college. The dissertation proposal committee shall review the dissertation proposal. The committee may require that the student present the proposal orally to the committee and respond to committee members’ questions about the proposal.

7.3.5.2 Decision of the Dissertation Proposal Committee
The dissertation proposal committee shall communicate formally its decision in writing to the student, indicating approval, approval with modifications, or lack of approval. In order for the student to proceed with the formal conduct of the dissertation research, the student shall have received written approval of the proposal by the dissertation proposal committee and written Institutional Review Board notification that human subjects review requirements have been met.

7.3.5.3 Resubmission of a Dissertation Proposal
If the dissertation proposal committee decision is “approval with modifications” or “lack of approval,” the committee shall communicate to the student in writing the process and expectations for resubmission. The committee shall review the revised and resubmitted proposal and communicate to the student in writing the committee’s decision.

7.3.6 Final Examination: Oral Defense of Dissertation
The final examination shall be an oral defense of the dissertation, administered by the dissertation committee. Approval of the dissertation and recommendation that the Ed.D. degree be conferred shall require unanimous agreement of the dissertation committee. In the event that the committee requires substantive changes to the dissertation, the final vote of the committee will be postponed until the changes are completed.

7.3.7 Submission of the Approved Dissertation
The student shall be required, after successful completion of the final examination and approval of the dissertation, to submit the approved dissertation to the appropriate campus entity in conformity with campus policy. The dissertation format shall conform to campus requirements for dissertation manuscripts. For the degree to be conferred in a particular term, the dissertation shall be submitted by the deadline specified by the program and campus.

Article 8. Satisfactory Progress
8.1 Requirement for Satisfactory Progress
Each Ed.D. student shall be required to maintain satisfactory progress toward degree conferral. Consistent with the cohort structure of the program, the student shall be expected to complete satisfactorily all courses and examinations and shall be expected to advance to candidacy within the time frame specified by the Ed.D. program faculty.

8.2 Criteria for Satisfactory Progress
In accordance with campus policy, the Ed.D. program faculty and the campus shall
establish criteria for satisfactory progress in the program. The criteria shall include, at a minimum, the following:

a. The student shall maintain at least a 3.0 cumulative grade point average in the program.
b. The student shall not have earned a grade point average below 3.0 in any two successive terms.

8.3 **Credit/No Credit**
The Ed.D. program shall establish a policy regarding credit/no credit in graduate work conducted toward satisfaction of degree requirements.

8.4 **Probation**
A student who falls below a 3.0 grade point average in any one term shall be placed on academic probation and notified of this placement in writing.

8.4 **Disqualification**
A student who fails to make satisfactory progress may be officially disqualified from the program based on the recommendation of the Ed.D. program faculty, in accordance with policies and procedures established by the campus.

8.4.1 A student may be disqualified only after a thorough review of the case, including appropriate consultation and submission of a written recommendation by the Ed.D. program faculty. The student shall be notified in writing of the disqualification. The student shall have the opportunity to appeal the decision.

8.4.2 A student who has been disqualified from the Ed.D. program shall not be allowed to enroll in doctoral-level courses in the program or otherwise continue in the Ed.D. program without formal re-application and re-admission.

**Article 9. Advancement to Candidacy**
For advancement to candidacy for the Ed.D. the student shall have achieved classified graduate standing, successfully completed a qualifying examination pursuant to Article 7, and met such particular requirements as the appropriate campus authority may prescribe. The total time from achievement of classified standing to qualifying examination and advancement to candidacy shall not exceed three years unless there are mitigating circumstances and the program faculty members have approved the extension. An extension shall not exceed one year.

**Article 10. Time To Degree**
10.1 While the Ed.D. program shall be designed to allow completion of all requirements within three years, the student shall have completed all requirements for the degree within five years of achieving classified standing in the doctoral program. The appropriate campus authority, consistent with campus policy, may extend by up to two years the time allowed for completion of the requirements under the following circumstances:

a. the student is in good standing,
b. **the extension is warranted by compelling individual circumstances, and**
c. the student demonstrates current knowledge of research and practice in educational leadership, as required by the campus.

10.2 Ed.D. program faculty shall establish, in conformity with campus policy, criteria for granting further extension, which may be granted under special circumstances. The criteria shall include, at a minimum, the conditions (a), (b), and (c) in the paragraph
10.3 During a period of extension, the Ed.D. program faculty shall determine at the conclusion of each term in which a student is enrolled whether the student has made satisfactory progress.

Article 11. Doctoral Advising and Mentoring

11.1 Definitions

Objectives appear below for advising, which is primarily an academic activity, and mentoring, for which the focus is on professional development.

11.1.1 Ed.D. Advising shall be arranged by the Ed.D. program and conducted by campus faculty members to address:
   a. promoting a well-planned and efficient Ed.D. course of study that can be completed within three years by a working professional; and
   b. creating a doctoral culture typified by:
      1. scholarly discussion and dialogue that fosters embedding of dissertation research within each component of the curriculum,
      2. expert supervision of Ed.D. candidates in the conduct of rigorous dissertation research,
      3. guidance and information that foster professional development, and
      4. advocacy on behalf of students and their academic needs.

11.1.2 Ed.D. Mentoring shall be arranged by the Ed.D. program to facilitate:
   a. supporting and enhancing professional experiences that foster leadership knowledge and skills,
   b. providing guidance and modeling to assist students as they apply what is learned in coursework toward improving public schools or community colleges, and
   c. fostering informal assessment and feedback designed to enhance student reflection on educational leadership and reform.

11.2 Each campus offering a Doctor of Education degree program shall establish and implement advising policies and mentoring policies designed to enhance the academic and professional development of students in the program. Policies shall address but are not limited to:
   a. objectives of advising, roles of faculty advisors, assignment of faculty advisors (including the student role in assigning faculty advisors), and advising responsibilities of dissertation committee chairs; and
   b. objectives of mentoring, roles and qualifications of mentors, orientation and training of mentors, and assigning mentors.

11.3 Each campus offering an Ed.D. program shall create and provide to all students enrolled in that program a student manual or handbook detailing, at a minimum, the following:
   a. Policies on professional ethics and academic integrity;
   b. Forms to be completed by students in the course of the degree program;
   c. The program of study required for the degree (see Article 5.2);
   d. Requirements for admission with classified standing (see Article 4.24);
   e. Academic residence requirements (see Article 6.2);
   f. Policies on student fees and financial aid;
   g. Provisions for advising and mentoring (see Article 11);
   h. Policies and procedures for establishing and amending a plan of study (see Article
i. Policies on the transfer of credit earned at other institutions (see Article 6.3);
j. Policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for administering a qualifying examination (if the qualifying examination is unique to the individual student) (see Articles 7.2.3 to 7.2.4);
k. Requirements for advancement to candidacy (see Article 9);
l. Policies and procedures for the formation of a committee for supervising a dissertation (see Article 7.3.2);
m. Dissertation requirements (see Article 7.3.1 and Articles 7.3.3 through 7.3.7);
n. Requirements for field experience embedded in the program, if applicable (see Article 5.2);
o. Requirements for satisfactory progress in the program (see Article 8);
p. Policies and procedures for petitioning for a variance in academic requirements (see Article 6.4);
q. Policies on extension of time for completion of degree requirements (see Article 10);
r. Policies on academic probation and disqualification (see Articles 8.3 and 8.4);
s. Policies and procedures for obtaining a leave of absence or for withdrawing from the university;
t. Policies and procedures regarding student grievances;
u. Policies on harassment and discrimination;
v. The names and areas of expertise of faculty members affiliated with the degree program.

Article 12. Faculty

12.1 Core Doctoral Faculty and Affiliated Doctoral Faculty

Ed.D. programs shall include core doctoral faculty and affiliated doctoral faculty. Core doctoral and affiliated doctoral faculty shall have distinct qualifications, roles, and responsibilities, as specified below and in the program bylaws.

12.1.1 Core Doctoral Faculty

12.1.1.1 Definition and Roles

The term core doctoral faculty refers only to those campus faculty members who have disciplinary expertise and a scholarly record relevant to leadership in P-12 or community college education. They are eligible to serve in all of the Ed.D. faculty roles: as primary doctoral course instructors, members of qualifying examination committees and dissertation committees, advisors and mentors to doctoral students, chairs of examination and dissertation committees, and members of Doctor of Education degree program governance groups. Core doctoral faculty members are expected to teach courses on a regular basis, serve on and chair student examination and dissertation committees, be available to act as faculty advisors, and be willing to participate in the governance of the program. This group shall include individuals from a number of relevant academic units on the campus administering the program.

12.1.1.2 Appointment

Core doctoral faculty members shall be appointed in accordance with procedures specified in the program bylaws. The procedures shall include submission and review of academic and professional qualifications.
12.1.1.3 Qualifications
Appointment and renewal of appointment as a core doctoral faculty member are dependent upon demonstrated currency in the area of scholarship related to the program. To be appointed to the core doctoral faculty, a faculty member shall in most cases meet the following criteria:

a. have expertise in theory, research, policy, or practice related to P-12 or community college educational leadership;
b. exhibit a strong professional record of scholarly publication pertinent to educational leadership or to the theoretical or methodological underpinnings thereof;
c. have earned a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline from an accredited institution of higher education;
d. be tenured or have a tenure-track appointment;
e. have teaching experience at the graduate level; and
f. have demonstrated ability to direct others in research activities, including master's theses or doctoral dissertations.

12.1.1.4 Term of Appointment
Appointment as a core doctoral faculty member in the Ed.D. program shall be for a term that conforms to appointment and reappointment procedures for tenure-track faculty at the campus. A term of appointment shall not exceed five years. The program bylaws shall specify procedures for renewing appointments to the core doctoral faculty.

12.1.2 Affiliated Doctoral Faculty
12.1.2.1 Definition and Roles
The term affiliated doctoral faculty refers to additional faculty members who have disciplinary expertise or significant experience related to the Ed.D. program and leadership in P-12 or community college education. The affiliated doctoral faculty is comprised of:

a. tenured or tenure-track faculty members on the campus who are not members of the core doctoral faculty and
b. other faculty members with specific expertise pertinent to educational leadership, including individuals who have expertise and experience relevant to issues of educational leadership addressed in the Ed.D. program and who are currently or who have recently been employed by a P-12 or community college partner.

Affiliated doctoral faculty members may teach in the doctoral program and serve as mentors and members of student examination and dissertation committees. They are expected to be willing to participate in the governance of the program as specified in the program bylaws. Affiliated doctoral faculty members are not ordinarily the primary instructors within the core of the Ed.D. program of study. However, those affiliated doctoral faculty who are tenured or on the tenure track may teach graduate courses relevant to educational leadership in which Ed.D. students may enroll as approved by the Ed.D. program faculty. Affiliated doctoral faculty members may also propose specialized courses in which Ed.D. students and other graduate students may enroll.

Affiliated doctoral faculty who are experienced practitioners in P-12 or
community college education will typically be appointed as lecturers. Affiliated doctoral faculty may teach or co-teach program courses. Service as members of Ed.D. examination or dissertation committees shall require special approval as specified in the program bylaws.

12.1.2.2 Appointment
Affiliated doctoral faculty members shall be appointed in accordance with procedures specified in the program bylaws. The procedures shall include submission and review of qualifications. Appointment and renewal of appointment as an affiliated doctoral faculty member is dependent upon demonstrated currency in the areas of expertise and experience related to the program.

12.1.2.3 Qualifications
To be appointed to the affiliated doctoral faculty, a faculty member shall in all but exceptional cases meet the following criteria:
- have expertise relevant to the program,
- have earned a relevant doctoral degree from an accredited institution of higher education, and
- be a tenured or tenure-track campus faculty member or be recommended by a P-12 or community college partner in the program.

12.1.2.4 Term of Appointment
Appointment as an affiliated doctoral faculty member in the Ed.D. program shall be for a term that conforms with appointment and reappointment procedures for lecturers. A term of appointment shall not exceed three years. The program bylaws shall specify procedures for renewing appointments to the affiliated doctoral faculty. Appointment and renewal of appointment as a core doctoral faculty member are dependent upon demonstrated currency in the area of scholarship related to the program.

12.2 Other Faculty
12.2.1 Other Faculty from the Campus Offering the Program
Faculty members who are not core or affiliated doctoral faculty but who hold tenured or tenure-track appointments on the campus may teach or co-teach Ed.D. courses or may serve as members of Ed.D. dissertation committees. Such individuals must have earned a relevant doctoral degree and have pertinent scholarly expertise. Service as a member of an Ed.D. dissertation committee must be recommended by the Ed.D. core doctoral faculty and be approved in accordance with campus policy and procedures governing graduate study.

12.2.2 Faculty from Other California State University Campuses
Faculty members affiliated primarily with other California State University campuses may teach or otherwise serve in the program, subject to rules and regulations governing such activity. These faculty members may serve as members of Ed.D. examination or dissertation committees under the following conditions:
- the faculty member meets the criteria for committee membership, and
- is approved in accordance with campus policy and procedures governing graduate study; and
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b. the faculty member’s participation has been requested by the candidate and the candidate’s advisor, or the faculty member has been recommended by the Ed.D. program faculty.

12.2.3 Educational Researchers and Faculty from Other Institutions
Educational researchers who are affiliated with centers or institutes and who have particular expertise in educational leadership, and faculty members affiliated primarily with the University of California or independent universities may be invited to teach or otherwise serve in the Ed.D. program. Those individuals who meet the criteria for committee membership may serve on Ed.D. examination or dissertation committees if recommended by the program faculty and approved in accordance with campus policy and procedures governing graduate study.

12.3 Procedures To Allow for Additional Faculty Roles Under Special Circumstances
There may arise special circumstances in which the Ed.D. program faculty determine that it would benefit the program for an exceptionally qualified individual to undertake a role for which the foregoing articles do not provide. The Ed.D. program bylaws shall specify conditions under which such appointments may be made, the procedures for making such appointments, and the formal approval mechanisms that shall govern them.

Charles B. Reed
Chancellor

Date: September 22, 2006

ADDENDUM A
CSU Doctor of Education in Education Leadership
Core Curricular Concepts

All Ed.D. programs shall include a core curriculum providing professional preparation for leadership, including but not limited to theory and research methods, the structure and culture of educational institutions, leadership in curriculum and instruction, equity, and assessment. Campuses developing Ed.D. programs shall be expected to integrate core educational leadership program concepts when designing the curriculum.

The sample model below lists key concepts that, in most cases, campuses are expected to address in Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. In cases where core concepts are not included in a program proposal, the campus should indicate why the concepts are not addressed. This three-part organization of concepts is an example of how Ed.D. program components might be organized, but campus proposals may organize the core concepts differently than appears here. Leadership core concepts are meant to include topics appropriate for both the P-12 and community college/post-secondary education specializations.
Leadership Core Concepts

1. **Systemic Educational Reform**: Achieving reform and improvement within California’s P-12 and community college/post-secondary education institutions.

2. **Visionary Educational Leadership**: Leadership based on a shared vision of learning grounded in moral principles and ethical decision making.

3. **Complexity and Organizations**: Modern theories of management of complex organizations and applications to education.

4. **Collaborative Management**: Fostering distributive leadership, facilitating collaborative change.

5. **Diversity and Equity**: Addressing issues of diversity, equity and opportunity, including attention to special populations.

6. **Educational Policy Environments**: Political, legal, and historical contexts affecting local, state, and federal educational decision making.

7. **Educational Accountability**: Internal and external accountability processes and their use in data-driven planning.

Leadership Specialization

1. **School and Campus Cultures**: Creating shared aspirations and expectations that result in learning-centered environments and student excellence.

2. **Curriculum and Instructional Reforms**: Cognition and learning, reforms in curriculum and instruction, instructional technologies, online and distance learning.

3. **Human Resource Development**: Human resource management, staff and professional growth and development, and learning organizations and communities.

4. **Student Development and Learning**: Classroom, school, and community-based support, instruction, and services reflecting theories of development and learning.

5. **Community and Governmental Relations**: Working with boards and trustees, families, communities, businesses, and local and state governmental entities.

6. **Resources and Fiscal Planning**: Financing public education; budgeting and resource allocation to achieve student outcomes.

Research Methodology

1. **Assessment and Evaluation**: Assessing learning outcomes, using data for student interventions and program decision making and improvement.

2. **Applied Quantitative Inquiry**: Formulating researchable questions, design and statistical analysis of surveys, and quantitative data collection.

3. **Applied Qualitative Inquiry**: Qualitative methods of data collection and interpretation, and ethnographic and action research.

4. **Field-Based Research**: Research applied to relevant field settings, including collection, analysis, and use of data.

5. **Data-Driven Decision Making**: Data-driven decision `making and institutional research to improve educational outcomes.