RESOLVED: That the Proposal for a California State University Bakersfield EdD Program in Educational Leadership distributed in March, 2016 and subsequently updated in response to comments from the Senate Committees be approved for implementation.

RATIONALE: The proposers and the Senate Committees have worked diligently to address priorities identified by the faculty, and the Provost has assured the Senate of her intent to work closely with the program faculty to assure the highest possible quality standards are sustained in the program.

Approved by the Academic Senate on April 21, 2016
Sent to the President for approval on April 28, 2016
Approved by the President on May 6, 2016
NEW DEGREE PROPOSAL

Proposals to add a new degree must receive appropriate campus and Chancellor Office approval prior to implementation. All attachments are to be added to this cover sheet and remain with the proposal through the required steps of evaluation. Please consult with the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs for questions or assistance.

This proposal is to add a new degree in (title) EdD in Educational Leadership. P-12 and CC degree code: 08273.

effective (term)

(degree codes may be found on the CO website www.calstate.edu/app/documents/HEGIS-CIP2000_102406.xls)

This new degree proposal is (check one):

☐ On the Academic Master Plan ☐ Fast track proposal ☐ Pilot degree program

Originating Department or Individual: SSE, Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

If a department formally approved the attached proposal, attach the appropriate memorandum and approval date.

Signature: [Signature] date: 3/16/2016

Curriculum Committee(s): Interschool programs should attach comments or approval from relevant school or department curriculum committees before being submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee, acting as the University Curriculum Committee. A memorandum and approval date from the curriculum committee must be attached. If any revisions were required or agreed to, a revised copy of the proposal must be attached.

Chair Signature: [Signature] date: 3/7/2016

School Dean(s): I have reviewed this proposal and send it forward for university-wide review with my comments attached. These comments include my analysis of the resource commitments that must be made to support the program and the origin(s) of those resources.

Dean Signature: [Signature] date: 3/17/2016

AVP of Academic Programs: I have reviewed this proposal and send it forward to the Provost.

AVP Signature: [Signature] date: 3/18/2016

Date of Senate Approval: 4/21/16

Date of President Approval: 

Please attach the final Academic Senate Resolution, as signed by the President and return to the Office of Academic Programs, which will notify the Chancellor's Office and the appropriate campus departments. A copy of this form must be sent to the Director of Academic Operations and Support.
MEMORANDUM

DATE:       June 17, 2015

TO:         Dr. Vandana Kohli, Associate Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

FROM:       Luis A. Vega, Professor of Psychology &
            Social Sciences and Education (SSE) Curriculum Committee Chair

SUBJECT:    Approval of Standalone Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

The purpose of this memo is to inform you that on June 3, 2015, the SSE Curriculum Committee met to discuss and consider approval of the Standalone Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

The Committee's decision was to support the proposal. Minutes of the meeting with evidence of the Committee's approval are attached.

Please contact me if you need more information or if you have any questions.
Memorandum

Date: March 16, 2016

To: Horace Mitchell, President
    Jenny Zorn, Provost and VP for Academic Programs

From: Kathleen Knutzen,
    Dean, School of Social Sciences and Education

Subject: EdD in Educational Leadership, P-12 and CC

I have reviewed this proposal and offer my full support for the substantive change to a standalone degree. The faculty have been working towards this standalone degree for over five years. CSUB has permission to currently offer the First Professional Doctorate as a joint degree and faculty are now seeking institutional support for a substantive change to the stand alone degree. I have analyzed the resource commitments to support the program and believe the program has fiscal sustainability. The only long term impact on sustainability would be a dramatic decrease in enrollment over multiple years. We have averaged an enrollment of 16 students over the past five years, which is a fiscally sustainable model. The funding provided from the state for each FTES is at the marginal cost calculation that the CSU and campuses receive which provides enough funding for the program.
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
Standalone Proposal

I. Overview
A. **Name of degree program proposed**—“Ed.D. in Educational Leadership”
   Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL)

B. **Initial date of offering**
   Fall 2016

C. **Projected number of students and type of student the program is designed to serve**
   (adult learners; full-time or part-time employed students)
   The DPEL is designed for 18 students per yearly cohort. Students in the program are expected to
   be working full-time in educational settings.

D. **Timeframe for course delivery** (e.g. accelerated program, weekends only, traditional format)
   Because the program serves working adults, courses are delivered on weekends and evenings
   using traditional and hybrid formats.

E. **Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements**
   The DPEL is designed to be completed in eight semesters with students attending Fall, Spring and
   Summer semesters in years 1 and 2, and Fall and Spring semesters in year 3.

F. The names of the departments, divisions, or other units of the campus(es) that will
   have primary responsibility for administering the program
   The DPEL will be an intra-school unit within the School of Social Sciences and Education under
   the administrative direction of the Dean. The curriculum will be an educational curriculum with the
   designation EDLD (i.e., Educational Leadership) subject to approval by the SSE Curriculum
   Committee. Faculty serving in the Graduate Group (described later), who teach in the program and
   serve on DPEL dissertation committees, will do so with the permission of their home department
   chairs and Dean. Faculty from outside SSE with expertise in aspects of educational leadership
   may serve as Graduate Group faculty. Most faculty, as well as the Program Director, will come
   from the Department of Advanced Education and the Department of Teacher Education within the
   School of Social Sciences and Education.

G. The names and titles of the individuals primarily responsible for drafting the
   proposal
   Dana Whetton, EdD, Interim Director of the DPEL
   Steve Bacon, Associate Dean, School of Social Sciences and Education

II. Program Rationale
A. The rationale for proposing the program, including:

B. **Description of how the program philosophy, design, and pedagogical methods
   suit the target student population**

C. Justification for introducing the program at this time
Sections A, B, and C will be addressed together.

This transitional joint doctoral program was established in 2011 and received campus, Chancellor Office, and WASC approval as a Fresno State off-site program and as a six-year transitional program with three phases. The current proposal is to gain approval for the Phase 3 of the program – the standalone CSUB program. In Phase 1, California State University, Fresno (Fresno State) faculty taught their courses and delivered the full program on the California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) campus (Cohorts 1, 2, and 3) with support and learning opportunities for CSUB faculty. In Phase 2 (Cohorts 4 and 5), during the Joint Program, Fresno State continued control of the program and taught on the CSUB campus alongside CSUB faculty and staff who transitioned to prepare to take over the standalone program. During Phase 3 (Cohorts 6 and beyond), the program will become an independent standalone CSUB program. The transition plan for this program is contained in the transitional program sequence figure in Attachment II.A, Program Transition Sequence. One change since the program was approved by WASC in 2011 is that Phase 1 included Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 rather than just Cohorts 1 and 2; Phase 2 included Cohorts 4 and 5; and Phase 3 will include Cohorts 6 and beyond. The change was necessary as a WASC review was not possible until fall 2013 and Cohort 3 had already begun the program.

Context, Mission, Purpose and Strategic Plans:

The doctoral program is part of a system-wide effort to offer the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, and as such, brief narratives about the California State University System, and California State University Bakersfield follow.

CSU System

The CSU is the largest, most diverse and one of the most affordable university systems in the country. The system has 23 campuses, 405,000 students, and 44,000 faculty and staff. Preparation of the staff for public PreK-12 education in California has been a primary focus of the CSU system since the founding of its first campus as a teacher training institution in 1857. Today, the CSU is a major contributor to the preparation of school leaders in California, with 20 of the 23 CSU campuses offering educational leadership programs. In the recent several years, CSU campuses awarded:

- 65 % of the Preliminary Administrative Services credentials awarded to new administrators in California (approximately 2,000 credentials in a three-year period).
- 50 % of the Professional Administrative Services credentials awarded to experienced administrators in the State (more than 1,500 credentials in a three-year period).

The Preliminary Administrative Services credential programs offered by CSU campuses are typically aligned with Master’s Degree programs in Educational Administration. In view of the significant role and commitment of the CSU to the preparation of educational leaders, Chancellor Charles B. Reed convened The CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs in early 2003. The Report of the Task Force, available at http://www.calstate.edu/teachered/TaskForceEduRpt.pdf, provided a vision for a statewide strategy to prepare educational leaders for the ever-changing and challenging demands of 21st Century educational institutions. It underscored the importance of collaborative partnerships between post-secondary education and the educational institutions in which PreK–14 leaders will serve.

The CSU played a major role in the delivery of Ed.D. programs through joint Ed.D. programs with the University of California (UC) that involved seven UC and 14 CSU campuses before the CSU began to offer the Ed.D. programs independent of the UC. The CSU has a large group of highly qualified faculty in educational leadership and related fields able to participate in the preparation of educational leaders at a considerably larger scale. To address the need for increased preparation of highly qualified school and community college leaders, the California Legislature enacted legislation authorizing the California State University (CSU) to independently offer the Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) degree in education leadership. Through Senate Bill 724 (Scott—Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005), this authority was signed into law in September 2005.

The CSU has developed a system-wide framework for implementing the new programs in accordance with the legislative framework and all 14 CSU doctoral programs currently being offered adhere to these frameworks. The programs link theory, research and practice in innovative ways through comprehensive participation of experts from Pre-K-12 and post-secondary education. The partnership design enables students to apply scholarly tools to significant problems of practice in ways that go beyond traditional Ed.D. programs.
California State University, Bakersfield

California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) is a regional university serving agriculturally rich southern San Joaquin Valley. The university meets the workforce needs of this southern region of the San Joaquin valley and reflects the region’s cultural, social, and human diversity. Some 8,100 undergraduate and graduate students attend CSUB at either the main campus in Bakersfield or the off-campus center in Antelope Valley, three quarters of them full-time and the rest on a part-time basis. The student body of California State University, Bakersfield, is comprised of 35.5% Hispanic, 36.3% Caucasian, 7.8% African-American, and 6.3% Asian/pacific Islander. As a regional comprehensive university, 69.9% of the student body is drawn from schools in Kern High School District with 16.8% drawn from the rest of the state of California. Since 1976 the university’s School of Education—and later the School of Social Sciences and Education—has granted 3844 graduate and 1287 undergraduate degrees, with 3576 of these being master’s-level graduates.

The vision of California State University, Bakersfield is:

CSU Bakersfield will be the leading campus in the CSU system in terms of faculty and academic excellence and diversity, quality of the student experience, and community engagement. Realization of our vision will be advanced by recruitment, development and promotion of excellent and diverse staff within an organizational culture committed to excellence in all areas.

The mission of California State University, Bakersfield is:

California State University, Bakersfield is a comprehensive public university committed to offering excellent undergraduate and graduate programs that advance the intellectual and personal development of its students. An emphasis on student learning is enhanced by a commitment to scholarship, diversity, service, global awareness and life-long learning. The University collaborates with partners in the community to increase the region’s overall educational attainment, enhance its quality of life, and support its economic development.

To realize the vision and mission, the University has created five Strategic Goals as part of its overall Strategic Plan. These goals include:

1. Extend Faculty and Academic Excellence and Diversity
2. Enhance the Quality of the Student Experience
3. Strengthen Community Engagement
4. Develop an Excellent and Diverse Staff
5. Develop a Campus Culture with a Sense of Community and Commitment to Organizational Excellence

CSUB supports the region by conducting high quality action research that is needed to improve education systems in Kern County and the service areas. The doctoral program will have a significant impact on problems in the region, in particular by producing researchers for the Kern County Superintendent of Schools (KCSOS), and through other collaborative projects and grants. This program partners with the local educational community through the Community Advisory Board for Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, and our partners have had significant input into the design and future delivery of this program.

The service area in Kern County and beyond needs doctoral-qualified educational leaders who can connect with and make a difference in the education of children in the southern Central Valley. The Central Valley has immense challenges and needs that will call upon outstanding education leaders to close the achievement gap. The link between the university’s mission, strategic plans and the creation of this doctoral program is strong, and as demonstrated above, serves two of the five strategic goals outlined in CSUB Strategic Plan.

School of Social Sciences and Education, Bakersfield

The School of Social Sciences and Education offers through the Department of Advanced Education and the Department of Teacher Education a Masters of Art in Education with three relevant specializations: Educational Administration, Special Education, and Curriculum and Instruction. It also offers a Masters of Science in Educational Counseling. The Educational Administration concentration was on moratorium for two years as it went through a major revision to develop a new program in educational leadership and administration in alignment with the new state standards; the program re-opened in fall 2015. These programs emanate from the stated vision and mission of School of Social Sciences and Education.
The overarching theme of the combined School of Social Sciences and *Education* is “Expanding minds, Engaging hearts, Enhancing communities”. From this theme is derived the vision and mission. The Vision and Mission for the school are:

**Vision**

*The School of Social Sciences and Education will provide professional leadership to improve the quality of social life and education for the region through high-quality scholarship, educational offerings, and community partnerships. The School of Social Sciences and Education will be recognized as offering premier programs in the CSU system and will offer landmark programs recognized nationally and internationally.*

**Mission**

*The mission of the School of Social Sciences and Education is to address local, regional, and state needs by providing high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in the social sciences and education. We are committed to advancing human development knowledge, encouraging healthy and productive lifestyles, and enhancing the quality of life for all people, particularly those with emotional, learning, and physical disabilities. We pledge to prepare future leaders, professionals, and community advocates. Together, we will work toward increasing the community’s understanding and acceptance of complex social, racial, and gender issues and toward creating positive social change. We will provide students with excellent classroom instruction, faculty-guided research experiences, and experiential learning opportunities to prepare them for career success and for lifelong learning to meet the changing demands of society.*

*The faculty and staff of the School of Social Sciences and Education are committed to supporting quality measures identified in the CSUB vision statement featuring faculty academic excellence and diversity, the student experience, community engagement, staff excellence and diversity, and organizational “best practices”.*

The School of Social Sciences and Education and its educational programs’ mission is the recruitment and development of ethically informed instructional leaders for classroom teaching, education administration, counseling, and higher education. Our mission is realized through a framework of teaching, scholarship, and service that addresses regional, state, national, and international perspectives.

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership has been in operation at CSUB since 2011. Although the program has been administered by Fresno State, CSUB faculty and administration have participated in the program as teaching faculty and committee members (Graduate Group and Dissertation Committees), and have participated in events such as the Annual Research Symposium and the Doctoral Program Faculty Colloquium since the beginning.

During the joint phase of the program, CSUB offered the first year Core courses (18 units) and shared with Fresno State the second year courses. In the third and final standalone phase, CSUB will independently administer the program and offer all courses through CSUB faculty.

### III. Summary of Employment Prospects and Workforce Demand

**A. Fit with the campus’ mission and strategic goals** (CPEC—*Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission*)

See previous section

**B. A list of similar doctoral programs offered or projected by California institutions (state clearly how the proposed program differs from the existing programs listed)** (CPEC—*Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field*).

Although several private institutions in the Bakersfield/Kern County area offer masters degrees in Educational Administration (as does CSUB) and one offers an EdD (University of La Verne), no other public university within 100 miles offers an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. This is important because most graduates of Ed.D. programs continue to work in the regions where they received their degrees. This suggests that Ed.D. graduates from distant programs are unlikely to settle in Kern County and use their
degrees to fill local needs and solve local educational challenges. In order to meet the local need for doctoral-level educators, we must grow our own educators locally.

There are currently 14 other CSU campuses offering the doctorate in educational leadership.

C. A summary of the employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program and the professional uses of the proposed program (CPEC—Societal Needs)

D. Regional need for program, as identified by partners. What local needs do partners intend to address through the help of program graduates? (CPEC—Societal Needs) and (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)

[Note: Proposals will need to indicate the ways in which the curriculum has been designed in response to California Education Code California Education Code Section 66040.3, which authorized the CSU to offer the Doctor of Education degree as specified in that law.]

It makes sense to address these two sections together because the employment prospects for graduates is so closely related to the regional need for the program.

The School of Social Sciences and Education, academic home for the DPEL, has strong relationships with our partners in the Kern County educational community. From our Teacher Education Advisory Committee to partnerships on several educational grants, including the $7.2 million Teacher Quality Partnership grant, SSE works closely with our partners to improve the educational attainment of Kern County students. Since Phase I of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership in 2011, the DPEL has worked closely with and listened to its Community Advisory Board, consisting of at least five members of the local educational community, including school district superintendents and other high-level administrators. Our community partners tell us that the need for well-trained educational administrators will continue to rise as Kern County grows and existing administrators retire in the coming years. Just as there is a shortage of teachers in the state and especially locally, there are fewer trained administrators than we will need in the future.

A needs assessment completed in 2011 under the direction of Dr. BJ Moore supported the need for an EdD program in the southern San Joaquin Valley (for the full report, see Attachment III.C-1, CSUB Needs Assessment 2011). In their recommendation, these evaluators said: “It is obvious that implementing this Ed.D. program in San Joaquin Valley will be an asset to the community. This program will promote professional educational advancement that will meet the needs of school systems in the area. An adequate investigation has proven that leadership professionals are a crucial component for this community.” Although this needs assessment was completed in 2011, objective support for the impressions of our community educational partners is as true today as it was five years ago. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the national job outlook for postsecondary education administrators is good with expected growth of 9% between 2014-2024. Locally, the California Employment Development Department predicts growth of 11.4% for education administrators (elementary and secondary school) between 2012 and 2022 in Kern County.

Although we have data for only our first cohort (2011-12) regarding job changes in the year following graduation from the program, the early results are encouraging: 31% had been promoted, 8% had received a lateral change, and 62% were still at the same job.

The relevant section of Educational Code Section 66040.3 describing cooperation between educational communities and EdD programs states:

“The Doctorate of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be focused on preparing administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges and on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in California public schools and community colleges. The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be offered through partnerships through which the California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation. This degree shall enable professionals to earn the degree while working fulltime.”
Our community partners have been with us at all stages of DPEL development. In addition to trained individuals to fill the educational administrator jobs of the future, our educational partners have told us that they want to create opportunities for people who are passionate about making positive changes that will improve the educational experience of our local students. Attachment III.C-2, Dissertations from the DPEL at CSUB, lists the titles of dissertations completed during the first phase of this transitional EdD program; a casual look at dissertation titles illustrates the practical and local emphases of these projects that are aimed at improving education in our community. One of the features of the DPEL that has supported the local focus of our dissertations is the involvement of local educational administrators as instructors of specialization courses (18 adjunct faculty) and dissertation committee members.

IV. Student Demand

The case for student demand can be made stronger by summarizing the enrollments in related community college certificate programs, and related master’s programs on the campus or in the service area.

Enrollment Projections

A. Enrollment projections for the first five years

The Doctoral program in Educational Leadership is expected to enroll and retain 18 students per year for the next five years. Experience suggests that the program will need to admit 19 students per cohort in order to retain 18.

B. Evidence used to support enrollment projections and to support the conclusion that interest in the program is sufficient to sustain it at expected levels beyond the first cohort—summary only, not the full study. (CPEC—Student Demand)

In its five years of operation, during Phases I and II, the DPEL has recruited cohorts of 20, 19, 14, 11, and 16. Although we are targeting 18 students per cohort, the program breaks even at 16. In years 3 and 4, when recruitment dipped to 11 and 14, several factors contributed to difficulty recruiting including the illness and eventual death of the original program director and replacement with a new director. These two years were also the years in which CSUB’s MA in Educational Administration, a pipeline into the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, was on moratorium. An additional factor contributing to non-optimal recruitment was a summer-start for Phases I and II of the program, which accommodated Fresno State faculty who taught classes in Fresno and Bakersfield, but was off-cycle for many students hoping to apply to the program. The summer-start also contributed to financial aid glitches that led to some students withdrawing from the program just as they were about to begin. We believe the change to a fall-start for the standalone program will be more in line with students’ educational planning and will lead to fewer financial aid complications. The re-opening of the MA in Educational Administration will re-open the pipeline into the DPEL. Also, in Phases I and II, the DPEL had no advertising budget for recruitment of new students and relied almost entirely on word of mouth; in the new standalone program budget, there are funds earmarked for recruiting and marketing.

The MA in Educational Administration at CSUB will graduate about 25-30 students per year. Educational Administration programs at local private colleges, with whom CSUB has good relations, graduate approximately 40-50 students each year who will later be prime candidates for the DPEL.

C. Explain how the program will provide for the continuing participation of students who do not complete their degree requirements within three years.

Because the program is offered in cohorts, students who are unable to complete their degree requirements with their cohort within the eight semesters of the scheduled program may join a later cohort to complete courses if they petition the program and receive permission of the program director. Students may also petition for a leave of absence. All students, however, must complete the program within seven years of starting it.
V. Program Context and History

A. A description of how the proposed program relates to existing programs on the participating campuses, especially to closely related master’s and doctoral programs.

CSUB has no other doctoral programs on campus. The masters programs most relevant to the DPEL are the MA in Educational Administration, the online MA in Curriculum and Instruction (offered through the Department of Teacher Education), and the MA in Educational Counseling. As discussed earlier, the MA in Educational Administration will serve as a pipeline into the DPEL. Typically, the MA in Educational Administration is earned by students who have been teaching for a few years and wish to increase their skills so they are better candidates for administrative positions like principals, vice principals, and school district mid-level administrators. The DPEL allows employees in these positions to increase their leadership skills further enabling them to compete for higher management and perhaps superintendent-level positions in PreK-12 or higher education settings.

B. The number, variety, and longevity of the doctoral programs currently being offered, including student enrollment data and degree completion and non-completion rates for previous or current joint doctoral program—Three to five years of data should be provided

Again, CSUB has no other doctoral programs on campus outside the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. The DPEL is currently in its fifth year at CSUB. Prior to the current DPEL, there was a different joint EdD collaboration between CSUB and the University of the Pacific which lasted four years. Enrollment, retention, and graduation data for the five cohorts are shown in Table 1. Graduation data for the last three cohorts is incomplete since these students are still enrolled in the program.

Table 1 Retention and Graduation in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Cohort Size</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention¹</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates²</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate³</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to Graduation (yrs)⁴</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Retention and Graduation data are all current as of October 2015.
² Graduation data is not available for 2013-14 and beyond since these students are not expected to graduate until after December 2015.
³ Graduation Rate is defined as Graduates/Initial Cohort Size. The upper limit of Graduation Rate is the Retention Rate. Students from the 2012-13 who have not graduated are still within the seven year window for graduation.
⁴ The expected time to graduation is 2.56 years (June 1, AY1 to Dec 22, AY3).

C. If the campus is a partner in an existing joint Ed.D. program:

1. Indicate whether the joint doctoral program(s) will continue;

The joint Fresno State/CSUB program will be discontinued when students currently in the program have been taught out. The standalone program opens in Fall 2016 (Cohort 6), previous cohorts (1-5) will be taught out by joint program faculty.

2. Submit a copy of the proposal to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program, including provisions for teaching out the program. Follow the instructions


The Coded Memo and discontinuation checklist referenced above are for joint programs between CSU and UC campuses. They do not apply to joint CSU-CSU programs such as ours.

3. Submit a copy of the Chancellor’s permission to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program.

Again, this permission refers to joint CSU-UC programs. We will, of course, notify the Chancellor’s Office of our intent to discontinue the joint program, contingent on approval of the standalone program at CSUB.

VI. Partnership with Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and/or Community Colleges (CPEC—Societal Needs)

A. A list of public school districts, schools and/or community colleges that are partnering with the campus(es) in the development and operation of the proposed program

Bakersfield College
Antelope Valley College
Fresno Pacific University
Kern High School District
Panama-Buena Vista School District
Bakersfield City Schools

B. Consistent with California Education Code Sections 66040-66040.7, the role of school district, school, and/or college partners in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation

The relevant code is cited in section III.D above of this proposal. Our community partners have been with us at all stages of DPEL development. Our Community Advisory Board, with whom the DPEL meets at least twice per year, has provided feedback on our program design and has helped make the Fresno/Bakersfield joint program ready to stand alone. Our partners on the Board, our adjunct faculty made up of community educators, and the worksite supervisors of students in the program have all helped us recruit new students through positive word-of-mouth, which augments our other program recruiting. Our current 18 adjunct faculty, and additional adjuncts who have since retired or moved out of the area, have been crucial to the applied focus of the program where students learn from academic as well as clinical faculty. At the end of assessment cycles, after the Graduate Group has had a chance to brainstorm possible solutions to closing the assessment loop, feedback and input is elicited from the Community Advisory Board.

C. Other involvement of school districts, schools and/or colleges in the program

Adjunct faculty in the DPEL come from a variety of school districts, schools, and agencies including:

Kern Community College District
Panama-Buena Vista School District
Taft Union High School District
Bakersfield College
Kern County Superintendent of Schools
Kern High School District
Fruitvale School District

D. Listing of the P-14 personnel participating in partnership meetings.
Past members of the Community Advisory Board have included: Dr. Christine Frazier, Kern County Superintendent of Schools; Don Carter, Superintendent, Kern High School District; and Dr. Jackie Fisher, Superintendent/President, Antelope Valley College.

VII. Information About Participating Department(s) or other CSU Campuses (if applicable)

A. A description of how the proposed program is expected to draw support from existing programs, departments, and faculty

The standalone DPEL will be an intra-school program within the School of Social Sciences and Education that begins with educational foundations from departments within the school and adds interdisciplinary faculty from SSE and other schools to broaden students’ perspectives on educational leadership. In the standalone program, qualified faculty will agree to serve in the DPEL and will receive permission from their home departments and schools to be released to the program. Details of the arrangements and incentives for faculty and departments to serve the DPEL are described below.

In the joint Ed.D., there has been little difficulty generating interest among CSUB faculty to serve in the DPEL. Currently, 15 faculty serve in the Graduate Group of the Ed.D., along with 18 adjuncts from the community. Faculty in the joint program have been serving under conditions very similar to the conditions under which standalone DPEL faculty will serve.

Faculty who are interested contributing to the DPEL will apply to the Graduate Group, as described in the Graduate Group Bylaws (Attachment VII.A), section V.3.

Faculty from various departments will receive 4.5 units of reassigned time for each 3-unit DPEL course they teach. Their home departments will receive 4.5 units of funding to replace them. Since each DPEL faculty member may teach only one course per year, no department should be significantly impacted by reassigning DPEL faculty members’ time. When faculty are released to teach in the DPEL, an MOU will be signed by the faculty member, the chair of the faculty member’s department, the DPEL Director, and the Dean. Some courses may be taught in summer in which case the faculty member will receive additional summer pay, with little or no impact on their home department.

Faculty can chair up to 4 dissertations and are awarded .5 units of release for each student for each semester (students register for dissertations for 3 semesters, therefore faculty receive a total of 1.5 units to
chair one dissertation). Faculty receive an additional .5 units of funding for professional development for each dissertation and each semester. Again, chairing a dissertation will require an MOU so that all interested parties are aware of the faculty’s obligations. Serving as a non-chair dissertation committee member will not be compensated but will instead count as university service; service on a committee will not require an MOU but should be done in consultation with department chairs. The most release time a core faculty member could generate in one year (Fall and Spring, since Summer does not generate release) would be 4.5 for teaching and 4 for dissertation (4 students x .5 units x 2 semesters); this would be a third of a tenure/tenure-track faculty’s teaching load (24 units/year), but would be a rare occurrence and, with the MOU requirement, only done with the full consent of the department chair and dean.

Once the standalone program is in place, CSUB will not be partners with other CSUs except to teach out students already in the joint Ed.D.

B. Provisions for partnership among participating departments

Individual faculty members with interests and expertise in educational leadership will initiate their connection with the DPEL, often following the yearly call of the Graduate Group for new member applications. Departments will contribute to the program by loaning faculty to the DPEL through compensated reassigned time. Coordination and cooperation between departments and the DPEL program will be ensured through an MOU signed by all the relevant parties.

C. Letters committing to partnership

A memo was sent to the chairs of all departments currently participating in the joint Ed.D. asking about their support for the new standalone program. A similar memo was sent to chairs of faculty members who have expressed an interest in participating in the standalone DPEL, but did not participate in the joint Ed.D. In all, 6 of 7 departments who have faculty working in the joint Ed.D. program agreed to work with the Graduate Group to accommodate their faculty; both of the departments queried that have faculty who would like to contribute to the DPEL, but are not currently involved, were supportive of their department’s participation. These letters may be found in Attachment VII.C., Departmental Letters of Support.

VIII. Governance Structure for the Program (consistent with systemwide requirements as detailed in California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and EO 991)

A. Membership and responsibilities of groups, boards, and committees

B. Participation, as appropriate, by program faculty; other faculty; administrators at the department, college, and university levels; regional public school and college educators; students in the program; and alumni of the program

C. Program bylaws or a statement affirming that bylaws are being developed

The Director of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL) is responsible for the successful operation of the program. The program is subject to the normal graduate policies and procedures as established by California State University, Bakersfield. The Director of DPEL serves as a liaison between the faculty governance structure (Graduate Group), the Community Advisory Board, and the School of Social Sciences and Education. The faculty governance structure for DPEL is the Graduate Group, faculty who have been appointed as doctoral faculty who tend to curriculum and other policy issues of the program.

The Graduate Group for the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is organized to establish and administer the graduate program of instruction and scholarship leading to the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, in conformance with regulations, policies and procedures of the California State University (CSU) and California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB).

The course offerings and research activities are broadly based and draw upon the interests and talents of students, Graduate Group faculty, and our community educational partners. The curriculum is driven by WASC and Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) guidelines and expectations.

A detailed description of the roles and responsibilities of individuals and groups responsible for the governance of the DPEL may be found in the Bylaws for the Graduate Group (Attachment VII.A, Graduate Group Bylaws). The Bylaws describe the composition of each group, including the Community Advisory
Board, the Graduate Group, and the subcommittees of the Graduate Group. The bylaws also describe how each of the groups interact with each other.

D. A description of how the governance structure complies with the provisions of California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and allows for substantial and meaningful participation by P-12 and community college partners.

In the Graduate Group bylaws, the Community Advisory Board is described (Attachment VII.A, Article III). The Community Advisory Board consists of seven university representatives associated with the DPEL and five members of the local educational community (at least two representing P-12 settings and two representing higher education). The purpose of the Board is to "provide for communications between the program, the broader campus administration and partners, and the educational partners, and it serves as a forum for planning and evaluation involving the full partnership." The Advisory Board was crucial to getting the original program off the ground five years ago and has remained an active partner. The Advisory Board includes superintendents of large school districts within Kern County. As we transition to the standalone program, we will retain our local Advisory Board that has been so helpful for the past five years.

The Community Advisory Board meets at least two times per year, with additional meetings scheduled as needed.

IX. Faculty

A. A listing of program faculty and their research and professional interests related to the program (P-12, community college, adult learning, research methods, etc.)

A listing of the 15 Graduate Group faculty and 18 adjunct faculty affiliated with the DPEL is shown in Attachment IX.A-1, CSUB Faculty Serving the DPEL. The 16 Graduate Group members include faculty who have applied and been accepted into the group; some members have taught classes, some have served on dissertation committees, and others have committed to teaching classes for the DPEL in the future. The adjunct faculty are all faculty who have taught at least one specialization course for the program and have expressed their continued wish to be part of the program. The faculty listing also shows the three faculty who currently hold the status of "Core" faculty, and the additional four faculty who intend to apply for core status in this academic year. This list includes faculty who have been Graduate Group members in the joint program who intend to continue in the standalone program. The call for new Graduate Group faculty for 2016-17 has not yet been distributed.

Attachment IX.A-2, Courses Offered and Planned shows all of the courses offered since the DPEL began five years ago (course numbers are for the joint program, not the new four-digit numbers we will use in fall 2016). Next to each course is the instructor that taught the course illustrating each faculty member's area of expertise within the program. The DPEL training model has been for Bakersfield faculty to teach with Fresno faculty before teaching on their own. As we prepare to open in Fall 2016, note that most Bakersfield faculty have taught on their own for a year or more and the remaining faculty will be prepared to teach solo by Fall 2016.

B. The criteria for choosing core doctoral faculty, affiliated doctoral faculty, and other faculty members for participation in the program

Criteria for inclusion into the Graduate Group (core and affiliated faculty) as well as criteria for adjunct faculty are found in Attachment VII.A, Graduate Group Bylaws. Relevant parts of Article IV, describing these criteria are appended below:

1. Core faculty

---

1 The criteria must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. The criteria applicable to a full-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with the university may differ from the criteria applicable to a part-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with a P-12 institution or a community college. The criteria may also vary with the type of participation in the program.
a. Core faculty serve on DPEL subcommittees, advise and mentor students, serve on
dissertation committees, teach courses in the doctoral program, remain active in professional
scholarship, and may chair dissertation committees.

b. Appointment and renewal of appointment as a Core Graduate Group member requires
evidence of meeting all of the following criteria, as judged by the full Graduate Group:

i. Possession of a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline

ii. Appointment as a tenured/tenure track faculty or university administrator with
departmental retreat rights. Administrators will not have a vote within the Graduate
Group or subcommittees

iii. Service as an Affiliated member for at least one year

iv. A strong professional record of published scholarship in refereed journals pertinent to
educational leadership or the theoretical or methodological underpinnings of study
related to the field, or promise relative to one’s rank (a minimum of one article
published in a refereed journal every two years is required for renewal)

v. Demonstrated ability in directing others in research activities

vi. Specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational
policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by the DPEL

vii. Service as a member of at least one dissertation committee

viii. A record of teaching at least one year at the graduate level with acceptable student
and peer evaluations (for new members) as judged by the Director

ix. A record of teaching at least one DPEL course in the last four years with acceptable
student and peer evaluations (for renewing members) as judged by the Director

x. Service on DPEL committees (for renewing members)

c. Appointment as a Core Graduate Group member shall be for a term of five years. Upon
completion of four years, Core faculty members wishing to continue their membership in the
Graduate Group shall reapply. For new applications and renewals, the full Graduate Group
will vote on appointment and renewal. The Graduate Group can initiate early review of a
member if the majority believes there is cause to do so. If recommendations are made by the
Graduate Group for change, the reviewed member will have one year to demonstrate
improvement. The Graduate Group will review the progress of the individual after a year and
vote on renewal.

2. Affiliated faculty

a. Affiliated faculty may serve on DPEL subcommittees, advise and mentor students, serve on
dissertation committees, teach courses in the doctoral program, and engage in professional
scholarship. Affiliated faculty are expected to participate in at least one activity within their
term, but are not required to participate in any particular activity.

b. Appointment and renewal of appointment as an Affiliate Graduate Group member requires
evidence of meeting all of the following criteria, as judged by the full Graduate Group:

i. Possession of a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline

ii. Appointment as a tenured/tenure track faculty or university administrator with
departmental retreat rights. Administrators will not have a vote within the Graduate
Group or subcommittees

iii. Specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational
policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by the DPEL

iv. If the faculty has taught within the DPEL, acceptable student and peer evaluations
(for renewing members) as judged by the Director

v. Participation in at least one Graduate Group activity listed in 2a. (for renewing
members)

c. Appointment as an Affiliated Graduate Group member shall be for a term of five years. Upon
completion of four years, Affiliated faculty members wishing to continue their membership in the
Graduate Group shall reapply to the Graduate Group. For new applications and renewals,
the full Graduate Group will vote on appointment and renewal. The Graduate Group can
initiate early review of a member if the majority believes there is cause to do so. If
recommendations are made by the Graduate Group for change, the reviewed member will
have one year to demonstrate improvement. The Graduate Group will review the progress of
the individual after a year and vote on renewal.

3. Adjunct Faculty

a. Adjunct faculty are selected to teach specialization courses in the program by the Program
   Director in consultation with the Graduate Group.

b. Adjunct faculty must possess a doctoral degree in the appropriate discipline. Exceptions may
   be approved by the Executive Committee (see Article V, section 1) for other degrees that are
   more relevant to course content (e.g., a J.D. for an educational law class).

c. Adjunct faculty are not members of the Graduate Group.

d. Adjunct faculty have specific expertise in the areas in which they teach.

e. Adjunct faculty are reviewed by the Director after each course they teach. Only adjuncts that
   receive acceptable student and peer reviews are able to continue teaching in the program.

f. Adjuncts may serve, at the invitation of the Program Director, on the Community Advisory
   Board.

g. The home department of adjunct faculty teaching within the DPEL shall be the home
   department of the Director (e.g., Advanced Educational Studies).

C. Number and type of faculty allocated to support the program in terms of
developing the curriculum, delivering instruction to students, supervising
internships and dissertations, and evaluating educational effectiveness

Currently, there are 15 CSUB faculty in the Graduate Group who may participate in the activities listed
above. Affiliated faculty may limit their participation if they wish. Faculty who teach the core courses, which
includes affiliated and core faculty, tend to be the most active in the program.

D. Faculty background and experience to engage in doctoral-level instruction.
Include copies of abbreviated faculty vitae (or summaries of 3-5 pages addressing
an overview of the key credentials, publications; if applicable, for primary faculty
responsible for the program, include prior experience supervising dissertation
work).

Abbreviated vitae for Graduate Group faculty teaching core courses, or scheduled to do so in Fall 2016, are
included in Attachment IX.D, Vitae for Key Faculty Serving the DPEL.
E. Strong proposals will demonstrate with specific numbers that as the program admits new cohorts, there will be enough faculty headcount to undertake dissertation supervisions, examination committee responsibilities, and teaching assignments. Please include formal campus commitments to faculty expansion, based on careful planning.

**Faculty Workload Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty for Core Courses Needed</th>
<th>Affiliated/Adjunct Faculty Needed</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Available</th>
<th>Students per Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Available</th>
<th>Students per Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Faculty Available</th>
<th>Students per Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Cohort 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Cohort 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Cohort 9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Cohort 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: In years 2016-17 and 2017-18, Cohorts 4 and 5 are not included in resources for the standalone program since these students will graduate from the joint program, administered by Fresno State. CSUB faculty will continue to be involved with Cohorts 4 and 5.

For initial advisors, although there are 15 graduate Group members, 8 are expected to be available for initial advising.

For dissertation chairs, at least six faculty are expected to be Core faculty by 2018.

For dissertation non-chair committee members, it is expected that faculty will serve on more than one committee so the number of faculty available are not unique faculty.
If more than one campus is participating, provide a description of how the faculty expertise and resources at one participating campus complement the faculty expertise and resources at the other participating campus(es).

Only CSUB will participate in the standalone Doctoral program in Educational Leadership.

X. **Resources (CPEC—Total Costs for the Program)**

During the December 2006 meeting of the CSU Executive Council, fiscal issues related to the Ed.D. programs were addressed, and it is expected that proposals will reflect the system’s recommended guidelines for fiscal planning, which were presented in that meeting. A brief review of existing financial, physical and information resources supporting the program, including research support within the institution, library support appropriate for doctoral degree work, physical facilities, and stability and sufficiency of financial resources

A. A summary of resource requirements for each participating institution by year for the first five years, including:

1. FTE faculty
2. library acquisitions
3. computing costs
4. equipment
5. space and other capital facilities (including rented facilities, where applicable) other operating costs

**Faculty.**

Faculty members serve within the Graduate Group as either Core doctoral faculty, Affiliated faculty, or Adjuncts who have expertise in a specific content area. Members of the Core Graduate Group teach courses, serve on dissertation committees, advise, and are actively involved in the governance of the program. Affiliated faculty may perform most of the duties of Core faculty, except chair dissertation committees, but are not required to do so. Adjunct faculty may teach specialization courses. Currently the program has 15 Core and Affiliated faculty and 18 adjuncts.

Core and affiliated faculty from participating departments will receive 4.5 units of reassigned time for each 3-unit DPEL course they teach. Their home departments will receive 4.5 units of funding to replace them. Since each DPEL faculty member may teach only one course per year, no department should be significantly impacted by reassigning DPEL faculty members' time. When faculty are released to teach in the DPEL, an MOU will be signed by the faculty member, the chair of the faculty member’s department, the DPEL Director, and the Dean of Social Sciences and Education. Some courses may be taught in summer in which case the faculty member will receive summer pay, with little or no impact on their home department.

Core faculty can chair up to 4 dissertations and are awarded .5 units of release for each student for each semester (students register for dissertations for 3 semesters, therefore faculty receive a total of 1.5 units to chair one dissertation). Faculty receive an additional .5 units of funding for professional development for each dissertation and each semester. Again, chairing a dissertation will require an MOU so that all interested parties are aware of the faculty’s obligations. Serving as a non-chair dissertation committee member will not be compensated but will instead count as university service; service on a committee will not require an MOU but should be done in consultation with department chairs. The most release time a core faculty member could generate in one year (Fall and Spring, since Summer does not generate release) would be 4.5 for teaching and 4 for dissertation (4 students x .5 units x 2 semesters); this would be a third of a tenure/tenure-track faculty's teaching load (24 units/year), but would be a rare occurrence and, with the MOU requirement, only done with the full consent of the department chair and dean.
CSUB faculty served as members on Fresno State candidates’ dissertation committees during the first phase of this transitional program and are currently serving as chairs of some dissertation committees during the joint-program phase. Several Bakersfield faculty will be ready to serve as chairs in 2016; additional Bakersfield faculty will be mentored to serve as dissertation committee chairs as they serve as non-chair committee members. Bakersfield faculty will need to be ready to chair all dissertations in the program beginning in 2018. Students in the joint-program between 2016 and 2018 may choose either Bakersfield or Fresno faculty for their chairs.

Core and affiliated faculty will also receive funding for professional development based on 1.5 WTU for each 3-unit course they teach.

Adjunct faculty will receive 3 WTU of pay at the current lecturer rate for a 3-unit class; they will not receive the additional 1.5 WTU that core and affiliated faculty receive as release time nor professional development funds for teaching in the program.

Fewer faculty will be needed in the first year of the standalone program than in the third since the Bakersfield/Fresno joint program will teach out students already enrolled until they graduate. Tables of teaching costs for the first five years of the standalone program may be found in Attachments X.A-1, Budget- Faculty Costs 2016-17 through X.A-5, Budget- Faculty Costs 2020-21.

Library

Access to library systems (local, national, or global), electronic services, Internet, information utilities, service providers, and document delivery services for both faculty and students are available through the CSUB Library. The Electronic Core Collection maintained at CSUB is designed to meet needs of core programs within the CSU system.

The Dean of the Library, as well as the dedicated Ed.D. Program Librarian will demonstrate their continued commitment to the Ed.D. program by purchasing needed resources, facilitating interlibrary loans, and addressing the electronic needs of candidates. The CSUB librarian has collaborated with the Fresno Ed.D. librarian to support a doctoral culture and satisfy the library needs of candidates.

The CSUB Walter Stiern Library database and journal Holdings provide necessary information for candidates, including but not limited to ERIC, Wilson OmniFile Full Text Mega, and ProQuest with dissertations and theses. The collection is extensive and targeted for researchers in education. The Interlibrary Loan (IL) augments the Stiern Library collection, providing over 15,000 items yearly. IL requests are handled quickly with materials available to researchers within days of the request. This service brings the resources of the 23-campus CSU library system and literally dozens of libraries with which we have a reciprocal agreement to the patrons of the Stiern Library at CSUB.

Staff and services are available to candidates and faculty for instruction on how to use, access, and support information resources, both onsite and remotely via telephone, in person, through email, or through instructional websites and tutorials. E-Learning Services and the Faculty and Student Help Desks are available. Within the program there will be orientation sessions for candidates that will enable them to access what they need.

Students and faculty in the doctoral program have access to a multitude of services, both local and worldwide, through the library. The campus maintains a state-of-the-art networking system with multiple connections to the Internet with the major connection being provided through the California Research and Education Network (CalREn) and redundant connections through T-1 and fractional T-1 lines; wireless network access is available across the entire campus. The library maintains a proxy server that allows all students, faculty and staff of the University to gain access to all the libraries licensed databases which have licenses that allow remote access (only two of the campus databases, both dealing with nuclear energy, do not allow off-campus access); over 100 databases are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

In addition to the local collection of over 1 million volumes, faculty and staff can gain access to any book that library will land through the libraries automated consortial borrowing and interlibrary loan programs. In addition to materials available through the local online library catalog, users can borrow materials from other libraries through an automated interlibrary loan system.

Library patrons also have access to automated Interlibrary Loan using the ILLiad system. In addition to allowing patrons to input all information directly to order their item, all of the Library’s abstracting and indexing databases have been integrated with ILLiad through the SFX OpenURL system; if the item is not
available through the library’s electronic collections or in the library’s print/microform collections, the automated interlibrary loan link appears on the users search screen to allow the student to obtain the title from another library. Items ordered through ILLiad are available in five to 10 working days from the date of request. If the requested item is a book chapter or article, the patron can “pick up” the item electronically by downloading it to his or her computer; physical items such as books or DVDs must be picked up at the circulation desk in the library.

The Walter W. Stiern Library provides reference librarians and reference assistants who are available throughout the day and evening when the library is open. In addition to chat, reference librarians provide information and instruction services through a variety of means including walk-up service at the reference desk, telephone call, e-mail, and private instruction via individual appointment.

The ED.D. program has a designated librarian liaison subject specialist with expertise in the field. The librarian liaison serves as a faculty partner in the students’ research instruction and ensures that resource needs for the program are being met. The librarian liaison meets with the students and the faculty throughout the year. In early fall, the librarian liaison provides an in-depth overview of all available library services and provides all students a hands-on workshop on searching for scholarly materials in the library’s collections and databases.

The librarian liaison works with the faculty of the school to include library instruction each semester of the program and is regularly available to meet with faculty and students. The librarian liaison also provides in-depth consultation regarding research materials, selecting the proper research databases for a topic, and searching strategies and techniques.

The 21-person library staff is always prepared to direct students to the correct library specialist, who will ensure that the students get the proper resource they need for their research, whether the resource is held by CSUB or in some other library. The Interlibrary Loan staff can obtain nearly any published resource quickly and provide it expeditiously.

The library also provides a subscribed 24-hour Ask-A-Librarian chat service electronically, which CSUB librarians participate in.

Continued support for library services will be provided by the $25,000 line item in the five-year budget (see Attachment X.A-6, Budget-Five-Year Plan).

Computing Costs

California State University, Bakersfield provides academic technology throughout campus. The classrooms established for use by the educational doctorate program are equipped with the "smart classroom" standard of: internet access, a ceiling mounted video projector, audio amplifier and speaker, DVD player, and a pushbutton desktop control. Wireless internet access is ubiquitous across the campus. CSU Bakersfield professors receive a Lenovo or Mac laptop or desktop computer, refreshed every three years. CSUB’s learning management system is Blackboard in the latest iteration. Almost all classes have a Blackboard course shell, and faculty are encouraged to post their course syllabus in accessible format along with other pertinent data even if they are not teaching the course online. Faculty training and support of academic technologies including the design, implementation, and assessment of online and hybrid classes is provided.

The university is actively engaged in the California State University system’s Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI). Specifically, the Instructional Materials emphasis of ATI sets milestones and provides system-wide coordination for ensuring that all course materials are accessible to students and faculty with disabilities. This includes requiring documents (in formats such as PDF and Word) to be screen-reader friendly, images to have text descriptions, and videos to be captioned or transcribed. CSU Bakersfield’s ATI group has university-wide participation including Services for Students with Disabilities, Student Services, library, academic technology, and the faculty.

Training in universal design and accessible technology is offered multiple times yearly at CSUB.

The university follows industry best practices for business continuity and service interruptions. This practice includes regularly scheduled back-ups of the Blackboard data in more than one format. Copies of the resulting backups are kept both on- and off-site. Scheduled service interruptions are planned to minimize impact on academic terms.
The exclusive doctoral student gathering and work space will have both Mac and PC computers equipped in a similar manner with additional software and tools that will assist candidates and faculty while they are on campus. There is a large computer lab in the building and several in the library that will be available for candidates and doctoral faculty.

Continued support for computing/technology services is provided by a line item in the five-year budget for Information Technology (Attachment X.A-6, Budget- Five-Year Plan).

**Equipment, Space, and Other Capital Facilities or Other Operating Costs**

The DPEL does not require any unique or specialized equipment.

Classrooms for the program will be in the Education Building at CSUB. The main classrooms, EDUC 252 and EDUC 121, are near the research and study rooms and offices of faculty. The primary classrooms have been recently refreshed with an interactive White Board, LCD projector, video conferencing capabilities, and other technologies to enhance the teaching and learning experience. Other classrooms that will be used for the program are "smart classrooms" with a computer, LCD projector, DVD player, and speakers. Throughout the buildings at CSUB, a state-of-the-art wireless network is available to doctoral students. The DPEL should have little impact on university classroom usage.

There is a doctoral research and study room at CSUB that serves as a place for doctoral students to convene in groups for the purpose of study, discussion, and research activities. This room is also within easy access to faculty offices and resources. Additionally, this room has both PC and Mac workstations equipped with the software required for the program.

The Stiern Library at CSU Bakersfield provides study rooms, carrels, wireless networking, media production facilities, and a large collection of books, databases, periodicals, maps, and the like. These facilities are available to all doctoral students. It is anticipated that doctoral students will make extensive use of the study rooms. If the demand warrants, the library will dedicate one or more study rooms exclusively to doctoral students.

The DPEL will work with the Enrollment Management operations, especially the Admissions Office and Financial Aid, to enroll and provide support for our students. The program will also require administrative support from the School of Social Sciences and Education and from the Provost’s Office. For this reason, indirect cost line items are built into the five-year budget to support these services (see Attachment X.A-6, Budget- Five-Year Plan).

B. A description of the intended method of funding the additional costs (including fee structures, internal reallocation, and external resources) and effects of the method of funding on existing programs

Note: Section 66040.5(a) of the California Education Code states:

> Enrollment in these [Ed.D.] programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not come at the expense of enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs.

The tuition for EdD students in the CSU is currently $5,559 per semester; the cost of tuition for Ed.D. programs is set by the CSU System. When students enroll at CSUB, they will pay an additional student campus fee, currently set at $439 per quarter. Since CSUB currently has no semester programs, the best estimate of this local fee would be prorating to semester (i.e., multiply the quarter fee by three, then divide by two) which is $659. Total tuition and local fees would then be $6,218 per semester. The program is designed to be completed in eight semesters which includes two summer semesters.

Students may apply for traditional financial aid, mainly in the form of student loans. In addition, ten percent of student fees are set aside for financial aid for participating students based on need.

A group of budget tables that show how costs and revenue are generated for the program are provided as attachments. Attachment X.B-1, Budget-Headcount and FTES shows the projected headcount and FTES.
generated for the first five years of the program. The table is based on 18 students per cohort. This table assumes the program which will open with new students in Cohort 6, and second and third year students in Cohorts 4 and 5. Students in Cohorts 4 and 5 will continue in the joint-program with all revenue and expenses going to Fresno State. Fresno will continue to pay all instructional costs and a proportional share of CSUB’s administrative costs for these joint-program students. CSUB will receive all revenue and assume all costs for first year students in 2016-17; CSUB will assume all financial responsibility for all second year students beginning in 2017-18 and for all third year students beginning in 2018-19.

The DPEL needs to average 16 students per cohort in the long term to remain financially viable. The target cohort size is 18 after attrition of one student per cohort. This break-even figure is based on current experience with the joint Fresno State/CSUB program and budget modeling using different cohort sizes.

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership will be a self-supporting program where student tuition and State marginal cost revenue come directly to the program. Student tuition rates for all doctoral programs in education in the CSU system are set by the Chancellor’s Office. Currently that rate is $5,559 per semester for a fulltime student. The marginal cost revenue rate, the amount per FTES the State provides to the program, is currently set at $7,405 per FTES. The self-supporting DPEL will receive all of its revenue from these two sources. **Attachment X.B-2, Budget-Revenue** shows that the program will receive about $266,769 in its first year of operation which will increase and level off at about $1,267,011 by its third year of operation, when revenue from the second and third-year students comes in. From this total revenue, 10% of student tuition will be set aside for student financial aid. In addition, experience with the program suggests that about four students per year will have their tuition waived as employees or family of CSU employees. This anticipated reduction in revenue has been built into the revenue model presented here. After these reductions, revenue is projected to be about $202,285 in the first year of the program, rising and leveling off in the third year at $1,009,073.

The following attachments show projected faculty costs for the first five years of the program: **Attachment X.A-1, Budget-Faculty Costs 2016-17**, **Attachment X.A-2, Budget-Faculty Costs 2017-2018**, **Attachment X.A-3, Budget-Faculty Costs 2018-2019**, **Attachment X.A-4, Budget-Faculty Costs 2019-2020**, and **Attachment X.A-5, Budget-Faculty Costs 2020-2021**. Costs are based on the course sequence reflected in **Attachment X.B-3, Course Sequence** and the faculty support described in the section above. Faculty costs, including teaching and professional development costs (but not benefits) are projected to be $40,536 in 2016-17, rising and leveling off at $254,349 by 2018-19.

**Attachment X.A-6, Budget-Five Year Plan** shows the projected five-year budget for the program, taking into account the revenue and cost assumptions of the previous tables. Most of the salaries, benefits, and operating costs are taken directly from the budget of the successful joint CSUB/Fresno State Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership. Since the University will not receive direct reimbursement for services to DPEL students, indirect costs are built into the budget to support DPEL students at the University. A payment of $25,000 per year to the library was negotiated to keep holdings and resources for DPEL students current, and to provide liaison librarian services. DPEL will rely on support from information technology services, especially for Blackboard and smart classroom maintenance. University enrollment management and financial aid services will be needed by DPEL students.

Overall, the budget plan suggests total expenses of the program should level out at $858,573 per year. Revenues should level out at approximately $1,009,073 per year, leaving a healthy surplus for expansion or covering unexpected losses (e.g., a single-year drop in enrollment).

The five-year budget plan described above suggests that in its first year, the program may experience a deficit of $8,965, but in subsequent years there will be surpluses. The School of Social Sciences and Education will cover the small first year deficit which will be repaid by the second year surplus.

C. The financial structuring of the programs should address the specific issue of the cost associated with students who lag in completing the dissertation.

Students who anticipate difficulties completing the dissertation on time may apply for a leave of absence from the program. If approved, the student does not pay tuition during the leave and does not register for classes. Students who do not receive an approved leave of absence are required to register for dissertation units, and are charged tuition, until the dissertation is complete. The program needs 16 students per cohort, on average over the long run, to break even.
D. Where the campus plans to expand faculty resources, provide documentation of the campus commitment to and specific budgetary resources for acquiring additional faculty with the appropriate credentials experience (including recent scholarship and publications and doctoral dissertation advising).

The DPEL has no plans to expand faculty resources beyond what is covered in this report and the five-year budget until we have more experience with the standalone program and confirmation of our current budget assumptions.

XI. Admission Requirements

A. Admission criteria, including: undergraduate, master’s-level, and, if appropriate, other postbaccalaureate preparation for admission; other admission requirements; and provisions, if any, for conditional admission of selected applicants who do not meet all the requirements for admission.

Admissions qualifications are set by the CSU. The following are required qualifications:

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership may admit only candidates who meet the academic requirements for the Ed.D. Program and who possess personal qualities and professional experiences that suggest a strong potential for success as doctoral candidates and as educational leaders. Meeting the minimum requirements qualifies an individual for consideration, but does not guarantee admission to the Program. Admission will be granted on a competitive basis.

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership requires the following of all applicants for admission to the doctoral program:

- An earned baccalaureate degree and master’s degree from accredited institutions of higher education with a grade point average in upper division and graduate studies of 3.0 or above;
- Sufficient preparation and graduate training and experience pertinent to educational leadership to benefit from the Program;
- Submission of Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores on the three GRE tests, taken within the last five years;
- Demonstrated educational leadership potential and skills including successful experience in school, postsecondary, community, and/or policy leadership;
- Demonstrated academic excellence, problem-solving ability, and an interest in critically assessing and bringing about improvements within current educational policies and practices;
- Three letters of recommendation attesting to the leadership, ability, and scholarship of the candidate;
- A written statement of purpose reflecting an understanding of the challenges facing the public schools or community colleges/institutions of higher education in California;
- Professional resume, including whether the applicant has proficiency in a second language;
- Examples of professional writings;
- A statement of support for the candidate’s doctoral studies from her/his employer;
- Response to a writing prompt administered on campus prior to the interview; and,
- A personal interview with the Admissions Committee.
Other university graduate admissions standards for graduate students also apply to all Ed.D. candidates.

B. Identify the type of student targeted and qualifications required for the program.

The program seeks practicing or potential educational leaders from PreK-12 and Higher Education (including Community College). The qualifications are outlined in the admissions requirements above.

C. Credit policies, including:
   1. The number of credits that students may transfer in to the program
   2. The distribution of credits allowed or required at the master’s, doctoral, and combined doctoral and master’s levels.

The standalone DPEL will use the same policy for transfer of graduate credit used by other graduate programs at CSUB: Graduate credit from another accredited college or university may be applied toward the fulfillment of requirements in the student’s graduate program at CSUB, if accepted by the faculty of the DPEL Graduate Group. In addition, graduate-level work taken through Extended University may be used to satisfy prerequisite requirements or specific degree requirements when such work is approved in advance by the Director of the DPEL.

A maximum of 9 semester units from another college or university or from Extended University may be accepted toward the DPEL, and all such units must satisfy the time limit requirements specified by the graduate program.

Any units accepted by the program may be counted toward the specialization courses and may not be counted towards completion of the core courses. Courses must be graduate-level courses with a grade of B or better. Course syllabi, catalog descriptions of the courses, and a copy of the transcript showing the posted grades for the courses must be submitted to the program director along with the request to accept the transfer credits.

D. Academic residence requirements

All units outside the 9 transferable units described above must be completed in residence at CSUB.

XII. Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree

The statement should include all of the following elements that are applicable to the proposed program:

A. Unit requirements

The DPEL is a 60-semester unit degree: 27 units of Core courses, 21 units of Specialization units, and 12 Dissertation units.

B. Criteria for continuation in the program

C. Criteria for satisfactory progress

D. Academic disqualification

The DPEL follows CSUB policy for graduate programs with respect to continuation, satisfactory progress, and academic disqualification.

All graduate students must maintain a grade point average of 3.0 or better in all courses taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree as specified in each student’s Plan of Study. A course in which no letter grade is assigned shall not be used in computing the grade point average. Graduate programs will not allow any

---

2 All requirements must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. Please see http://www.calstate.edu/APP/Ed.D./.
course with a grade lower than "C" to count in the Plan of Study. For graduation, the GPA in the Graduate Plan of Study must be 3.0 or better.

In addition to GPA criteria, students are assessed each year by the faculty who have had them in classes regarding their professional development and professional dispositions and receive feedback that may lead to adjusting their Plan of Study. Each year students receive a progress letter informing them of the faculty's evaluation of their performance (see samples in Attachment XII.B, Sample Student Progress Letters). These annual letters are called, "Green Light, Yellow Light and Red Light" letters and provide the student with an assessment of their strengths and opportunities as they continue through the program. Students who fall below GPA criteria or who fail to make changes required in "red light" letters may be disqualified from the program.

Students should be aware of the following regulations concerning academic probation and academic disqualification:

**Academic Probation for Graduate Students.** In general, a graduate student shall be subject to academic probation at the end of any academic term where the student's grade point average for all course work that is in the Plan of Study falls below a "B" (3.0) average. However, students admitted to a graduate program may be subject to academic probation when their performance is judged to be unsatisfactory with respect to the scholastic and/or professional standards established by the individual graduate program. This judgment of performance will be based upon a review by the graduate program coordinator and the AVP for Academic Programs. All graduate students are encouraged to consult with their respective graduate program coordinators regarding acceptable scholastic and/or professional standards established by the graduate program.

**Academic Disqualification for Graduate Students.** A graduate student shall be subject to academic disqualification if, while on academic probation, the student fails to satisfy the conditions of probation and attain a 3.00 GPA. Academic disqualification will be based upon the review and recommendation by the graduate program coordinator, the approval of the appropriate academic dean, and the approval of the AVP for Academic Programs.

E. Foreign language requirements, if any

The DPEL has no foreign language requirement.

F. Field experiences, if any

Students in the DPEL apply their work in the classroom to their educational work settings, but there is no additional fieldwork experience within the program.

G. Internships and monitoring procedures—if internships are required

No internship is required in the DPEL.

H. Field examinations, written and/or oral, if any

The qualifying exam, described below, involves applying coursework to field examples, however, there is no specific field examination.

I. Written qualifying examinations

Students take their qualifying exam after they have completed all core courses at the end of the second year. Passing the exam advances students to candidacy and allows them to begin work on the dissertation in the third year. Guidelines and rubrics for the qualifying exam may be found in Attachment XII.I, Qualifying Exam Description and Rubrics.

J. Dissertation proposal

K. Dissertation examination

L. Dissertation
M. Final examination oral defense of dissertation

All procedures for establishing a dissertation committee, writing the proposal, defending the proposal, writing the dissertation, defending the dissertation, and submitting the final dissertation are discussed in Attachment XII.J, Dissertation Description and Rubrics. Editing guidelines as well as the rubrics used to evaluate dissertations are included in this attachment.

N. Other demonstration of student competence, if any

As described in B-D above, in addition to maintaining a 3.0 GPA, students must demonstrate adequate progress in their professional development and professional dispositions.

O. Special requirements for graduation or distinctive elements of the program

There are no additional special requirements for graduation, however, a distinctive element of the program is that, consistent with our CPED affiliation, the program is designed to be a professional practice oriented degree.

XIII. Curriculum

A. Listing of core courses, identifying those that are required

Core Courses (27 units; All required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6010</td>
<td>Organizational Theories in Complex Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6090</td>
<td>Advanced Applied Research and Measurement in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6060</td>
<td>Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6040</td>
<td>Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6020</td>
<td>Educational Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6080</td>
<td>Theories of Cross-cultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6110</td>
<td>Educational Evaluation, Assessment and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6030</td>
<td>Educational Policy Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6070</td>
<td>Applied Qualitative Research Methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dissertation Courses (12 units; required)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6900</td>
<td>Dissertation (may be repeated three times to complete dissertation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Listing of specialization courses, identifying those that are required

Specialization Courses (21 units; all 21 units are required but the specific courses may differ according to needs of the cohort and track. Courses are approved by advisors. A partial listing of courses that have been offered to date are shown below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Leadership for Reading Instruction (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Human Resource Administrations (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Organizational Development for High-Performing Organizations (PreK-12 and CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Resource and Fiscal Planning (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Community College Administration (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Professional Ethics and Moral Issues in Education (PreK-12 &amp; CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Leaders and Leadership (PreK-12 and CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Interpersonal Leadership and Conflict Resolution (PreK-12 &amp; CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Data-Driven Decision Making (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Advanced Curriculum (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Resource Management and Fiscal Planning (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Contemporary Issues in Post-Secondary Education (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Post-Secondary Legal Aspects (CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: School Law (PreK-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6770</td>
<td>Special Topics: Writing for Publication (PreK-12 &amp; CC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDLD 6770  Special Topics: Practicum in Program Evaluation (PreK-12 and CC)
EDLD 6770  Special Topics: Technology in Education (PreK-12 and CC)

C. Listing of additional recommended courses

No other courses are recommended or required

D. Total number of units required

The DPEL is a 60-semester unit degree: 27 units of Core courses, 21 units of Specialization units, and 12 Dissertation units.

E. Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements

The DPEL is designed to be completed in eight consecutive semesters (Years 1 and 2: Fall, Spring, Summer; Year 3: Fall and Spring). The typical student is able to complete the program as designed.

F. Draft catalog description of the program

See Attachment XIII.F, Catalog Program Description.

G. Draft catalog descriptions of existing and proposed courses

See Attachment XIII.G, Catalog Course Descriptions.

H. For each Ed.D. specialization, a matrix demonstrating how the core and specialization courses ensure coverage of core curricular elements. Please use the matrix template enclosed at the end of this packet.

A matrix demonstrating how the core and specialization courses ensure coverage of core curricular elements is shown in Attachment XIII.H, Course by Curricular Element Matrix. Only one matrix is included because specialization courses provide support for a variety of elements. Each cohort in each track will take a unique pattern of specialization course. The elements are consistently addresses in the core courses and dissertation; none of the elements are dependent on a particular specialization course sequence.

I. Sample schedule of courses for a full cycle of the program.

See Attachment X.B-3, Course Sequence.

J. Provisions for accommodating the enrollment of professionals who are working full time

The DPEL is designed for professionals who are working full-time. Consequently, courses are offered weekends and evenings in Bakersfield, using traditional and hybrid formats.

K. Provisions, as appropriate, for students in the program to complete requirements for the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential (Tier II)

The program is not designed to enable students to complete Tier II requirements.

XIV. Assessment and Accountability (CPEC—Maintenance and Improvement of Quality)

Programs will need to develop formal assessment plans and should not rely on regular 5-year program review cycles or NCATE accreditation to provide insight about how well students are learning or how well the program meets its objectives. While program goals
and student-learning outcomes goals should both be assessed, it is recommended that a clear distinction be drawn between the two. Program goals should drive program assessment, and core concepts should drive the curriculum and its assessment. Both should be related, so that the curriculum carries out the program goals.

Dissertation goals should be included among student learning goals, with outcomes assessed using a dissertation-evaluation rubric. Embedded assessment, conducted in courses, can reveal how well students are achieving the stated learning outcomes, and are a valuable tool for improving curriculum and pedagogy. Indicate how regularly planned analysis of assessments will allow faculty to adjust the program, as appropriate, to support learning effectiveness.

**Assessment Plan**

**A. Include School/College and Ed.D. Program Mission Statements**

SSE Mission Statement:

*The mission of the School of Social Sciences and Education is to address local, regional, and state needs by providing high quality undergraduate and graduate programs in the social sciences and education. We are committed to advancing human development knowledge, encouraging healthy and productive lifestyles, and enhancing the quality of life for all people, particularly those with emotional, learning, and physical disabilities. We pledge to prepare future leaders, professionals, and community advocates. Together, we will work toward increasing the community’s understanding and acceptance of complex social, racial, and gender issues and toward creating positive social change. We will provide students with excellent classroom instruction, faculty-guided research experiences, and experiential learning opportunities to prepare them for career success and for lifelong learning to meet the changing demands of society.*

The faculty and staff of the School of Social Sciences and Education are committed to supporting quality measures identified in the CSUB vision statement featuring faculty academic excellence and diversity, the student experience, community engagement, staff excellence and diversity, and organizational "best practices”.

DPEL Mission Statement:

*The Doctoral program in Educational leadership prepares leaders with demonstrated potential to transform educational systems and settings that improve the life outcomes of all learners and their communities, and to serve as stewards of the profession.*

**B. List of programs outcomes goals (most broad)**

The program will prepare diverse leaders, committed to social justice, who will:

1. Lead successful educational change and reform for teaching and learning in the 21st Century through ethical, equitable and research-based best practices.
2. Employ critical and systems thinking to identify root causes of complex educational problems and develop meaningful solutions to address educational inequities.
3. Respect and engage diverse families, organizations and communities through collaborative partnerships and networking.
4. Collaborate with others to generate and apply a professional knowledge base that integrates both experiential and research knowledge to inform leadership decisions; be able to undertake appropriate critical inquiry and research studies to inform leadership decisions.
5. Construct and use program evaluations and assessments for the purpose of improving program quality.

**C. Student-learning outcomes (SLOs) for the proposed program (narrower, identifying what students know and can do)**

Students will be able to:
1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort
1.2 Identify and navigate ethical complexities of educational leadership
1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to social justice, ethics and equity
1.4 Evaluate and use evolving technologies to inform practice, enhance learning, and increase professional knowledge
2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice
2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and potential solutions
2.3 Assess critically the successes and failures of educational systems
2.4 Analyze systemic and/or root causes of educational inequities and design and implement meaningful solutions
2.5 Align decisions and actions as leaders with stated (and evolving) philosophy of educational leadership
3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader
3.2 Build collaborative partnerships with students, families and communities
3.3 Build collaborative partnerships and networks with colleagues and other professionals
3.4 Create a safe culture and instructional program that is conducive to all students' learning and staff professional growth
4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success
4.2 Undertake and complete an applied research study related to educational issues, problems and practice
5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations
5.2 Design and interpret assessments and assessment data using quantitative reasoning and make leadership decisions based on the data
5.3 Communicate assessment data and outcomes to stakeholders both orally and in writing
6.1 Provide leadership that infuses social justice, equity and ethics into educational programs.

D. Curricular map articulating the alignment between program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes

See Attachment XIV.D, DPEL Outcome Assessment Plan (DOAP), pp. 6-7.

E. Criteria used to assess success of meeting program goals (Identification of the performance criteria used to assess the effectiveness of the program.)

See Attachment XIV.D, DPEL Outcome Assessment Plan (DOAP), p. 8-10, 14-33.

F. Include a matrix that shows assessment criteria for student-learning outcomes. (Assessment matrix describing the achievement of the program’s student learning outcomes)

See Attachment XIV.D, DPEL Outcome Assessment Plan (DOAP), pp. 11-12.

G. Indicate how the results of the assessment will be used to achieve program improvement (the assessment “feedback loop”); and that specifies the schedule for review of assessment reports by the Faculty Group, Executive Committee, and Advisory Board.

See Attachment XIV.D, DPEL Outcome Assessment Plan (DOAP), p. 13

H. Provisions for conducting systemwide Ed.D. program evaluation and reporting as required by Education Code Section 66040.7. The proposal should explain the processes in place that will allow the program to report these performance criteria, as required by California Education Code Section 66040.7(d):
1. How graduates of the programs have affected elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts

2. How CSU Ed.D. graduates have positively affected student achievement in elementary and secondary school and community college settings.

The CSUB DPEL will participate in system wide evaluation efforts when it becomes a standalone program just as it did in the joint program. The CSU system organizes these assessments that address # 1 and 2 above.

The most recent report concludes, “There is clear evidence of the impact of the CSU Ed.D. programs on P-12 and community college reforms and on student learning, development and achievement. Impacts have been attained through careful program design, implementation, and assessment that follow the explicit purposes of the authorizing legislation-to address the urgent need for effective leaders of California’s elementary and secondary school and community colleges.”

A copy of the most recent CSU report, which includes CSUB joint program data, is provided in Attachment XIV.H., CSU EdD Report Final.

XV. Student Support Services

A. A description of the ability of the institutions to provide graduate student support, including teaching or research assistantships, fellowship eligibility, financial aid, and research funding, if any

The five-year budget (Attachment X.A-6, Budget- Five-Year Plan) shows yearly line items of $20,000 for research/graduate assistants, $20,000 for student travel to conferences, and $5000 for dissertation research support (about $500 available for 10 students). These competitive awards are considered by the Graduate Group and distributed by the Program Director. Doctoral students are eligible for the same need-based grants and other loans as other graduate students at CSUB. These awards are made through financial aid; the assistance that financial aid provides to our students (e.g., receiving applications, distributing awards) is considered an indirect cost for the self-supporting DPEL and is reflected in a budget line item. Finally, one requirement of all CSU Ed.D. programs is that they reserve 10% of what they receive in state fees for a financial aid set aside for needy students. We have built this 10% set aside into our budget.

B. Advising, mentoring, and cohort interaction, including a description of how timely and appropriate interactions between students and faculty, and among students will be assured. This is especially relevant for online programs.

Students are assigned a faculty advisor and a peer mentor during the first week of the program. The faculty advisor remains their advisor until students select a dissertation chair, who then becomes their new advisor. The coordinator at the Center for Research and Publications will also be available to advise students, in conjunction with their committee, on research design and analysis issues. Four dissertation seminars are held so that students get assistance in thinking through their problem of study, theoretical frameworks and methodology. The program director is also available to meet with students on any program issues and often advises students on potential dissertation committee members.

Students in the DPEL go through the program in cohorts, which means students are surrounded by the same 15-20 peers in their classes every week for the first two years of the program. Students are exposed to a variety of instructors since instructors may teach only one core course per cohort. Within their classes, students do much of their work in groups, especially field projects. Students also have the opportunity to interact through Blackboard discussions in several classes.

There is a doctoral research and study room at CSUB that serves as a place for doctoral students to convene in groups for the purpose of study, discussion, and research activities. This room is also within easy access to faculty offices and resources. Additionally, this room has both PC and Mac workstations equipped with the software required for the program.
The Stiern Library at CSU Bakersfield provides study rooms, carrels, wireless networking, media production facilities, and a large collection of books, databases, periodicals, maps, and the like. These facilities are available to all doctoral students. It is anticipated that doctoral students will make extensive use of the study rooms. If the demand warrants, the library will dedicate one or more study rooms exclusively to doctoral students.

C. Specify the arrangements that have been made to identify and assist students who struggle in meeting academic requirements and for those who fall behind their cohort.

All graduate students must maintain a grade point average of 3.0 or better in all courses taken to satisfy the requirements for the degree as specified in each student’s Plan of Study. Transcripts for all students in the DPEL are reviewed each semester to be sure students are meeting academic requirements. Where they are not, students are required to consult with their advisor. In addition to GPA criteria, students are assessed each year by the faculty who have had them in classes regarding their professional development and professional dispositions and receive feedback that may lead to adjusting their Plan of Study. Each year students receive a progress letter informing them of the faculty’s evaluation of their performance (see samples in Attachment XII.B, Sample Student Progress Letters). These annual letters are called, “Green Light, Yellow Light and Red Light” letters and provide the student with an assessment of their strengths and opportunities as they continue through the program.

Students who fall behind their cohort may take additional specialization courses to catch up if they are in that phase of the program and if they receive the permission of the Director. Students who fall behind may also joint a later cohort if that seems a more reasonable strategy and it is approved by the Director.

D. Ed.D. program student handbook or a plan to create and distribute a program student handbook, as required by Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40511

A draft of the current student handbook may be found in Attachment XV.D, CSUB EdD Guidelines Draft. Currently, most of the material covered in the draft refers to academic policies and procedures. More description of student services available to DPEL students will be added to the guidelines before the first cohort of CSUB standalone students arrives.

XVI. Doctoral Culture (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)

Proposals should explain where support for doctoral students and faculty currently exists and how the campus will enhance a sense of graduate community and an environment supportive of doctoral-level study. Plans may be addressed from the faculty perspective, as well as from the student viewpoint.

A. Description of how a doctoral-level culture will be established to support the proposed program, including such elements as doctoral level course requirements, nature of the research environment, balance between applied and research components of the degree, and description of dissertation. (Note: Greater rigor will be represented for doctoral courses than in syllabi at the master’s level. Ed.D. syllabi should be designed to align course objectives, content, assignments, texts, and exams with learning outcomes at both the program and course levels. The number and intellectual rigor of required readings and student assignments will be appropriate for doctoral study.)

The doctoral-level culture will build on the graduate culture that has been growing at CSUB, especially since the funding of the Graduate Student Center. The DPEL program director will enthusiastically participate on the Graduate Coordinator’s Council and is excited about working with the other coordinators to help shape the future of graduate programs at CSUB.
The University Learning Outcomes for Graduate Programs unite all of the graduate programs on campus by reflecting a shared set of educational commitments toward our students and the DPEL has developed a program consistent with these ULOs. Our DPEL graduates will demonstrate broad integrative knowledge about educational leadership and will understand how interdisciplinary cooperation between disciplines prepares future leaders; they will develop specialized knowledge that allows them to understand the educational system as it is today, and will learn theories, skills, and methods that allow them to also improve education for the benefit of their students; DPEL students will use critical thinking, information literacy, writing, and oral communication skills, while taking diverse perspectives into account, in order to become better educational leaders who can investigate important educational issues through their dissertation and after graduation; and our students will share a commitment with other graduates to apply what they learn to better their community.

Although there may be places where the unique needs of the DPEI and the needs of other graduate programs on campus may differ, we look forward to working with other graduate programs on our common mission of improving the quality of education at CSUB and supporting the community. We will seek opportunities for collaboration with our colleagues in other graduate programs.

The following activities and practices will encourage a doctoral-level culture at CSUB for DPEL students:

1) Use of a cohort model that encourages interaction, collaboration and rich discussions among peers; 2) Action research in courses (embedded fieldwork, laboratories of practice) that facilitates synergy between coursework and scholarship; 3) Courses that include writing for publications; 4) Center for Research and Publications (CRP) (half-time faculty member will serve as the coordinator of CRP) where students receive assistance with APA, data analysis, writing for publications (these services are also available for faculty). Such a center has been part of the joint program and CSUB will create a similar center on our campus; 5) Opportunities for students to be Graduate Assistants; 6) Annual review of students' progress in the program with frequent feedback regarding doctoral expectations and mentoring for student success; 7) Opportunities for students to attend seminars and colloquium sponsored by CSUB and the Central Valley Educational Leadership Institute (CVELI) at Fresno State (given our history together, we hope to cultivate continued collaborations that benefit both program's students); 8) Opportunities through faculty co-presented papers and travel support from the program for students to attend professional organizational conferences (UCEA, AERA, CERA, AEA, CSCC) and to present with faculty at these venues; 9) Dissertation seminars in students' second and third years that ensure students have support through the development of their dissertation topics; 10) Celebratory events that encourage social interaction with other students in the program and recognize achievement among peers; 11) Annual Research Symposium where all graduating doctoral students present their research with mandatory attendance by all doctoral students; 12) Annual town hall meetings for all doctoral students; 13) Publications bulletin board; 14) Doctoral program newsletter that acknowledges current doctoral student and graduates accomplishments both in terms of scholarship and professional activities; 15) Faculty colloquia where faculty spend the afternoon with students discussing research agendas and possible research partnerships with students; 16) Availability of a Director of Grants, Community Engagement and Special Projects within the School of Social Sciences and Education to help students and faculty locate and secure grants to support their scholarship; and 17) Faculty colloquia that will be held annually where faculty present their research to students. These colloquia will help students to select dissertation topics and identify faculty whom they may be interested in working with, early in the program.

DPEL faculty, Fresno State librarians, and the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education have worked with CSUB library staff to be sure that necessary library resources are available for standalone program students.

Dissertation requirements and procedures are described in Attachment XII.J, Dissertation Description and Rubrics.

B. Support/resources for faculty to develop a doctoral culture, engage in research, and if applicable, receive an orientation in order to chair dissertation committees.

To increase the research productivity of faculty participating in the DPEL and develop a doctoral culture within our faculty, a set of supports and incentives will be available. We will encourage affiliated faculty to progress to core faculty when they are ready.
Faculty support resources for teaching in the doctoral program and for chairing dissertations will be as follows:

1) Faculty will be awarded 4.5 units for teaching a 3.0 unit course during Fall and Spring semesters. The additional 1.5 units will provide reassigned time for faculty to work on research.

2) Awarded funding based on 1.5 units at the tenure-track replacement rate (approx. $1689 per unit) to be used for scholarly pursuits/professional development. Professional development money may be used to defray the costs of research, professional travel to conferences, and membership in scholarly organizations.

3) Awarded .5 units for each dissertation chair for each semester (1.5 units total per dissertation).

4) Awarded professional development funding based on .5 units at the tenure-track replacement rate for chairing dissertation for each semester.

Faculty will be oriented to dissertation committee service through the requirement that a faculty member must serve on a committee as a non-chair before chairing a committee. In addition, only core faculty with productive research experience and deep acquaintance with the DPEL may serve as dissertation committee chairs.

DPEL faculty will participate in many of the activities listed in XVI.A above.

C. Support services available for doctoral students, such as financial aid, professional placement, and research opportunities.

The five-year budget (Attachment X.A-6, Budget - Five-Year Plan) shows yearly line items of $20,000 for research/graduate assistants, $20,000 for student travel to conferences, and $5000 for dissertation research support (about $500 available for 10 students). These competitive awards are considered by the Graduate Group and distributed by the Program Director. Doctoral students are eligible for the same need-based grants and other loans as other graduate students at CSUB. These awards are made through financial aid; the assistance that financial aid provides to our students (e.g., receiving applications, distributing awards) is considered an indirect cost for the self-supporting DPEL and is reflected in a budget line item. Finally, one requirement of all CSU Ed.D. programs is that they reserve 10% of what they receive in state fees for a financial aid set aside for needy students. We have built this 10% set aside into our budget.

Students in the DPEL will be professional educators who already have jobs and are not in need of job placement services. Within their coursework, however, students will learn how to be more valuable to their employers which will increase their chances of promotion.

XVII. Special Provisions for Administration of a Multi-Campus Program (if applicable)

A. Administrative support at each participating campus and mechanisms for program coordination

B. Assistance for faculty, staff and students in meeting the unique demands of the proposed joint program (e.g., travel among participating campuses, distance learning expenses, relocation expenses)

C. Rules for determining registration and fee payment obligations, especially when students are receiving instructional services simultaneously from more than one participating campus

D. Comprehensive support services for students (e.g., child care, access to information resources) at multiple campuses

E. Mechanisms to ensure the involvement of each participating campus in admission decisions, curricular coordination and modification, advisory committees, and dissertation committees
F. Any other relevant features of the relationship between the partnering campuses in the development and implementation of the proposed degree program

These provisions are not applicable to the standalone Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

XVIII. Accreditation

*If the proposed program is within a school or related to other programs accredited by a professional accrediting agency, please list the agency, the year accredited, and include in the appendix a copy of the most recent accreditation evaluation. This pertains only to those participating departments that have relevant accreditation.*

Education programs within the School of Social Sciences and Education completed accreditation evaluations in the 2015-16 academic year. These programs received positive evaluations following a joint visit by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Letters from these agencies are included as Attachment XVIII-1, CTCC Accreditation Letter and Attachment XVIII-2, NCATE Accreditation Letter.
### Fresno State/CSUB Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

#### Program Transition Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
<th>Cohort 4</th>
<th>Cohort 5</th>
<th>Cohort 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Phase 1: Fresno State program at CSUB
- Phase 2: Joint Fresno State/CSUB program
- Phase 3: CSUB independent program
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Background

In 1970, California State University Bakersfield (CSUB) was established as the 19th of the 23 California State University campuses. It is located on a 375-acre site that serves the southern regional area of the San Joaquin Valley. CSUB is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The university is committed to excellence in its four schools, which consist of Arts and Humanities, Business and Public Administration, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Social Sciences and Education.

The CSUB Vision Statement enounces the following:

By 2014-15, CSU Bakersfield will be the leading campus in the CSU system in terms of faculty and academic excellence and diversity, quality of the student experience, and community engagement. Realization of our vision will be advanced by recruitment, development and promotion of excellent and diverse staff within an organizational culture committed to excellence in all areas.

The California State University Chancellor, Charles Reed said “between 2002 and 2004, all CSUs reviewed their teacher preparation programs, to ensure alignment with California’s content standards for K-12 students. Despite lack of state funding to fully implement high-quality teacher performance assessments, all campuses continued to develop faculty knowledge and skill in the assessment of teacher candidates”. Hence, the Trustees of the CSU approval, in 2002, of funding in the form of grants for CSUs that implements doctorate degree programs in education and nursing.

On January 14, 2011 CSUB took a step towards the continuous pursuit of its vision with the announcement of a six-year transitional program plan with California State University Fresno (CSUF) offering a Doctorate in Educational Leadership (Ed.D.). CSUB President Dr. Horace Mitchell stated the “university has been working for quite some time to implement its first stand-alone doctoral program as there clearly is a need but not many options available in our service area”.

Structure of Partnership between CSUB and CSUF:

Dr. Sharon Brown-Welty, Director of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at CSUF, agrees this “collaboration between universities is a milestone for educators in Bakersfield”. Moreover, this partnership will “encompass CSUB
educators, who are familiar with local education issues, to work hand in hand with CSUF educators that have years of experience in this doctoral program, in dissertations, and in applied research”.

This doctoral program will be an ongoing program including 3 transitional phases. The plan for this program is contained in the transitional program sequence. The first two cohorts will be California State University, Fresno students. Cohorts 3 and 4 will be admitted into a joint program between California State University, Fresno and California State University, Bakersfield. Cohorts 5 and 6 will be offered entirely by California State University, Bakersfield. The program is offered for working professionals week nights, weekends and it is anticipated that a small number of courses (no more than 25%) will be redesigned to be fully on-line courses. The program will be marketed within the campus service region, which includes a satellite campus in the Antelope Valley and an extension program in Santa Clarita. CSU Bakersfield also serves a five-county region including (Kern, Inyo, North Los Angeles, Tulare, and Kings Counties) where information about this program will be distributed.

The Ed.D. Program, which is designated to be completed within three years, offers two leadership programs one in pre K-12 the other in post-secondary education. Each program requires students to complete three phases of study totaling 60 units. The first phase consists of 27 core units, the second phase is 21 units of specialized courses, and the final phase is the 12 dissertation units.

The prospective Ed.D. students must meet the following criteria:

- Master’s Degree from an accredited institution
- Accumulated Grade Point Average of at least 3.0 in all college level coursework
- Pass the Graduate Record Exam

**The Project:**

The last needs assessment for a CSUB Ed.D. program was developed in 2001 and is no longer accessible. Dr. Kathleen Knutzen, CSUB Dean of Social Science & Education, requested students in the PPA 402 Program Evaluation course to provide a new needs assessment.
In order to adequately meet the request of Dr. Knutzen, it is necessary to evaluate the intention of a program evaluation. Program evaluations are social research tools which are intended to investigate social actions that improve social conditions. The following are the five types of program evaluations:

- Needs Assessment
- Assessment of Program Theory
- Assessment of Program Process
- Impact Assessment
- Efficiency Assessment

After reviewing the five types of program evaluations, it was determined a needs assessment was the most appropriate program evaluation tool to meet Dr. Knutzen’s requests. A needs assessment evaluation is intended to study the social conditions and address the need for a program. Based on previous research completed prior to this program evaluation, it was concluded there was a need to facilitate Educational Leadership in San Joaquin Valley by the development of an Ed.D. program.
Ed.D. Needs Assessment Model:
(Chart One)

Is there a need for the program?

- Yes
  - A projected need

  - Initial Pool of Candidates
    - Admitted
      - Failed to Matriculate
      - Drop-outs
      - Graduates
Ed.D. Needs Assessment Model continued:
(Chart 2)

Is there a continuing need?

A continuing need

Initial pool not admitted

History of other programs

New Applicants

Number likely to reapply

Number likely to reapply denial letters

Admitted

Failed to matriculate

Drop-out

Graduates
Program Theory/SWOT Analysis:

After reviewing the 2009 needs assessment survey spearheaded by Dr. Curt Guaglionone, CSUB Special Assistant to the Provost, and Dr. Penny Swenson, CSUB Associate Professor of Educational Administration, the conclusion was that there is a need for an Ed.D. program at CSUB. The established need for the program is the backbone of the Needs Assessment Models (Chart 1 and Chart 2). An overview and explanation of each model is described below. A Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis is incorporated with the program theory models.

Chart 1:
This chart describes phase one of the five year joint relationship between CSUB and CSUF. Prior to the establishment of the universities collaboration, CSUF had an initial pool of over 200 interested candidates. It is unknown how many of these candidates met the minimum qualifications for acceptance into the program. CSUB does not have firsthand knowledge of the exact number of candidates who applied and were qualified for the 2011/2012 cohort. CUSB was informed by CSUF there were 20 candidates accepted into the 2011/2012 cohort; however, CSUB was not provided with the names and contact information of those who applied and were accepted. In addition, CSUB did not participate in the inaugural selection process.

Data is devoid of the CSUB Ed.D. program as to how many of the 20 accepted applicants will fail to matriculate or drop-out. Efforts need to be established to capture the matriculated and drop-out rate which will increase the number of successful applicants.

Chart 2:
This Chart describes beyond the initial phase of the collaboration between CSUB and CSUF. Similar to the projected need this chart flows in a linear and horizontal fashion, each level examining deeper into the continued need of the program. The continuing need of the program has three prongs, the initial pool of applicants not admitted, history of other programs, and new applicants.

The first theme in the horizontal line focuses on the initial pool of applicants who were denied admission, out of the denied applicants how many are likely to reapply and how many are not likely to reapply. This information is important to
document, as efforts to raise a successful pool of qualified applicants is imperative in order to have a continuously high number of eligible applicants.

The second theme in the horizontal line focuses on the history of other programs. Learning from the CSU’s collaboration with the University of California Ed.D. programs will provide insight, guidance and direction will provide safeguards in the success of the CSUB program.

The final theme in the horizontal line focuses on new applicants which dovetails and mirrors Chart 1- Is there a need for the program? Chart 1 and the final horizontal theme consider new applicants and how many were admitted. Out of those admitted how many failed to matriculate, dropped-out or graduated.

**SWOT:**

Examining the strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the CSU educational doctorate program will enhance the realization and vision of the academic excellence set forth by the Chancellor of the CSU system.

**Strengths**
- Program being offered by a public university
- Raising level of professionalism for local educators
- Affordable local education

**Weaknesses**
- CSUB not involved in the admission decision with CSUF
- CSUB does not have independent pool of qualified prospective applicants
- CSUB has not participated in local marketing of the EdD program
- CSUB is not aware of what denial letter states
- CSUB has had no contact with incoming students

**Opportunities**
- CSUB to offer more on-line classes
- Align with UC system
- Learn from success of private universities
- Mentorship opportunities

**Threats**
- Lack of ongoing or new interested and qualified applicants
- Lack of involvement with admission process with CSUF
- Cohorts only starting yearly
- Aggressive marketing by private universities
CSU Perspective Ed.D. Program Survey: A Survey for the Need of an Educational Doctorate Program within the CSU System by Dr. Curt Guaglianone and Dr. Penny Swenson of California State University, Bakersfield
CSU Perspective Ed.D. Needs Assessment Analysis: An Analysis for the Need of an Educational Doctorate Program within the CSU System by Dr. Curt Guaglianone and Dr. Penny Swenson of California State University, Bakersfield
A. Program Need

A. Program need/rationale framed by the institution’s mission and strategic goals – Local program need should be documented in addition to any national or statewide need.

The legislation authorizing doctoral studies in educational leadership at CSUs developed as a result of an identified need, that being a projected critical shortage of school leaders in years to come. That need is found both regionally and throughout the state.

California has approximately 1,000 school districts and county offices of education and 8,000 schools, all in need of skilled, knowledgeable and committed leaders. More than 23,000 administrators now serve in schools and district and county offices; another 11,000 educators possess the necessary credentials to serve in administrative posts. However, national and state research shows a severe shortage of candidates for administrative positions. The administrator shortage is expected to become increasingly severe over the next decade as California searches for leaders for hundreds of new schools and thousands of posts left vacant because of attrition. The demand for school and district leadership continues to increase while the supply of trained individuals dwindles (Association of California School Administrators Task Force, 2001.)

CSU Bakersfield fulfills a critical leadership role in the socio-economic and educational development of the region. In this regard, since the baccalaureate degree is the key to development of the State’s future business, government, and community employees, graduate programs at CSUB develop responsible leaders in this diverse service region. The CSUB doctoral degree in educational leadership will provide another means to support and encourage increasing the college attending rate within the region.

As the primary institution that prepares school teachers, counselors, and administrators for a five county service region, CSU Bakersfield is recognized for its role in preparing entry-level school leaders. That entry-level preparation is a sound foundation for advanced study, but at this time there are no programs for doctoral level work in the region. A significant gap exists between the skills and knowledge required of entry-level personnel and those who aspire to positions of
greater responsibility and breadth, particularly at the district level, and this proposed program will meet that community need.

Strong, effective, and visionary leadership is required at these more advanced levels. The large number of recent and upcoming resignations and retirements nationwide are magnified in the southern San Joaquin Valley, which includes the largest high school district and elementary school district in the state. A similar need exists in the nine community colleges in the region. Community colleges within the CSUB service region had a combined Fall 2008 enrollment of over 79,000 students.

Regional community college leaders who participated in the planning of the CSUB Ed.D. Program attests to a similar trend in the San Joaquin Valley. Our partners also note that future community college leaders need excellent preparation in the area identified in the proposed program curriculum and that these leaders must be prepared to lead a team that will create change, measure the educational reform progress, and infuse technology into the learning process. The community college system requires leaders, from deans and chairs to chancellors, who are focused on educational reform within the community college system and on innovative learning in the classroom. Openings outstrip the supply and will for the foreseeable future.

Throughout California there has been for the past decade and continues to be a substantial unmet workforce need for an affordable and accessible doctoral degree in education. This need cannot be accommodated through current programs in the state. During the five years prior to 2006, awarded public sector program Ed.D. Degrees averaged 35 to 45 annually, and private institution Ed.D. Degrees between 290 and 325, the latter having an average student total cost of between $45,000 and $60,000, which have increased substantially since 2006.

The growth in California’s student population has generated a corresponding need for pre-K –14 educational leaders. California Department of Education data indicate that more than 27,500 school administrators were needed last year to manage 8,900 schools. This represents an increase of 13.7% or 3,613 in administrative leadership positions in a six-year period. State of California occupational projections from the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1998-2008 demonstrated an increase in demand for educational administrators of 21%.
The need for qualified administrators is compounded by the fact that in California, a large number of school administrators are eligible for retirement. Eighty percent of superintendents in the state will be eligible for retirement in the next five years. Most districts seek superintendents with a doctorate to fill these vacating positions, and the limited supply of Ed.D. or Ph.D. qualified candidates adversely affects adequate applicant pools to fill these positions.

Despite the increase in the challenges facing California’s school administrators, the percentage of school administrators with a doctorate has declined in the past eight years. In 1997-98, 9% of the 22,799 school administrators possessed a doctorate. This figure had dropped to 7.7% of California’s administrators in Spring 2005.

A California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) study found that public school district superintendents identified a need for doctoral programs that emphasize a practical knowledge base, including such areas as instructional methods, school finance, politics of education, statistical analysis methods, school law, and project management. The Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy at CSU Sacramento conducted interviews with 35 California community college leaders, including 15 presidents and chancellors. Nearly all indicated that while certificate programs can meet a short-term need, there is a significant need for an Ed.D. in community college leadership. In 2003, community college presidents stressed that the Ed.D. was the single most important need for improving leadership capacity within their colleges. Given the forty-eight pre-K-12 school districts in Kern County alone and nine-community colleges within CSUB’s service region, a doctoral program that addresses the above needs is clearly in alignment with the University’s strategic goals of meeting the needs of the community and enhancing the quality of life in the region.

In two separate online surveys conducted within the past four years to explore demand for the doctorate in Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties, between 68 and 82 percent of administrators indicated an interest in pursuing a doctoral degree in education. California’s production of education doctorates is significantly lower than that in other states, which use this professional degree in education to meet the leadership needs of their public schools and community colleges.

In one of the surveys (which included over 600 respondents), 73% saw the Ed.D. as an opportunity to improve knowledge and skills than an opportunity for professional advancement and 37% viewed it as a way to improve their salary.
Nearly three-quarters of respondents agreed that the additional Ed.D. Programs offer the potential to improve the quality of education throughout California.

The seven CSU independent Ed.D. Programs which began in fall 2007 will produce a total of between 130 and 150 education doctorates per year. It would require CSU to add approximately 615 doctorates per year for the public universities in California to reach national average patterns in producing educational leaders prepared with doctoral-level study. A majority of other states use regional, comprehensive universities not offering more than two or three doctoral programs to offer the education doctorate, as is planned by the CSU.

California currently relies on the private university sector to provide the Ed.D. in a pattern that is the reverse of national practice. The cost of private university programs range from $13,000 (for a 4 to 5 year full-time, on-campus program) to $40,000 per year. As a consequence, the cost of the Ed.D. excludes large numbers of potential candidates. At a time when we need to bring additional diversity into leadership, this is a significant issue. Current administrative leadership is more than 90% white, despite a school population that has been a majority-minority for over ten years.

Graduates of the CSU Bakersfield Ed.D. Program will integrate practice, theory, and research, while examining issues from multiple perspectives, questioning assumptions, while respecting and honoring divergent views. The goal is for candidates to grow and become the visionary educational leaders needed in the region that will support the CSU strategic goals.

Educational leaders from the regional P-16 community have partnered with CSU Bakersfield because they believe this Ed.D. will have a substantial impact in advancing educational opportunities for the diverse groups of students in the regions served through preparing exceptional leaders (Attachment V.A.2 – Community Participants). The program is designed to offer a curriculum of graduate study that is accessible to individuals having diverse backgrounds reflective of the communities they serve and to prepare these candidates as practitioner-scholars. Diversity is also the theme of one of the core courses and is emphasized throughout the program.

In addition to the Cooperative Doctoral Program CSU Bakersfield has had with University of Pacific, CSUB offers a Master’s in Education Degree with concentrations in educational administration, bi-lingual education, counselor education, special education, multi-cultural education, early childhood education,
and reading literacy. All of these programs prepare administrators and curriculum leaders for pre-K-14 positions throughout the University service region. A number of these administrators are themselves practitioner-scholars and participate as lecturers in the CSUB Master’s in Education Degree programs. CSUB faculty in higher education have specialized expertise in multiple areas including instructional leadership, curriculum, research, program development, finance and administration, technology, and diversity.

CSUB offers a Master’s in Bilingual Education which is designed to prepare individuals for careers in multicultural/multilingual settings, international education, and contemporary urban educational environments. Its faculty expertise includes such areas as language, literacy, culture, and diversity. The program addresses the major demographic shifts within our society and the educational challenges and opportunities that they present. Areas of concentration include language minority education, with attention to English as a Second Language (ESL) and multicultural/multilingual education.

In addition, CSUB offers a Master’s Degree in Education with a concentration in educational administration as well as both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services credentials. These programs prepare candidates for entry level pre-K-14 administrative leadership roles. The master’s program in Educational Administration is unique compared to other programs in the area due to its focus on scholarly research; all candidates must complete either a master’s thesis, project, or comprehensive examination. Field experiences are also embedded in each course, which ensures a tight connection between theory and practical application. Program faculty have expertise in school leadership, implementation of school-based reforms, state educational policies, educational technology, preparation of school administrators, and research methodologies.

The Curriculum and Instruction Program concentration is intended for educators and those interested in education who are seeking to enhance their skills and understandings of curriculum development, implementation, and assessment. While most candidates for the Master of Arts in Education with an emphasis in Curriculum and Instruction are Pre-K-12 teachers, there are professional development specialists, community college instructors, coaches, educational technologists, and others who find the programs useful in their careers. Degree candidates work with an advisor to develop programs that will help meet their professional goals.
B. Process and results used to establish the need - Please provide a summary of the findings, not the full study

Local area needs assessment used several methods of inquiry:

1. Nineteen CSUB-initiated leadership summits and/or follow-up meetings with key community partners were conducted in order to
   1. explore and probe interests in the doctorate;
   2. engage in focused group discussions;
   3. assess depth of interest and breadth of need;
   4. design and plan constituent components for the program; and
   5. write the proposal.

On-going formal and informal meetings have been held with educational leaders from:

0. Kern Community College District,
1. Antelope Valley College,
2. Bakersfield College,
3. Kern Union High School District,
4. Panama Buena Vista School District,
5. Richland School District, Hot Springs School District,
6. Standard School District,
7. Rosedale Union School District,
8. Bakersfield City School District and
9. The Kern County Superintendent of Schools.

Several formal and informal meetings with CSUB university-wide faculty as well as faculty within the SOE have been conducted in order to determine need, expectation, focus of the program, and anticipated involvement of interested faculty.

Two Needs assessment surveys were conducted soliciting input from potential applicants and veteran administrators preK-14 districts. Formal and informal periodic surveys were used to ascertain input from prospective students who were participating in course work in SOE’s Department of Advanced Educational Studies.

List of queries has been maintained from individuals holding M.A. or M.S. degrees who called or emailed to inquire about the possible doctorate. See Attachment V.B.1 – CSUB, Ed.D. Needs Survey Data below.
To gauge the context of the local needs assessment, CSUB relied on conversations with experts in the field in Washington and on data, texts, and discourses to be found in the following sources:

1. Data provided by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) at [http://www.acsa.org/](http://www.acsa.org/)
3. Data on the declining trend in the ratio of number of administrators per pupil at [http://www.eddata.k12.ca.us/Navigation/fsTwoPanel.asp?bottom=%2Fprofile.asp%3Flevel%3D04%26reportNumber%3D16](http://www.eddata.k12.ca.us/Navigation/fsTwoPanel.asp?bottom=%2Fprofile.asp%3Flevel%3D04%26reportNumber%3D16)
7. South San Joaquin valley data set on administrators on the ACSA region [xi web-site](http://www.acsaxi.org/)
9. Annual Reports for four years, from 2005 to 2008 to be found at [http://www.aasa.org/publications/content.cfm?ItemNumber=3337](http://www.aasa.org/publications/content.cfm?ItemNumber=3337)
12. Synopsis of prospects for pre-K-14 jobs to be found in projection data from the National Employment Matrix displayed in [http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos007.htm](http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos007.htm)
The summary of the findings all point in one direction: The doctorate as outlined here is needed; is much warranted and is assured of a stable, sustainable enrollment-driven future.

C. Evidence (surveys, focus groups, documented inquiries, etc.) used to support enrollment projections and to support the conclusion that interest in the program is sufficient to sustain it at expected levels

1. The designated service region for CSUB consists of five San Joaquin Valley counties covering nearly 25,000 square miles. According to recent census figures, Kern County is the heaviest populated county in the service region and includes a highly diverse population in excess of 687,600 residents, including 38% of Hispanic origin. Further, CSUB serves a large service area, which includes nine feeder community colleges that had a combined Fall 2006 enrollment of 76,214 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>14,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope Valley College</td>
<td>Palmdale, CA</td>
<td>10,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerro Coso College</td>
<td>Ridgecrest, CA</td>
<td>4,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Canyons</td>
<td>Valencia, CA</td>
<td>16,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Sequoias</td>
<td>Visalia, CA</td>
<td>15,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porterville College</td>
<td>Porterville, CA</td>
<td>3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taft College</td>
<td>Taft, CA</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills</td>
<td>Coalinga and Lemoore, CA</td>
<td>7,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Local educational leaders have explained that the declining workforce numbers in educational leadership positions is quite typical of the picture in the San Joaquin Valley.

3. Without advertising, marketing or promotion, and without a program such as the one proposed here, CSUB produced and was able to sustain on average 15 graduates a year for four consecutive years under the doctoral collaborative with the UOP.
4. This program was designed in partnership with the community in a series of regularly held meetings over a period of two years – see Attachment V.C.1. - Community Partner Meetings and Leadership Summits for the schedule of meetings, activities, and outcomes. This process ensured that the community shaped and designed the curriculum. The university provided the framework to transform the community needs and wants into a programmatic doctoral proposal. The prospects of enrollments on a sustained basis is now much higher and more likely, given the specific community context in which this proposal was crafted.

5. A survey distributed in summer 2007 to assess the need for a doctoral program to the 47 Pre-K-12 school districts indicated 66% among the pre-qualified respondents to be currently interested in earning an Ed.D.

6. A subsequent online survey carried out in 2009 yields a clearer prospect for future and sustainable enrollments. Of the 78 educators responding to the survey, 35.9% were teachers, 32.2% administrators, and the remaining respondents held a variety of jobs in the county’s educational system. The respondents qualitatively reflected the diversity of CSUB’s own demographics and included 72.2% white, 22.2% Hispanics/Latina(os), 8.3% African American, and 2.8% American Indian/Alaska native. Seventy-eight potential candidates completed the 39 question survey. Seventy-five percent previously explored the possible options for attaining a doctoral degree. Eighty-five percent indicate they are likely to remain within the region after securing a doctorate. Nearly 60 percent want to apply for the first cohort and 34 percent indicate their application is somewhat likely. Overwhelmingly, the group plans to be part of the CSUB Ed.D. through applying within the first three years of the program. The group is nearly evenly distributed between males and females. The largest group (35%) is in the 31 to 40 age range. On the open-ended questions many potential candidates provided direct and important comments, further indicating their strong interest in the program. The positive response to the survey underscores evidence from past reports and surveys calling for a doctoral program at CSUB. Attachment V.B.1 - CSUB, Ed.D. Needs Survey Data.

7. SOE’s own sources suggest that yearly fifteen or more of the best M.A. students from Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Administration enquire and follow up about the Ed.D. Over 100 individuals, without any advertisement, are on the list to receive information and applications once the program materializes. This number of prospective students is likely to increase
after the formation of an active web-site and the approval and announcement of the degree to the 115 to 120 Educational Administration and Curriculum and Instruction MA graduates.

8. CSUB offers a Master’s degree in education with five concentrations and a Master’s degree in School Counseling and Student Affairs as well as a Master’s Degree in Special Education. These programs will serve as feeders for the new Independent doctoral program: the concentrations include Educational Administration, Curriculum and Instruction, Early Childhood Education, Reading/Literacy, Bilingual/Multicultural Education.

9. Four private universities in the greater Kern County region contribute to the doctoral pool of applicants by preparing educators at the master’s level. Graduates from these programs have expressed interest in a doctorate in education and have no other options in the region to further their degree.

Demand In The Region

1. Demand for affordable and accessible doctorates in education continues in the state of California and will continue unabated. During the five years prior to 2006, the annual average of public sector educational doctorates awarded was 35 to 45, while the annual average by the private sector stood between 290 and 325. On the other hand, California needed more than 27,500 school administrators to manage its 8,900 schools. This figure represents a 13.7% increase for the past six years and does not take into account a possible increase in demand for doctorates once 80% of the states’ superintendents scheduled for retirement leave the workforce or become eligible to retire in the next five years. Should these retirements occur, the decline already underway in school administrators with doctorates will precipitate steeply.

2. The need for the Ed.D. in California is borne out by studies undertaken by The Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) which also studied the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego. The CSUS findings highlight two needs; one, to provide highly affordable diversity-conscious doctorates in educational leadership of quality; and the other, to cater for qualified candidates unable to either avail themselves of, or are marginalized by, the private sector institutions granting educational doctorates at a financial premium.

3. Additionally, national data suggest the demand for doctorates will outstrip supply as the pupil to administrator ratio continues to increase.
Findings and Cost Comparisons:

Based on the research conducted by Dr. Curt Guaglianone and Dr. Penny Swenson it is evident that there is a need an Ed. D. program at CSUB. Their research also exhibits that those who enroll and complete the program will continue to reside in the region. This will lead to establishing more highly qualified academic leaders in the community.

A. In Practice
   a. Do applicants show up? Currently 200 individuals showed interest in the CSUB Ed.D program. Of those, approximately 10% were accepted and are enrolled for the first cohort

   b. Do applicants drop out? More research is needed

   c. How many graduate? More research is needed

   d. Is it cost beneficial?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition of Graduate Studies by Schools (per academic year)</th>
<th>per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Bakersfield <em>(price can be determined by university)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Fresno</td>
<td>$ 15,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Fullerton</td>
<td>$ 11,889.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>$ 29,724.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>$ 16,929.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Long Beach</td>
<td>$ 16,902.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU San Bernardino</td>
<td>$ 11,337.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. CSU Bakersfield – To be determined

II. CSU Fresno $15,291 per academic year or $5,097 per semester
   a. In 2007 83% of the Ed.D. student enrolled graduated from the program

III. CSU Fullerton $11,889 per academic year or $3,963 per semester
   a. Offer classes on Saturdays

IV. San Diego State University $29,724 per academic year or $9,908 per semester
   a. Doctorate Enrollment: Fall 2008-415; Fall 2009-438; and Fall 2010-445 with an average of 75% graduate with a doctorate. Only offer open enrollment in Fall semesters

V. San Francisco State University $16,929 per academic year or $5,643 per semester with classes on Saturdays and Sundays

VI. CSU Long Beach $16,902 per academic year or $5,634 per semester

VII. CSU San Bernardino $11,337 per academic year or $3,779 per semester
Recommendations:

According to the 2009 Needs Assessment Program Evaluation, it is clear that strong, effective, and visionary leadership is required at more advanced levels. It is obvious that implementing this Ed.D. program in San Joaquin Valley will be an asset to the community. This program will promote professional educational advancement that will meet the need of the school systems in the area. An adequate investigation has proven that leadership professionals are a crucial component for this community. The primary reason for introducing this program into CSUB is to establish an already distinguished, more competitive edge to the highest quality education delivered by CSUB. Because the Ed.D. program exhibits a considerable need for leadership professionals, then offering this program will bring significant opportunities to the San Joaquin Valley. As expected, strong evidence to create and provide professional leadership at a doctoral level is justified and necessary.
Recommendation 1: CSUB Ed.D. Program should become more involved with CSUF regarding the process of enrollment screening leading to acceptance or denial of program.

Recommendation 2: CSUB should begin marketing the Ed.D. Program.


Recommendation 4: CSUB should do a cost analysis, comparison and cost benefit of other Ed.D. Programs: matriculation, drop-outs, and graduates.

Recommendation 5: CSUB should do cost effectiveness to the students that will be served in this community.

What then Remains To Be Evaluated?

The Doctorate is a labor intensive and therefore, expensive program. Projected need must be considered in regards to the experience of other institutions with matriculation, drop-outs, and those that graduate from the program. In CSUB’s case, an additional component must be considered—the handover of the program. CSUB faculty has had little input into the admission process, marketing, recruitment, and notification process. The continuing need for the CSUB based program will be affected by how the CSUF/CSUB stage is handled.
Memorandum of Understanding

Between

Marilyn Brown, Francisco Esguerra, Jr., Laura Hughes, and S. Thomas Richardson, Jr.
And
Dr. Kathleen Knutzen, Ph.D. Dean, School of Social Sciences and Education, CSUB.

Participants
This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) institutes an agreement between:

- Dr. BJ Moore, Ph.D., Instructor PPA 402
- Marilyn Brown, Francisco Esguerra Jr., Laura Hughes, S.Thomas Richardson, Jr., and
- Dr. Kathleen Knutzen, Ph.D. Dean, School of Social Sciences and Education, CSUB.

Term
The term of this contract will begin May _____, 2011 to July 4, 2011.

Scope of work
This contract contemplates the completion of a basic program evaluation. The specific goals, objectives, terms, research questions, methodology, and statistical analysis will be fully negotiated by and between the parties previously identified. The program evaluation process will involve the active collaboration and input of Dr. Kathleen Knutzen. Any and all of the information, whether transmitted orally or in writing, and by whatever means i.e. in person, by hard copy, or by electronic means (fax, computer email, Survey Monkey, etc.) will be treated in full compliance with confidentiality agreements and protocols. All direct service information necessary to the program will be modified to delete any individual identifiers (name, SSN, etc.) in accordance with HSIRB protocols. See Appendix A.

Responsibilities
CSUB School of Social Sciences and Education
In accordance with this MOU, the School of Social Sciences and Education will provide access and guidance pertaining to the collection of raw data and all
participants will maintain an open line of communication for the duration of the program evaluation.

PPA 502 Group 7
PPA 502 Group members will conduct an evaluation based on the raw data collected. It is understood that the all data collected and developed is confidential and is the property of the CSUB School of Social Sciences and Education thus shall be returned to this department.

Signatures
Signing this contract implies that the signatories will strive to reach, to the best of their ability, the CSUB and Dr. Kathleen Knutzen, Ph.D.’s vision for the Ed.D. Program stated in this MOU. I wish to sign this MOU and make personal contributions to the progress of the Ed.D Program’s further development and needs assessment.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY BAKERSFIELD.

_____________________________________________  ______________________
B.J. Moore, Ph.D.                                Date

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Kathleen Knutzen, Ph.D.                           Date

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD PPA 502—GROUP 7.

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Marilyn Brown                                    Date

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Frank Esguerra                                   Date

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Laura Hughes                                     Date

_____________________________________________  ______________________
Tom Richardson, Jr.                               Date
Appendix A

Purpose

The purpose of this MOU is to establish a general agreement for the evaluation of the CSUB Education Department’s need to add an Educational Doctorate program to its curriculum. In addition, the program’s evaluation will determine evidence to maintain this program in Kern County.

Mission

Since September 1970, CSUB has strived to achieve comprehensive, competitive educational goals for the community of Bakersfield. By 2014-15, CSU Bakersfield will be the leading campus in the CSU system in terms of faculty and academic excellence and diversity, quality of the student experience, and community engagement. Realization of our vision will be advanced by recruitment, development and promotion of excellent and diverse staff within an organizational culture committed to excellence in all areas.

Together, the Parties enter into this MOU to mutually promote the vision of CSUB as well as better assess the educational needs of Bakersfield’s community. Furthermore, to emphasize the purpose and vision for Dr. Knutzen and the future students, applicants, and faculty members participating or will be participating in the Ed.D. Program. The main purpose of this program’s evaluation is to provide strong evidence the Kern County needs the Ed.D. Program as well as provide enough students that want to participate in this program.

Group 7 intends to develop a needs assessment for CSUB and the community of Bakersfield in order to obtain academic excellence and diversity. The main goal is to achieve results that warrant the necessity of the Ed.D. Program and the benefits the program will add to the community. Although a local needs assessment will be established, it is vital to the success of the program to deliver an attractive program that brings others from outside of the community. As a result, our vision is to capitalize the CSUB vision to achieve the goal of becoming the most competitive, leading educational institution in all areas.
## EdD Program Evaluation Budget Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consulting Fees</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Estimated Number of Hours</th>
<th>Plus Initial consulting fee</th>
<th>Estimated Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wages (Marilyn Brown)</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$10,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages (Francisco Esguerra, Jr.)</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$10,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages (Laura Campos-Hughes)</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$10,140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages (Thomas Richardson, Jr.)</td>
<td>Hourly Rate</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$10,140.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ink</td>
<td>$80.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>gallons</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Monkey</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation/Advising Fees - Dr. BJ Moore: $1,500.00 | $2,000.00

**Grand Total of Program Evaluation:** $43,440.00
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Prologue

The following general conditions apply:

The Director of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL) is responsible for the successful operation of the program. The program is subject to the normal graduate policies and procedures as established by California State University, Bakersfield (herein after called CSUB). The Director of DPEL serves as a liaison between the faculty governance structure (Graduate Group), the Community Advisory Board, and the School of Social Sciences and Education. The faculty governance structure for DPEL is the Graduate Group, faculty who have been appointed as doctoral faculty who tend to curriculum and other policy issues of the program. Additional governance structures and subcommittees of the Graduate Group and their responsibilities are outlined in the following Articles.

Article I: Objective

1. The Graduate Group for the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is organized to establish and administer a graduate program of instruction and scholarship leading to the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, in conformance with regulations, policies and procedures of the California State University (CSU) and California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB).

2. The course offerings and research activities are broadly based and draw upon the interests and talents of students, Graduate Group faculty, and our community educational partners. The curriculum is driven by WASC and Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) guidelines and expectations.

Article II: Director

1. The Director of DPEL is recommended by the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education (SSE). The director is appointed by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. The Director is responsible to the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education (SSE) for the management and administration of the program, and to the Graduate Group for curricular matters.

3. The faculty Director holds at least a 9 WTU per semester appointment. The Director is responsible for the operation, budget management, and day-to-day administration of the program, and chairs the Graduate Group and the subcommittees of the Graduate Group.

4. The Director is responsible for setting the class schedule and assigning courses to faculty in consultation with the Graduate Group. Course assignments will be consistent with signed MOUs on file for each Graduate Group faculty member (see Article V, section 3e below).
Article III: Community Advisory Board

1. The Community Advisory Board is the advisory liaison group between the campus community, the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, and the P-12 and community college/higher education communities. The Community Advisory Board provides for communications between the program, the broader campus administration and faculty, and the education partners, and it serves as a forum for planning and evaluation involving the full partnership. In addition, the Community Advisory Board helps ensure that the program adheres to CSU, CSUB, and accreditation agency policies.

2. The Community Advisory Board provides input on substantive policy issues such as program size, budget issues, program direction and other over-arching issues that may include the larger community.

3. The Community Advisory Board includes the following 12 members:

   - Program Director (Co-Convener)
   - Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Co-Convener)
   - Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education
   - Associate Vice President for Academic Programs
   - One Graduate of the program appointed by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Group
   - One Core Graduate Group member appointed by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Group
   - One Affiliated Graduate Group member appointed by the Executive Committee of the Graduate Group
   - Five members of the local educational community which may include adjunct teaching faculty within the program. At least two members should come from a P-12 setting and at least two from a community college/higher education setting

4. The Community Advisory Board meets at least two times per year, with additional meetings scheduled as needed.

Article IV: Graduate Group

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL) at California State University, Bakersfield aspires to the highest level of academic scholarship and student professional achievement. The quality of educational and scholarly experiences that DPEL can offer requires committed program faculty who have the requisite disciplinary knowledge and scholarly experience to direct and examine doctoral level work.

The Graduate Group for the Doctorate in Educational Leadership serves as the organizational means for ensuring distinct governance, consultation, and faculty leadership for this program. The Graduate Group of the doctoral program operates within the guidelines and policies of the Academic Senate when they apply. It is the responsibility of the Graduate Group to make recommendations regarding:

   - Program curricula, admissions, and exit requirements;
   - Program resources and assessment;
   - Promotion of values of scholarship and professionalism in the field;
   - Courses of action on all doctoral program matters; and,
• Development and maintenance of Bylaws under which the Graduate Group operates.

Graduate Group members for the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership include Core doctoral faculty and Affiliated doctoral faculty.

1. Core faculty

   a. Core faculty serve on DPEL subcommittees, advise and mentor students, serve on dissertation committees, teach courses in the doctoral program, remain active in professional scholarship, and may chair dissertation committees.

   b. Appointment and renewal of appointment as a Core Graduate Group member requires evidence of meeting all of the following criteria, as judged by the Membership Committee and full Graduate Group:

      i. Possession of a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline
      ii. Appointment as a tenured/tenure track faculty or university administrator with departmental retreat rights. Administrators will not have a vote within the Graduate Group or subcommittees
      iii. Service as an Affiliated member for at least one year
      iv. A strong professional record of published scholarship in refereed journals pertinent to educational leadership or the theoretical or methodological underpinnings of study related to the field, or promise relative to one’s rank (a minimum of one article published in a refereed journal every two years is required for renewal)
      v. Demonstrated ability in directing others in research activities
      vi. Specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by the DPEL
      vii. Service as a member of at least one dissertation committee
      viii. A record of teaching at least one year at the graduate level with acceptable student and peer evaluations (for new members)
      ix. A record of teaching at least one DPEL course in the last four years with acceptable student and peer evaluations (for renewing members)
      x. Service on DPEL committees (for renewing members)

   c. Appointment as a Core Graduate Group member shall be for a term of five years. Upon completion of four years, Core faculty members wishing to continue their membership in the Graduate Group shall reapply to the Membership Committee. For new applications and renewals, the Membership Committee will forward its recommendation concerning appointment or renewal to the full Graduate Group who will vote on appointment and renewal. The Graduate Group can initiate early review of a member if the majority believes there is cause to do so. If recommendations are made by the Graduate Group for change, the reviewed member will have one year to demonstrate improvement. The Membership Committee will review the progress of the individual after a year and make a recommendation to the Graduate Group, who will vote on renewal.

2. Affiliated faculty

   a. Affiliated faculty may serve on DPEL subcommittees, advise and mentor students, serve on dissertation committees, teach courses in the doctoral program, and engage in
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professional scholarship. Affiliated faculty are expected to participate in at least one activity within their term, but are not required to participate in any particular activity.

b. Appointment and renewal of appointment as an Affiliate Graduate Group member requires evidence of meeting all of the following criteria, as judged by the Membership Committee and full Graduate Group:

i. Possession of a doctoral degree in an appropriate discipline

ii. Appointment as a tenured/tenure track faculty or university administrator with departmental retreat rights. Administrators will not have a vote within the Graduate Group or subcommittees

iii. Specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by the DPEL

iv. If the faculty has taught within the DPEL, acceptable student and peer evaluations (for renewing members)

v. Participation in at least one Graduate Group activity listed in 2a. (for renewing members)

c. Appointment as an Affiliated Graduate Group member shall be for a term of five years. Upon completion of four years, Affiliated faculty members wishing to continue their membership in the Graduate Group shall reapply to the Membership Committee. For new applications and renewals, the Membership Committee will forward its recommendation concerning appointment or renewal to the full Graduate Group, who will vote on appointment and renewal. The Graduate Group can initiate early review of a member if the majority believes there is cause to do so. If recommendations are made by the Graduate Group for change, the reviewed member will have one year to demonstrate improvement. The Membership Committee will review the progress of the individual after a year and make a recommendation to the Graduate Group, who will vote on renewal.

3. Adjunct Faculty

a. Adjunct faculty are selected to teach specialization courses in the program by the Program Director in consultation with the Graduate Group.

b. Adjunct faculty must possess a doctoral degree in the appropriate discipline. Exceptions may be approved by the Executive Committee (see Article V, section 1) for other degrees that are more relevant to course content (e.g., a J.D. for an educational law class).

c. Adjunct faculty are not members of the Graduate Group.

d. Adjunct faculty have specific expertise in the areas in which they teach.

e. Adjunct faculty are reviewed after each course they teach. Only adjuncts that receive acceptable student and peer reviews are able to continue teaching in the program.

f. Adjuncts may serve, at the invitation of the Program Director, on the Community Advisory Board.
Article V: Subcommittees of the Graduate Group

Subcommittees are the working bodies of the Graduate Group. Recommendations made by subcommittees are forwarded through the Director to the Graduate Group for formal action. All members of a subcommittee, except administrators, have voting rights on that subcommittee. Standard subcommittees of the Graduate Group include the Executive Committee, Admissions Committee, Membership Committee, Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P) Committee, and Research Committee. Ad hoc committees may be created based on need at the direction of the Graduate Group with members appointed by the Executive Committee.

1. Executive Committee
   a. The primary role of the Executive Committee is to appoint Graduate Group members to subcommittees and other ad hoc committees as needed. Unless stated otherwise, all Graduate Group appointments to subcommittees are made by the Executive Committee.
   b. The Executive Committee consists of three members:
      • Program Director (Convener); and,
      • Two Core members of the Graduate Group.
   c. The Graduate Group members elect the two Core members to serve on the Executive Committee.
   d. Members of the Executive Committee serve renewable two-year terms.

2. Admissions Committee
   a. The Admissions Committee establishes the criteria for admitting students to the program. The criteria must be consistent with Title V of the Education Code for admitting students.
   b. The Admissions Committee conducts the interviews and makes the final decisions on the applicants to be offered or denied admission.
   c. The entire Graduate Group has the opportunity to review all applications and may make recommendations concerning which applicants should or should not be interviewed.
   d. The Admissions Committee consists of seven members including:
      • Program Director (Convener)
      • Two Core members of the Graduate Group
      • One Affiliated member of the Graduate Group
      • One adjunct faculty/community member representing P-12, appointed by the Executive Committee
      • One adjunct faculty/community member representing community college/higher education, appointed by the Executive Committee
      • One graduate of the program, appointed by the Executive Committee.
   e. Members of the Admissions Committee serve renewable one-year terms.
3. Membership Committee

a. The Membership Committee receives, reviews and evaluates the credentials and qualifications of faculty who apply for membership on the Graduate Group as either Core or Affiliated members.

b. The Membership Committee sends out a call for members each year.

c. The Membership Committee forwards to the Graduate Group their recommendations of support or non-support for applicants who wish to join the Graduate Group, and also recommends the level at which they should join (Core or Affiliated). Their recommendation is accompanied by a copy of the applicant’s vita.

d. A vote is taken for each candidate either at a regularly scheduled Graduate Group meeting or by email. Applicants are elected upon receiving a majority of votes of the eligible voting members of the Graduate Group.

e. Upon receiving a positive vote by the Graduate Group, the applicant receives a letter (or email) of invitation to join as a Core or Affiliated Graduate Group member by the DPEL Director. The applicant, program director, the applicant’s department chair, and the applicant’s home dean then develop and sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that outlines the applicant’s expected level of involvement with the DPEL (e.g., will the member teach classes, chair dissertations, grade qualifying exams?). The applicant becomes a member only after returning a signed MOU to the Director.

f. The Membership Committee consists of three members:
   • Program Director (Convener); and,
   • Two Core members of the Graduate Group.

g. Members of theMembership Committee serve renewable two-year terms.

4. Academic Policy and Planning (AP&P) Committee

a. The AP&P Committee addresses curriculum and policy issues and makes recommendations regarding new policies and curriculum, as well as changes to current policies, curriculum, and Bylaws.

b. All matters of curriculum and policy are reviewed by the AP&P Committee before being brought to the Graduate Group.

c. The AP&P Committee consists of six members:
   • Program Director (Convener)
   • Two Core members of the Graduate Group
   • One Affiliated member of the Graduate Group
   • One adjunct faculty/community member representing P-12, appointed by the Executive Committee
   • One adjunct faculty/community member representing community college/higher education, appointed by the Executive Committee
d. Members of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee serve renewable two-year terms.

5. Research Committee

a. The Research Committee is responsible for research-related issues which include ensuring that Institutional Research Board (IRB) policies and processes are followed; the annual Research Symposium is planned and implemented; and dissertation committee membership is approved.

b. The Research Committee consists of six members:

- Program Director (Convener)
- Two Core members of the Graduate Group
- One Affiliated member of the Graduate Group
- One adjunct faculty/community member representing P-12, appointed by the Executive Committee
- One adjunct faculty/community member representing community college/higher education, appointed by the Executive Committee

c. Members of the Research Committee serve renewable two-year terms.

6. Limits on Subcommittee Service

Graduate Group members ordinarily serve on no more than two Graduate Group subcommittees at one time. In emergencies and for a short period of time, the Executive Committee may approve a waiver on this limit. The Director serves on and convenes all standard subcommittees

Article VI: Dissertation Chairs

Only Core Graduate Group faculty can chair student dissertation committees. Dissertation chairs must be approved by the Research Committee and Director. Faculty are limited to chairing no more than four student dissertation committees at one time; under extenuating circumstances (e.g., a student is only weeks away from completion) a faculty member may petition the Executive Committee for a waiver of this limit.

Article VII: Faculty Advisers

1. Each member of the Core Graduate Group shall be available to serve as a faculty adviser. Affiliate Graduate Group members may also serve as advisers.

2. Normally, no more than two incoming graduate students are assigned to any one faculty member.

3. Faculty advisers develop a plan of study for their students and assist the Graduate Program Assistant in maintaining their students’ files.

4. Faculty advisers may be changed upon request of the student or adviser to the Program Director.

5. After a student selects a dissertation chair, the dissertation chair becomes the student’s faculty adviser.
Article VIII: Meetings

1. The Program Director shall call such regular and special meetings of the Graduate Group as are deemed necessary. At least two regular meetings shall be called each year.

2. The Program Director shall call a special meeting of the Graduate Group at any time that is so requested by written notice of three or more members of the Graduate Group.

3. Annual meetings shall be conducted in accordance with generally accepted procedures.

Article IX: Quorum

Fifty percent of the members in residence shall constitute a quorum of the Graduate Group. With the exception of amendments to the Bylaws, in order for mail ballots, email votes, or meeting votes to be valid, at least fifty percent of the Graduate Group in residence must vote.

Article X: Amendments

The Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of all eligible voting members and subsequent approval by the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education. Written notice of proposed amendments shall be sent by mail or email to each member of the Graduate Group at least five calendar days prior to a meeting at which the amendment is to be proposed and discussed. The vote shall be taken by a mailed or emailed ballot sent to each Graduate Group member after the meeting where the amendment is proposed and discussed.
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

✓ I agree

___ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Chair’s name

Department

Date

3/14/16
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

     ___ I agree
     ___ I do not agree

...to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Chair’s name ____________________ Department ____________________ Date 3/14/16
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

☐ I agree
☐ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

M. Suleiman
Chair’s name

Advanced Ed. Dept.
Department

3-9-16
Date
Department Chair's Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have
participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation
committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

X I agree
___ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would
continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These
terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of
the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Kristina LaGue
Chair's name

Teacher Education
Department

3/9/16
Date
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

\(\checkmark\) I agree
\(\_\) I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

\[\text{Jong Choi} \quad \text{Social Work} \quad 3/9/2016\]

Chair’s name
Department
Date
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have participated in the joint Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

___X__ I agree
____ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) would continue to serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Andrew C. Trupp
Chair's name

English Department

March 9, 2016
Date
Department Chair's Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have inquired about participating in the Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

X I agree
__ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) might serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Doreen Anderson-Face Sociology 3/9/16
Chair's name  Department  Date
Department Chair’s Intent to Partner
with the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

I acknowledge that a member or members of my departmental faculty have inquired about participating in the Ed.D. program as teaching faculty or dissertation committee members.

If the Ed.D. becomes a standalone program on our campus,

✓ I agree
___ I do not agree

to consider negotiating the terms under which my faculty member(s) might serve the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL). These terms will be clarified in an MOU signed by the faculty member, the Director of the DPEL, the department chair, and the Dean.

Chair’s name

Department

Date
## 2015-16 CSUB DPEL Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DPELP Connection</strong></th>
<th><strong>First Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Last Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Faculty Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Core</td>
<td>Dr. Bruce</td>
<td>Friedman</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Core</td>
<td>Dr. Mahmoud</td>
<td>Suleiman</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Core</td>
<td>Dr. J.J.</td>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Barbara</td>
<td>Bartholomew</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Jacquelyn</td>
<td>Kegley</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Carl</td>
<td>Kloock</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Kristina</td>
<td>LaGue</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Yeunjoo</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Roseanne</td>
<td>McCleary</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated</td>
<td>Dr. Stacy</td>
<td>Schmidt</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated*</td>
<td>Dr. Randy</td>
<td>Schultz</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated*</td>
<td>Dr. John</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated*</td>
<td>Dr. Amanda</td>
<td>Taggart</td>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated*</td>
<td>Dr. Luis</td>
<td>Vega</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Group – Affiliated*</td>
<td>Dr. Danny</td>
<td>Whetton</td>
<td>Tenure-track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Will apply for Core in 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Adjunct</strong></th>
<th><strong>First Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Last Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Institution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Kern Community College District Chief Business Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Pam</td>
<td>Bianchi</td>
<td>Panama Buena Vista School District Asst. Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Blanca</td>
<td>Cavasos</td>
<td>Taft Union High School District Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Greg</td>
<td>Chamberlain</td>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Chandra</td>
<td>Commuri</td>
<td>CSU Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Fekete J.D.</td>
<td>Schools Legal (Retired)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Christine</td>
<td>Frazier</td>
<td>Kern County Superintendent of Schools Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Jenny</td>
<td>Hirst</td>
<td>CSU Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Dixie</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Owner Transforming Local Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Dean</td>
<td>McGee</td>
<td>Kern High School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Jacqueline</td>
<td>Mimms</td>
<td>CSU Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Bill</td>
<td>Mosely</td>
<td>Bakersfield College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Manny</td>
<td>Mourtazanos</td>
<td>Bakersfield College Dean of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Markel</td>
<td>Quarles</td>
<td>CSU Bakersfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Carol</td>
<td>Sherrill</td>
<td>Bakersfield City School District Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Kevin Silberberg</td>
<td>Panama Buena Vista School District Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Matt Torres</td>
<td>Fruitvale School District Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Dr. Mary Westendorf</td>
<td>Fruitvale School District Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>Course #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum11</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum11</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F12</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sp13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sp14</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sp14</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F13</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sp14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sp14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>X-Strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>X-Strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sp15</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sp15</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sp15</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F14</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>Course Number</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>508 Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>502 Educational Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>503 Educational Policy Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>507 Applied Qualitative Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>511 Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T Human Resource Leadership in Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>X-Strand</td>
<td>580T Technology in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>X-Strand</td>
<td>580T Specialization Class in Literacy, Technology, and Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T Community College Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Qualifying</td>
<td>Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T Human relations: leading Managing, and Valuing Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T Resource &amp; Fiscal Planning for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T Interpersonal Leadership and Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>580T Resource Management &amp; Fiscal Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum16</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T Practicum in Program Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Sum16</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T Writing for Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F16</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>580T Community College Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>F16</td>
<td>X-strand</td>
<td>580T Leaders &amp; Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>501 Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sum15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>509 Advanced Applied Educational Research &amp; Measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>504 Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>F15</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>506 Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>508 Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sp16</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>502 Educational Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sum16</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>503 Educational Policy Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sum16</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>507 Applied Qualitative Research Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>Sum16</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>511 Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviated Vitae for Faculty Teaching Core Courses in the
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

California State University, Bakersfield
BRUCE D. FRIEDMAN

EDUCATION

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) – Social Welfare

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Master of Social Work (MSW) - Family Therapy, Chemical Dependency, and Research Applications.

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
Bachelor of Arts in Religion and Sociology (BA)

PROFESSIONAL ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

PROFESSOR
California State University Bakersfield
Bakersfield, California
2007 – present

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
University of Texas – Pan American
Edinburg, Texas
2001 – 2007

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SPECIALIST
Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine
East Lansing, Michigan
1998 - 2001

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
Wayne State University School of Social Work
Detroit, Michigan
1994 - 1998

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
Southern Connecticut State University
New Haven, Connecticut
1991 - 1994

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE EXPERIENCES

PROGRAM DIRECTOR
Calgary Jewish Centre
Calgary, Alberta
1984 - 1985

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Northwest Suburban Jewish Community Center
Chicago, Illinois
1983-1984

DIRECTOR-ADULT & COMMUNITY SERVICES
Jewish Community Center of Greater Minneapolis
Minneapolis, Minnesota
1978 - 1983

OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Co-Convener Social Work and Health Inequalities Network (SWHIN)

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS

Books


Book Chapters


Journal Articles


Friedman, BD; Reifel, B; Reed, A; Cloud, D (2014) “Overcoming barriers to mental health services for foster children,” International Journal of Child Health and Human Development. Vol. 7(1).


Friedman, BD (2000) "Building A Spiritual Based Model To Address Substance Abuse," *Social Thought*, vol. 19:3. pg. 23 - 38.


**SELECTED GRANT PROPOSALS, CONTRACTS, & RESEARCH**


Co-Principal Investigator – National Institute of Minority Health and Health Disparities (NIMHD) - Addressing Minority Health Disparities in Kern County: A Community-Based Participatory Research Intervention (pending) $2.8 million


Principal Investigator – Raising a Reader - United Way of Kern County (2008) $11,100.


Principal Investigator – Hidalgo County Continuum of Care to Eradicate Chronic Homelessness – Department of Housing and Urban Affairs (June 2005) - $102,165.


Principal Investigator – Special Initiatives in Mental Health –Rio Grande Valley – Hogg Foundation (2005 - 2006) - $100,000.


Edinburg Housing Opportunity Corporation – Texas Department of Housing Commission – Bootstrap Program (2005 – present) $1.6 million.


Project Faculty – Faculty Development in Family Medicine – HRSA – 1999 – 2002 - $875,000.

Project Faculty – Family Development in General Internal Medicine – HRSA – 1999 – 2002 - $775,000.

Site Director - Models that Work - HRSA - 1999-2000 - $100,000.

Principal Investigator - Cross Cultural Parenting - Grant from Freedom House - 1997 - $7,000.

Principal Investigator - Interfaith Marriages - Grant from Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Detroit - 1997- $6,000.


Principal Investigator - An Interdisciplinary Approach to Optimizing Outcomes for Foster Care Placement - Richard J. Barber Fund for Interdisciplinary Legal Research - 1997 - $3300.

Co-Principal Investigator - Increasing Group Acceptance: An Interactive Approach to Affirmative Action - “The President’s Award for Affirmative Action” Program - 1996 - $5,000.

Principal Investigator - The Enhancement of Undergraduate Student Learning by Integrating Information Resources and Technology into the Curriculum - Wayne State University 1996 Technology in Learning Grant - $7,000.

VITA

ALEM KEBEDE, Ph.D.
Professor of Sociology/Social Theory
akebede@csub.edu

OFFICE ADDRESS
Department of Sociology
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311-1099
(661) 654-2306

HOME ADDRESS
12800 Crystal Cove Avenue
Bakersfield, CA 93311
(661) 858-0443

ACADEMIC TRAINING
1999 Ph.D., Sociology, Oklahoma State University
1999 M.A., Philosophy, Oklahoma State University
1994 M.S., Sociology, Oklahoma State University

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
2000-Present Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor—California State University, Bakersfield.

1999-2000 Visiting Assistant Professor, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN. (Class Taught: Introduction to Sociology.)

PUBLICATIONS


Jackson and AlemSeghed Kebede.


PAPERS PRESENTED (Selections)

2015 "Classical and Contemporary Social Theories; Points of convergence and Divergence." Pacific Sociological Association Meetings, San Diego, California (2015)


ADMINISTRATIVE AND COMMITTEE EXPERIENCE (Selections)

2012-Present Member, Professional Responsibilities, CSU—Bakersfield
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Graduate Coordinator, Sociology Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-Present</td>
<td>Chair, Black Studies Interdisciplinary Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-Present</td>
<td>Advisor, Alpha Kappa Delta, International Sociological Society, CSUB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDUCATION:

Pepperdine University The Graziadio School of Business and Management, Encino, California, Masters of Business Administration, 2000.
Grade Point Average: 3.73/4.00

Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology, Culver City, California, Doctorate of Education in Institutional Management, 1999.
Grade Point Average: 3.85/4.00

Pepperdine University Graduate School of Education and Psychology, Culver City, California, Masters of Arts in Education, 1996
Grade Point Average: 3.92/4.00

Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, Bachelors of Science in Business Administration and Management, 1995
Grade Point Average: 3.21/4.00

CREDENTIALS AND CERTIFICATIONS:

California Multiple Subject Clear Teaching Credential
California Single Subject Clear Teaching Credential in Business
Quality Matters Online Instructor Certification
TPA Lead Assessor Certification
CTAP Level 3 Mentor Certification

AWARDS:

Best Paper Award for “The Role of Marketing In Making the Transition From State of the Art Technology to Advanced Technology Products” from the Applied Business Research Conference.


Best Paper Award for “Educators need to Go Back to the Basics” from the Teaching and Learning Conference.

Who’s Who in High School Teachers 2001

PUBLICATIONS:


ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

TENURED FULL PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR OF TEACHER CREDENTIALING AND CHILD ADOLESCENT FAMILY STUDIES. Teach courses that cover the following issues: Foundation of American Education, educational philosophy, educational psychology, classroom management, Technology for Educators, and the continuum of learning to teach. Create and teach online courses for students on 3 campuses. Recruit adjunct professors and advised them as needed. Schedule courses, advise students, hold information sessions and collaborate with school districts and community partners.

INTERIM CHAIR TEACHER EDUCATION. Served the Department of Teacher Education as the Interim Chair while the Chair was out on sabbatical in Fall 2012. Responsible for all duties of the chair including hiring parttime faculty, managing the budget, addressing candidate issues, assisting faculty and adjuncts, and scheduling classes.

TPA – TEACHING PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT COORDINATOR. Oversee the TPA implementation in the Elementary and Secondary Education Programs. Train Faculty, Students, and Assessors in the TPAs. Create and maintain resources for faculty and students. Monitor, assess, and record completed TPAs of candidates. RemEDIATE candidates on TPAs when necessary.

CALITPA STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBER. Represent small CSUs on the CalTpa steering committee with CTC. Work with CTC to oversee and make recommendations on changes to the CalTpa.

CONDUCT AND CO-TAUGHT MARKETING SIMULATION SEMINARS. Conduct and co-taught marketing simulation seminars with undergrad students seeking a BS in Business Administration and graduate students seeking an MBA. I coordinate, facilitate, and teach the simulations with Marketing Professors at Pepperdine University. The simulation is an online computer simulation that is utilized in a weekend seminar with 50 to 100 students divided into groups competing in the marketing simulation.

PRINCIPAL. Work with eight teachers on creating lesson plans, curriculum, and activities that are utilized in the classroom. Assured that a variety of strategies and techniques were utilized in the classrooms that were both informative, innovative, and effective. Evaluated curriculum, lesson plans, and implementation of the curriculum. Successfully trained, evaluated, and assisted teachers that resulted in increasing the standardized achievement tests' scores by an average of 1.2 grade levels.

DIRECTOR OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. Worked with twenty teachers on creating lesson plans and curriculum that was interesting and effective in the classroom. Assured that a variety of strategies and techniques were utilized in the classrooms that were both informative, innovative, and effective. Evaluated curriculum, lesson plans, and implementation of the curriculum. Curriculum was successfully implemented in the variety of classrooms that resulted in increasing the standardized achievement tests' scores by an average of 1.8 grade levels.

JR/SR HIGH SCHOOL MATH. Created and successfully implemented an interesting and educational program that successfully resulted in the preparation of the students. Taught Prealgebra, Algebra 1 and 2, Geometry, Trigonometry and Calculus. Students math standard achievement test scores increased to an average of 2.2 grade levels above their own.
EMPLOYMENT:

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
September 2001 to Present
Tenure Full Professor and Director Teacher Credentialing and Child Adolescent Family Studies

PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY
September 2003 to Present
Marketing Online Simulation Assistant Professor

ANTELOPE VALLEY CHRISTIAN SCHOOL
June 1991 to July 2001
Principal
Director of Curriculum Development and Staff Development
Jr/Sr High Math Teacher
Randy Schultz Ed.D
108 Chaparral St.
Tehachapi, Ca 93561
(661) 428-2809 Cell
rschultz@csub.edu

QUALIFICATIONS
10 + years administrative experience
10 + years full time experience teaching at the university level, face-to-face and online
Extensive experience in creating staff development programs for teachers and administrators
Extensive experience in grant writing, reading, administration and evaluation
Variety of K-12 experiences from teaching in the classroom to administration

EDUCATION
May 2002 Ed.D Educational Administration
Dissertation: *Veteran teachers, innovation and change: a study of veteran teachers in a beginning technology staff development program*
University of the Pacific, Steven Davis Ed.D. Chair
May 2002 Tier Two Administrative Credential CSU Bakersfield
May 2000 Tier One Administrative Credential CSU Bakersfield
May 1994 MA Curriculum and Instruction CSU Bakersfield
May 1986 Clear Credential K-12 Multi-subject CSU Northridge
May 1980 B.A. Drama University of Dallas

EMPLOYMENT
2015-Present Interim Dean, California State University, Bakersfield Antelope Valley Campus
Actively involved in the Antelope Valley on a daily basis and engaging with faculty, staff, students, local junior colleges, local schools, local businesses, and the community as a whole. Serving as principal liaison for the Center, representing it externally in the community and internally on the Academic Affairs Leadership Council and before the Academic Senate and its committees.

2014-2015 Principal Investigator and Grant Administrator for GRO STEM a Teacher Quality Partnership grant, a 7 million dollar, five-year federal grant designed to create a rural residency model for teacher preparation.

2012-2016 Principal Investigator and Grant Administrator for Edvention Partners a Teacher Quality Partnership grant, a 12 million dollar, five-year federal grant designed to reform teacher education.

2013-2014 Interim Dean, Extended University Division, California State University, Bakersfield (November to September)

2012-present California State University, Bakersfield
Associate Professor, Teacher Education Department. Responsibilities include teacher candidate advising, course scheduling, textbook ordering, and promoting the teacher education program at the Antelope Valley Center.
Courses taught:
Technology for Educators
Mathematics Methods and Assessment for the Elementary Teacher
Classroom Management and Theory for the Elementary Classroom
Early Field Work
General Education Fieldwork for Special Education Students

2015  Ombudsperson for CSUB

2006-2012  California State University, Bakersfield
            Assistant Professor, Teacher Education Department. Responsibilities include teacher
            candidate advising, course scheduling, textbook ordering, and promoting the teacher
            education program at the Antelope Valley Center.
            Courses taught:
            Technology for Educators
            Mathematics Methods and Assessment for the Elementary Teacher
            Classroom Management and Theory for the Elementary Classroom
            Early Field Work
            General Education Fieldwork for Special Education Students

2012-Present  Faculty for the Fresno State/CSUB joint Doctorate program.
            Course: Program Evaluation

2009-2012  Co Principal Investigator for “Edvention Partners” a 12 million dollar federally funded
            Teacher Quality Partnership grant. Edvention Partners is a quality improvement grant
            designed to reform teacher education.

2006-present  California State University, Bakersfield
            Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction Masters program, Extended University
            Courses taught:
            Instructional Strategies
            Curriculum Theory and Development
            Special Problems in Mathematics Education
            Computers and Instruction
            Special Topics: Grants and Grant writing

2001-2006  California State University, Bakersfield
            Adjunct Instructor, Curriculum and Instruction Masters program
            Courses taught:
            Instructional Strategies
            Technology and Assessment
            Teaching to California Standards
            Fundamentals of School Legal Issues in Technology

2004-2006  California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP) Region 8 Director.

2003-2004  Principal, Community Learning Center, Tech – an Alternative Education high school with
            a focus on using technology in the classroom.

2002-2004  Coordinator, Instructional Technologies
            Coordinating and providing staff development, technology purchases and grants.

2001-2002  iLearn Project Coordinator
iLearn was an Educational Technology Professional Development Program funded by the California State University Chancellor’s office.

2000-2001  Vice-Principal Tompkins Elementary School
1999-2000  Sixth grade teacher Wells Elementary School
1995-1999  Teacher-leader Anvil Program (a self-contained 5th, 6th and 7th)
1986-1995  Mostly a Sixth grade teacher, Tehachapi Unified School District

CONSULTATION

2006-2008  External Evaluator California Technology Assistance Project Regions 7 & 8
2006-2008  Data Teams Trainer for Kern County Superintendent of Schools
2006-2008  Coach for Pivot Learning (formally Springboard) Schools in Richland CA school district

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM SUPPORT EXPERIENCE

2013-2014  Participant in Regional Education for Achievement in Leadership (REAL) program is a leadership development enrichment track consisting of cohorts from the California State University campuses of Bakersfield, Fresno, and Northridge.

2006  Implications Wheel Training, a strategic exploration tool that draws upon group wisdom to quickly and effectively uncover the short and long term implications of any change.

2005  Data Teams Certification training by the Center for Performance Assessment. Trained to facilitate the regular and systematic collection of data to support continuous Data-Driven Decision Making in a school setting.

2002-2004  Teacher co-presenter for “Do The Math” a live broadcast program on KETV (Kern Educational Television) designed to help students with mathematics homework

2001-2004  Evaluator for CLRN project, evaluating software, websites and video to see if they meet with California Educational Standards.

2000-2001  Co-Coordinator, developer and consultant for "In on the Ground Floor", a website hosted by KCSOS that ties powerful real world mathematical content to the California Mathematics Standards.(www.creativille.org)

1999-2001  Technology Mentor for California Technology Project
Co-Planned and implemented two separate week long technology workshop for teachers in Kern County.

1999-2002  Nicknamed "Techboy" by the members of my UOP doctorate cohort

1993-1994  California Technology Leadership Academy Co-leader. Responsible for developing a week long technology camp for teachers interested in technology integration. Participants were K-12 teachers.
1996-1999  Internet Mathematics Methods Instructor for Bank St. College, New York- provided online staff development for New York area Middle School Teachers.

1996-1997  Adjunct Instructor in Education, CSUB
Designed and taught teacher credentialing courses in elementary mathematics

PUBLICATIONS

Bush-Ortiz, Y & Schultz, R. (2015) Bullying Prevention for Preservice Educational Credential Students
Submitted: Journal of Creativity in Mental Health


CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

2015  “Re-inventing Teacher Preparation Through Reform Elements: A Six year journey.” With Mahmoud Sulieman 31st Annual National Technology and Social Science Conference

2014  “Info With A Side Of Graphics” KernCUE October 2014

2014  “Photographs as Non-linguistic Representations” KernCUE October 2014

2014  “Managing Millennials, preparing for Gen Z” With Kelsey Vroomunn Leadership 3.0 Symposium

2014  “Reforming Teacher Education through A Community of Practice” With Mahmoud Sulieman 30th Annual National Technology and Social Science Conference

2014  “Reforming the Clinical Experience through Co-Teaching” With Sarah Brooks 30th Annual National Technology and Social Science Conference

2014  “Research Results on Teacher Quality: A Report Using Interactive Logic Modeling Cycles” With Mahmoud Sulieman 30th Annual National Technology and Social Science Conference

2013  “Coming Soon: Using Movie Trailers to Engage Students” With Anne Duran The Nineteenth Lewis M. Terman Western Regional Teaching Conference

2013  “iPads, iMovie & Academic Literacy: Using Technology to Engage Learners” California League of Schools Technology Conference

2012  The Anticipatory Set: Using Technology to Engage Learners; Kern CUE October 2012

2011  “Central California Partnership for Teacher Quality Programs: An Innovative University and K-12 Collaborative” American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) Spring Conference


2011  “10 things to do in the cloud” Computer Using Educators Conference March 2011


2009  “2.0? I Never Learned what 1.0 was!” presented at the March 2009 Computer Using Educators Conference.


2009  “Using Web 2.0 Tools at School – The Obstacles and How to Overcome Them” Presented at the Leadership 3.0 Conference April 3, 2009

2008  “One Picture Equals a Thousand Words” California League of Middle Schools, California League of High Schools, National High School Association


2008  National Technology and Social Science Conference Paper Title “Putting Content First: Student Videos with Meaning”

2007  Digital Immigrants, Digital Natives Conference California League of Middle Schools, California League of High Schools, National High School Association Presentation title “Putting Content First: Student Videos with Meaning”


AWARDS
2002  Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
1994  Central California Recipient: Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics Teaching
1991  Jacobson Jr. High Teacher of the Year, Tehachapi CA

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
International Society for Technology in Education
Computer Using Educators
California Council on Teacher Education
Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society
John B. Stark, PhD
6906 Eagle Cap Street
Bakersfield, CA 93313
Phone: (661) 664 – 1951 Cell: 661-496-4732
Email Contact:
 njnstark@earthlink.net

EDUCATION

Fall 2001 Ph.D. in BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION - University of Missouri at Columbia (AACSB), with an emphasis in Organizational Behavior / Human Resources and an outside area of study in Communication.

Summer 1995 MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION - California State University in Sacramento (AACSB), with an emphasis in Organizational Behavior.

Spring 1979 BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION - Troy State University in Troy, AL, with an emphasis in Accounting.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE

ASSOCIATE DEAN (California State University, Bakersfield: 2012 to Present) –
Responsible for daily operations of the School of Business & Public Administration (BPA), in addition to presiding over the Chairs’ Leadership Council and the Strategic Planning Committee for the School, as well as participating in various School standing committees (e.g., Curriculum, the BSBA and MBA Program committees, etc.).

Highlights of this experience:
- Authored the AACSB Reaccreditation reporting for both the initial effort in the fall of 2013 and the “6th year” report for the fall of 2014, with the result of full reaccreditation.
- Had key roles in leading the quarter to semester conversion work in both 2013 and 2014
- Participated in the development of a fund-raising campaign for the School in conjunction with the University Foundation.

DEPARTMENT CHAIR (California State University, Bakersfield: 2006-2012) –
Elected by the Management & Marketing Department faculty to serve two terms as the Chair of the largest department in the School (beginning with 18 faculty lines and a dozen adjuncts).

Highlights of this experience:
- Oversaw the multi-year budget crisis, which led to the loss of six lines in the department (accomplished with no layoffs).
- Led the reorganization of the department curriculum dropping two concentrations, putting another on moratorium, and developing two new areas to meet regional economic needs (agri-business and logistics).
ASSOCIATE EDITOR (Journal of Management Education - Sage Publications: 2005-2011) – Responsible for a sixth of the manuscript review process for the Journal over the five year term, including desk review, solicitation of reviewers, following up on reviewer work, and decisions on manuscript acceptance.

SHARED GOVERNANCE ROLES (California State University, Bakersfield: 2005-2012) – Elected to multiple terms in the University’s Academic Senate, serving in a number of leadership roles.

Highlights of Leadership Roles:
- Chair of the Senate (2010)
- Chair, Committee for Academic Requirements & Standards (2010-12).
- Chair of the Committee for Professional Responsibility (2009-10).
- Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee (2005-06, 2007-08).

HONORS AND AWARDS
2011 Appointed by CSU- Fresno as EdD Associate (teaching in program)
2006 Reviewer Award – Org. Behavior Div. of Academy of Management
2006 Tenured and promoted at CSU-Bakersfield
2004 Appointed Undergraduate Student Fellow and Mentor at CSU-Bakersfield
2002 Awarded Research Release Time by the CSU-Bakersfield University Research Council for Winter Quarter 2003
2002 Chosen for the CSU annual TSSI training conference in San Francisco
2000 Nominated for “Best Teacher” Award – Stephens College

TEACHING EXPERIENCE
2000 to Present CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY (Bakersfield, CA) – Tenured in 2006 and promoted to Associate Professor of Management, teaching Org. Behavior, Small Business Mgmt, Entrepreneurship, Managerial Skills, Org. Theory, and Business Strategy courses at the undergraduate, MBA, & EdD levels.

1997 to 2000 STEPHENS COLLEGE (Columbia, MO) – Full-time Visiting position in Management for 1999-00 school year, with prior relationship an adjunct instructor position, teaching a variety of undergraduate and MBA classes.

1997 to 2000 WILLIAM WOODS UNIVERSITY (Fulton, MO) – Adjunct position teaching in Organizational Behavior, Human Resources, and Ethics at both the undergraduate and MBA levels (cohort model).
STARK VITAE

1996 to 2000 UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - full responsibility for courses as a teaching assistant and as an adjunct instructor in Organizational Behavior, Human Resources, Strategy (capstone), and Organizational Theory at both the undergraduate and MBA levels.

1988 to 1994 PACIFIC UNION COLLEGE (Angwin, CA) - full responsibility for courses as an adjunct in Purchasing/Inventory Control, Accounting, and Marketing.

PUBLICATIONS


REFEREED PROCEEDINGS AND PAPER PRESENTATIONS


Dobson, J., Lund-Dean, K., & Stark, J. (2013). Never, EVER, blow on a tarantula. Presentation at the 40th Annual Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference. UNC Asheville, Asheville, NC.
Farmer, K., Stark, J.B., Levitt, K., & Seltzer, J. (2011). Questioning the Impact of the Internet on Social Connections via Interrogative Debating. 38th Annual Organizational Behavior Teaching Conference. Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI.


MAHMOUD F. SULEIMAN
School of Social Sciences and Education
California State University, Bakersfield
Bakersfield, CA 93311
Tel: (661) 654-3032 (O) Fax: (661) 664-2199
E-Mail: MSULEIMAN@CSUB.EDU

EDUCATION
Ph.D Education. Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, May, 1993.
M.A. English (TESL); Field: Linguistics; ESL Teaching Methods, Applied Linguistics. Arizona State
University, Tempe, Arizona, August, 1987.
B.A. English/TEFL; An-Najah National University, Nablus, West Bank, May, 1985.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
- 8/13 – present, Professor & Chair, Advanced Educational Studies Department, Curriculum. California
State University, Bakersfield, CA.
- 8/10 – present, Core Faculty, Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at Fresno State. California
State University, Fresno, California.
- 8/08 – present, Professor, Teacher Education Programs, Curriculum and Instruction, California State
University, Bakersfield, CA.
- 6/05 – 6/08, Professor and Chair, Department of Teacher Education, California State University,
Bakersfield, CA.
- 8/02 – 6/05, Director, Multiple Subject Credential Program, California State University, Bakersfield, CA.
- 8/09 – 6/05, Associate Professor, Teacher Education, Curriculum and Instruction, California State
University, Bakersfield, CA.
- 8/95 – 7/99, Assistant Professor, Teacher Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Fort Hays State
University, Hays, KS.
- 8/93 – 7/95, Faculty Associate, Curriculum and Instruction, and English Department, Arizona State
University, Tempe, AZ.
- 8/93 – 7/95, Adjunct Faculty, English Department, ESL Programs, Maricopa County Community
Colleges, Phoenix, Arizona.
- 8/88 – 12/92, Intern, Public Schools Teaching Practicum, Tempe Public Schools, Tempe, Arizona.
- 8/89 – 12/93, Director – Board of Education, & Teacher: An-Noor Elementary School (K-8). Tempe,
Arizona.
- 1/89 - 5/93, Graduate Research and Teaching Assistant, & Title VII Fellow, Center for Bilingual
Education and Research, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES/PUBLICATIONS

BOOKS
Sciences Publishing Corporation.
Science Press.

BOOK CHAPTERS
C. Grant (Ed.), Creative Partnerships: Gateway to Embracing Diversity (pp.87-97). Washington, DC:
National Association for Multicultural Education.
Suleiman, M., Campbell, K., & Vaz, P. (2001). Talking the talk, walking the walk: Teaching diversity in a
monocultural setting. In C. Grant (Ed.), Creative Partnerships: Gateway to Embracing Diversity (pp.123-
Stafford, K., Sagehorn, A., & Suleiman, M. (1997). Learning to teach, teaching to learn: Evaluative and
pedagogical tools for teaching native American literatures. In C. Grant (Ed.), National Association for
(Ed.), National Association for Multicultural Education Proceedings (pp. 60-70). San Francisco, CA:
Caddo Gap Press.

**RECENT ARTICLES (Refereed and refereed)**

**ARTICLES (Non-Refereed)**

**ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS (Partial list)**


SELECTED RECENT PAPERS & PRESENTATIONS, NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL


Suleiman, M. (2013). Democracy, pluralism and leadership: A global perspective. A Session Presented at the Annual DPELFS Faculty Research Colloquium, October 19, Fresno, CA.


**ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERSHIP, EDITORIAL JUROR**

- 2012-present, Co-editor & Reviewer/Advisor, CLEARvoz Journal
- 2012-present, Reviewer/Advisor, Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education—An International Journal
- 2009-present, Governing Board Member, National Social Science Association
- 1999-2004, Reviewer/Advisor, Critical Inquiry in Curri. and Instruct Journal
- 1997-2002, Reviewer & Contributor, NAME Magazine

**HONORS, APPOINTMENTS, & AWARDS** *(partial list)*

- Fulbright Ambassador, 2015-present. The Fulbright Program (CIES).
- Recipient, Excellence in Research Award, 2015, GRASP Office, California State University, Bakersfield.
- Fulbright Peer Reviewer, 2010-2013, The Fulbright Program (CIES).
- Recipient—Fulbright Scholarship Award, 2009/2010, Bahrain’s Teacher College, University of Bahrain, Kingdom of Bahrain.
- Recipient—Faculty Honors Award, 2010. Category: School and University Research and Scholarship, California State University, Bakersfield.
- Recipient—Scholarship, Excellence, and Creativity Honoree (CSUB), Spring 2007
- Nominee—Wang Family Excellence Award, California State University, 2004-2005.
- Recipient—Faculty Honors Award. Category: School and University Service, California State University, Bakersfield, 2003.
- Recipient—Mortar Board National Honor Society Award Top Professor, 1999.
- Recipient—National Social Science Association Executive Director Distinguished Member of the Year Award, 1997-1998.
- Recipient—An Outstanding Mediated Instructor of the Year Award, Fort Hays State University, 1997-1998.
- Recipient—An Outstanding Mediated Instructor of the Year Award, Fort Hays State University, 1997-1998.

**GRANTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES**

• Edvention Partners, Teacher Quality Program, team member, federal grant, 2010-2015.
• E-Learning Course Development Grant, Awarded by the CSUB’s Extended University, 2014-2015.
• Second Language Instruction for Central California (SLICC)—Evaluator and Private Investigator, Awarded annually by the Foreign Language Project, Stanford University, 2002-2014.
• SB 2042 Early Adopter & Implementation Grant, Awarded by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 2003.
• English Language Development Institute (ELDPI) Grant. ELDPI Team Leader and grant contributor and participant, Federal grant, 2001-2003.
• Excellence in Curriculum for English Learners Grant (Project EXCEL). Grant participant and contributing developer, Federal grant, 2000-2003.

**CURRENT PROFESSIONAL TRAININGS, CERTIFICATES:**

• **2013--present**, Online Quality Matters in Online Learning
• **2008--present**, Board of Institutional Review, CCTC, Member.
• **2008--present**, Ventures for Excellence in Teacher Selection, certified
• **2007--present**, Teacher Performance Assessment Training, certified Lead Assessor.
• **2002--present**, Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) & Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT), Performance Assessment Training, certified Trainer.
• **2001--present**, California Technology Assistance Project (CTAP). A series of technology workshops for Level I & Level II CTAP Certification.
AMANDA S. TAGGART
9001 Stockdale Highway • Bakersfield, CA 93311
(661) 654-3080 • ataggart@csub.edu

SCHOLARLY INTERESTS

Racial/ethnic minority student equity, access, and achievement in P-20 educational settings, instructional and cultural leadership

ACADEMIC TRAINING

Major: Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Major: Educational Leadership
Completed additional undergraduate major: Spanish (May, 2005).

B.A. Utah Valley University, Orem, UT. December, 2002.
Major: English Education

B.A. University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT. August, 2001.
Major: English

ACADEMIC WORK EXPERIENCE

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
Department of Advanced Educational Studies
California State University, Bakersfield • Bakersfield, CA
SEPTEMBER 2015 – PRESENT

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR
Department of Teaching and Learning
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas • Las Vegas, NV
AUGUST 2014 – DECEMBER 2014

RESEARCH ASSOCIATE
Utah Education Policy Center
University of Utah • Salt Lake City, UT
JUNE 2013 – MARCH 2014

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
Department of Leadership and Foundations
Mississippi State University • Mississippi State, MS
AUGUST 2011 – MAY 2013

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
The University of Texas at San Antonio • San Antonio, TX
AUGUST 2010 – MAY 2011
DOCTORAL FELLOW  
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies  
The University of Texas at San Antonio • San Antonio, TX

PUBLIC SCHOOL WORK EXPERIENCE

TEACHER
Clark County School District • Las Vegas, NV  
Taught English and Spanish, Grades 9-12.

PRINCIPAL INTERN
Clark County School District • Las Vegas, NV  
Implemented school improvement plan focused on expanded student learning outcomes;  
facilitated a team of teachers in analyzing instructional, curricular, and assessment methods and  
led professional development courses in order to improve these methods for student learning;  
analyzed student achievement data to address inequities in student preparation, placement,  
instruction, and grading practices; developed recruitment plan for underserved students.

TEACHER
Cassia County Joint School District #151 • Burley, ID  
Taught English, Grades 9-10.

ESL TECHNICIAN
Nebo School District • Springville, UT  
Taught English as a Second Language (ESL), Grades 8-9.

PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL ARTICLES

review of research identifying factors contributing to academic success outcomes. Review  
of Educational Research, 85(2), 249-274. doi: 10.3102/0033654314551064 (Impact  
Factor = 4.229)

Taggart, A., & Shoho, A. R. (2013). Attracting diverse students to a magnet school: Risking  
aspirations or swallowing one’s beliefs. Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership,  
16(2), 20-32. doi: 10.1177/1555458913487032

Crisp, G., & Taggart, A. (2013). Community college student success programs: A synthesis,  
critique, and research agenda. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 37,  
114-130. (Journal Acceptance Rate = 21 to 30%)

and recommendations for future research. The Journal of College Reading and Learning,  
42(1), 24-44.


**INVITED PUBLICATIONS**


**EVALUATION REPORTS**


---

**NATIONAL CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**


**Taggart, A.** (2010, October). *The role of perceived equitable treatment on Hispanic high school students’ aspirations to attend college.* Poster presented at the annual conference of the University Council for Educational Administration in New Orleans, LA.

**Crisp, G., & Taggart, A.** (2010, April). *Community college student success programs: A synthesis, critique, and research agenda.* Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Denver, CO.

---

**UNIVERSITY TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

**COURSES TAUGHT AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD**

**Master’s Level**

- EDAD 620: Instructional Leadership
- EDAD 671: Leadership Development I
- EDAD 681: Fieldwork I
EDAD 672: Leadership Development II
EDAD 682: Fieldwork II

COURSES TAUGHT AT MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Doctoral Level
Seminar in Educational Leadership
Organizational Theory

Master’s Level
Educational Leaders as Instructional Supervisors
Contexts of Educational Leadership
Internship I: Observation and Field Experiences
Internship II: Administrative Applications
Internship III: Instructional Applications

Undergraduate
Social Foundations of Education
Exploring Diversity through Writing
Writing for Thinking

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mississippi State University
Committee Member for Raymond Morgigno (MSU). The effects of National Board Certified Teachers on student achievement in Mississippi high schools. Defended June, 2012.


Committee Member for Timothy Wilcox (MSU). The effectiveness of using the Mississippi Student Progress Monitoring System to improve a school district’s state test scores. Defended February, 2012.


Committee Member for Lynn Horton (MSU). A case study of academic achievement in fifth grade classes at an urban elementary school. Defended February, 2014.

Committee Member for Faith Strong (MSU). A case study of inclusion at the elementary school level: Does principal leadership for shared decision making between general and exceptional education teachers impact inclusion? Defended February, 2014.
Jianjun (JJ) Wang’s Vitae

**Degrees**

- Science Education
  - Ph.D. Kansas State University 1993
- Statistics
  - Ph.D. Candidacy Kansas State University 1993
  - (Passed the second Ph.D. Qualifying Examination)
  - M.S. Kansas State University 1993
- Physics
  - M.S. Beijing Normal University 1987
  - B.S. Anhui Teacher's College 1982

**Academic Experiences**

- 2007 - … Board of Examiner, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- 2005 - … Review panel member, National Science Foundation.
- 2005 Review panel member of the Australian Research Council (GAAMS ID: G47753).
- 2002 - 2008 Chair, Department of Advanced Educational Studies, CSUB.
- 1993/1997/2001 - … Assistant/Associate/Fully Professor of Advanced Educational Studies, CSUB.
- 2000 Fellow of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).

**Monographs/Reports**


Journal Articles


Wang, J. & Staver, J. (2001). An examination of relationships between factors of science education and
Conference Papers (more presentations are available at http://www.csub.edu/~jwang)


QUALIFICATIONS PROFILE

Performance-driven instructional leader with broad-based background in administering school operations and providing top-quality education. Leverage expertise in implementing educational program to boost the teacher and students performance. Demonstrate dynamic ability in spearheading continuous process improvement efforts to maintain seamless operations and establish the school’s reputation. Design and lead professional development workshops for teachers to guarantee the integration of high-quality instructions and education.

EDUCATION

University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Professional Clear Administrative Credential (Education Administration): Nov 1994
University of Fresno Pacific, Fresno, CA

Master of Science in Preliminary Administrative Credential (Education Administration): Aug 1989
National University, Sacramento, CA

Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (Teacher Education): Dec 1985
California State University, Sacramento, CA

Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies: Dec 1981
California State University, Sacramento, CA

LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCE

California State University, Bakersfield, CA
INTERIM PROGRAM DIRECTOR FOR DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP/ASSISTANT PROFESSOR – ADVANCED EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
AUG 2013–PRESENT

› Assume full responsibility in identifying and recruiting educational leaders and instructors within Kern County for the Doctorate Program.
› Proactively engage in driving the doctorate culture of the university toward successful development.
› Concentrate on improving the college rate within Kern County by training and mentoring educational leaders, educational administrators, and teachers in order to expand awareness on current educational practices and policies as well as to integrate quality of instruction and promote learning environments.

Kern County Schools, Bakersfield, CA
2001-2013

Vineland School District, Bakersfield, CA
SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT
JUN 2011–JUN 2013

› Leveraged solid leadership expertise within Vineland School District that revitalized the underperforming operations, reestablished the school’s reputation, and significantly improved student’s performance.
› Adopted innovative ideas in strategic planning, encompassing goal development and communication progress; presented results to the Board and Community.
› Spearheaded the operative school system alignment and team building focused on increasing student achievement, including parent involvement initiatives.
› Successfully completed the Federal Program Monitoring process with the California Department of Education.
› Directed the implementation and growth of the ASES program at both school sites.
› Led efforts in achieving $250K in grants for the District.
› Oversaw the restoration of the award winning instrumental music (Band) program at the middle school.
› Managed and coordinated all personnel and general direction of the district.
COORDINATOR FOR CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION AND ACCOUNTABILITY  
FEB 2007–JUN 2011
- Actively involved in delivering exceptional support for school district under state and/or federal sanctions which comprised of program improvement districts, SAIT schools, high priority schools, and DAIT school districts.
- Rendered assistance to school districts undergoing program improvement; spearheaded the District School Leadership Team for Lost Hills School District in exiting the program improvement status.
- Applied superior leadership skills in administering all instructional aspects concerning school reform and improving student achievement.
- Supported the district and site administrators in the execution of CCSS and state adopted instructional materials.

INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT, EL TEJON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, LEBEC, CA  
JUL 2009–JUN 2010
- Provided intense coaching of High School Principal to create an Academic Centered High School
- Exercised sound judgment and decision-making skills to maintain the financial stability of the district.
- Built a Construction Team of an architect, project manager, and general contractor that ensured the continuation of District Bond project that was stalled for a long time
- Provided exemplary management on all personnel and general direction of the district.

INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT, EDISON SCHOOL DISTRICT, BAKERSFIELD, CA  
JAN–JUN 2008
- Reinstituted the district administration’s credibility after the release of the previous superintendent by evaluating and restructuring business practices at the district level, as well as taking action on long overdue personnel issues, including the release of site principal
- Progressively led the operation of a modernization project, as well as the finalization of perquisites for the new gymnasium construction.

INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT, STANDARD SCHOOL DISTRICT, BAKERSFIELD, CA  
JUL–DEC 2007
- Administered a school modernization program and earned the initial approval from upper management to build the first school within the district.
- Successfully completed positive negotiation process with all represented groups within the district.
- Took charge of all personnel and general direction of the district.

DiGiorgio School District, Arvin, CA  
JUN 2004–JUN 2007
- Integrated a school-wide intervention program that augmented the academic performance within the district.
- Capitalized on industry expertise in designing and implementing numerous innovative programs, such as Accelerated Reader Program, Parent involvement (transported low income parents to school site) that added to school effectiveness

Highland Elementary School/Standard School District, Bakersfield, CA  
AUG 2001–JUN 2004
- Generated 50 points increase in Academic Performance Index (API) by promoting and developing teacher accountability in accomplishing academic responsibilities.
- Conceptualized the design and led the application of diverse innovative programs that added to school effectiveness, such as Accelerated Reader Program, After School Reading Laboratory, and Artist in Residence

Earlier Positions Held:
PRINCIPAL, Clinton/Mendenhall Elementary School/Garden Grove Unified School District, Garden Grove, CA (1998–2001)
DANNY WETTTON
Address: 6117 College Avenue, Bakersfield, California 93306
Phone: 661.873.9888 Mobile: 661.379.5258 Email: dawhett@zeus.kern.org

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Point Loma Nazarene University

ADJUNCT PROFESSOR
- Developed and implemented new CCTC and WASC approved programs
- Taught administrative credential course, such as Instructional Leadership for Student Success

AUG 2004 – JUN 2007

North Sacramento School District, Sacramento, CA

TEACHER
- Taught second and sixth grade at high poverty inner city school

JAN 1986–DEC 1991

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Association for California School Administrators (ACSA)
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
American Educational Research Association (AERA)
Phi Delta Kappan

AWARDS AND HONORS

ACSA Region 11 Superintendent/Principal of the Year: 2006/2007 | District’s Golden Apple Award: 1998

ACTIVITIES

Field of Education Presentations

Workshop Development and Facilitation –Professional Learning Communities:
Annual Review of State Testing | Annual Updates on Budget
Board Policies and Procedures (General Boardmanship)
New School Funding Formula [Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)]
Common Core State Standards and Smarter Balanced Assessments

Promoting Team Leadership Skills in Doctoral Candidates
A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Professors
of Educational Administration. Camarillo, CA, August, 2014

Alignment of Signature Pedagogy with Field-Based Data Analysis Methods
Guided by CPED's Signature Pedagogy, this presentation illustrates model choices for analyzing field-based data across institutions of different sizes with simple application of standard software packages like SPSS and/or SAS
Presentation at the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate in
Fullerton, CA, June 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cours Units</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Base (Units x Base Rate)</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l (1.5 x RR)</th>
<th>Direct Faculty Cost</th>
<th>Faculty PD Units</th>
<th>Faculty PD Cost</th>
<th>Faculty + PD Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Subtotal</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,268.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Subtotal</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,268.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,402.00</td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
<td>$40,536.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:

Tenure-track Replacement Rate (RR) = 1689
Summer Base Rate = 2700
(the mean of 90k and 72k, which are mean assoc & prof salaries)
### Table 3b

#### Faculty Costs 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l Units</th>
<th>Faculty Base Cost</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l (1.5 x RR)</th>
<th>Direct Faculty Cost</th>
<th>Faculty PD Units</th>
<th>Faculty PD Cost</th>
<th>Faculty + PD Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 2,700.00</td>
<td>0 $ 8,100.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,633.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 508</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 2,700.00</td>
<td>0 $ 8,100.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,633.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summer Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21,267.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 503</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fall Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50,670.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T.1 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td>0 $ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T.2 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td>0 $ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T.1 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td>0 $ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T.2 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td>0 $ -</td>
<td>$ 5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$ 1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $ 5,067.00</td>
<td>$ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5 $ 2,533.50</td>
<td>$ 10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40,536.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>112,473.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**

Tenure-track Replacement Rate (RR) = 1689
Summer Base Rate = 2700

(131)

*(the mean of 90k and 72k, which are mean assoc & prof salaries)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Add'1 Units</th>
<th>Faculty Base Rate (1.5 x RR)</th>
<th>Faculty Add'1</th>
<th>Direct Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty PD Units</th>
<th>Faculty PD Cost</th>
<th>Faculty + PD Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.1 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 508</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summer Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$71,937.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.2 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 503</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fall Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$101,340.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.3 Dissertation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$7,600.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Spring Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$81,072.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$254,349.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
- Tenure-track Replacement Rate (RR)= 1689
- Summer Base Rate = 2700
- (the mean of 90k and 72k, which are mean assoc & prof salaries)
### Table 3d
Faculty Costs 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Course Units</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l Units</th>
<th>Faculty Base x Base Rate</th>
<th>(Units x 1.5 x RR)</th>
<th>Direct Faculty Cost</th>
<th>Faculty PD Units</th>
<th>Faculty PD Cost</th>
<th>Faculty + PD Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.1 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0 $8,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,633.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 508</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0 $8,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,633.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Subtotal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,937.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.2 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 503</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Subtotal</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101,340.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 599.3 Dissertation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>15,201.00</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0 $5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5 $5,067.00</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,533.50</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Subtotal</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81,072.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>185,944.50</td>
<td>$68,404.50</td>
<td>$254,349.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
- Tenure-track Replacement Rate: 1689
- Summer Base Rate: 2700
- (the mean of 90k and 72k, which are mean assoc & prof salaries)
### Table 3e
Faculty Costs 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Cohort N</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
<th>Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l Units</th>
<th>Faculty Base x Base Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Add'l x (1.5 x RR)</th>
<th>Direct Faculty Cost</th>
<th>Faculty PD Units</th>
<th>Faculty PD Cost</th>
<th>Faculty + PD Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 3 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 4 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 589.1 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 502</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,633.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 508</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,633.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Subtotal</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$71,937.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 5 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 6 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 589.2 Dissertation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 507</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 511</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 503</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 501</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 509</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fall Subtotal</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$101,340.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 7 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 589.3 Dissertation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$15,201.00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>30,402.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 P-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 1 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 580T 2 HE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5,067.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 506</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>EDL 504</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>$1,689.00</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$5,067.00</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>7,600.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,533.50</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>10,134.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spring Subtotal</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,072.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$185,944.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**
- Tenure-track Replacement Rate (RR)= 1689
- Summer Base Rate 2700
- The mean of 90k and 72k, which are mean assoc & prof salaries
### Table 4
Five Year Budget Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty- teaching</td>
<td>30,402</td>
<td>89,672</td>
<td>185,945</td>
<td>185,945</td>
<td>185,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty benefits (50% of teaching)</td>
<td>15,201</td>
<td>44,836</td>
<td>92,973</td>
<td>92,973</td>
<td>92,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty-professional development*</td>
<td>10,134</td>
<td>22,802</td>
<td>68,405</td>
<td>68,405</td>
<td>68,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Faculty</strong></td>
<td>55,737</td>
<td>157,310</td>
<td>347,323</td>
<td>347,323</td>
<td>347,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-fac Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50% of salaries)</td>
<td>98,750</td>
<td>98,750</td>
<td>98,750</td>
<td>98,750</td>
<td>98,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-fac Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Assistant</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Grad Assistants</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP Coordinator</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Salaries</strong></td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies &amp; services</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Machine Lease</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; tech support</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED participation</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation/marketing activities</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni activities</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student travel</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online course development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation research support</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., travel to meetings)</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating</strong></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSE</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Mgmt/Financial Aid</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonfaculty Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>471,250</td>
<td>471,250</td>
<td>511,250</td>
<td>511,250</td>
<td>511,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted (Fresno picks up 2/3, 1/3, or none)</td>
<td>155,513</td>
<td>311,025</td>
<td>511,250</td>
<td>511,250</td>
<td>511,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COSTS (Faculty + Nonfaculty)</strong></td>
<td>211,250</td>
<td>468,335</td>
<td>858,573</td>
<td>858,573</td>
<td>858,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on FTES (marginal cost revenue)</td>
<td>66,645</td>
<td>183,274</td>
<td>466,515</td>
<td>466,515</td>
<td>466,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on headcount</td>
<td>200,124</td>
<td>500,310</td>
<td>800,496</td>
<td>800,496</td>
<td>800,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: State revenue</strong></td>
<td>266,769</td>
<td>683,584</td>
<td>1,267,011</td>
<td>1,267,011</td>
<td>1,267,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10% Financial Aid Set Aside</strong></td>
<td>(20,012)</td>
<td>(50,031)</td>
<td>(80,050)</td>
<td>(80,050)</td>
<td>(80,050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuition waivers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential loss based on 4 students per cohort</td>
<td>(44,472)</td>
<td>(111,180)</td>
<td>(177,888)</td>
<td>(177,888)</td>
<td>(177,888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>202,285</td>
<td>522,373</td>
<td>1,009,073</td>
<td>1,009,073</td>
<td>1,009,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carry Forward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>(8,965)</td>
<td>45,073</td>
<td>195,574</td>
<td>346,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net surplus/loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8,965)</td>
<td>45,073</td>
<td>195,574</td>
<td>346,075</td>
<td>496,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Cohort 4</td>
<td>Cohort 5</td>
<td>Cohort 6</td>
<td>Cohort 7</td>
<td>Cohort 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HeadCnt</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>HeadCnt</td>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>HeadCnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2018</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2018</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2019</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 2019</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2019</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2019</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su 2020</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fa 2020</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp 2021</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Projected Revenue 2016-17 to 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Headcount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>24.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Support per FTES (marginal cost revenue)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
<td>$7,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL State Appropriation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,645.00</td>
<td>$183,273.75</td>
<td>$466,515.00</td>
<td>$466,515.00</td>
<td>$466,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Fees per Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
<td>$5,559.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL State Fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,124.00</td>
<td>$500,310.00</td>
<td>$800,496.00</td>
<td>$800,496.00</td>
<td>$800,496.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL State Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$266,769.00</td>
<td>$683,583.75</td>
<td>$1,267,011.00</td>
<td>$1,267,011.00</td>
<td>$1,267,011.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less 10% of State Fees Financial Aid Set Aside</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,012.00</td>
<td>$50,031.00</td>
<td>$80,050.00</td>
<td>$80,050.00</td>
<td>$80,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL State Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$246,757.00</td>
<td>$633,552.75</td>
<td>$1,186,961.00</td>
<td>$1,186,961.00</td>
<td>$1,186,961.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Tuition Waiver loss (based on 4 students per cohort taking waiver)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(44,472.00)</td>
<td>$(111,180.00)</td>
<td>$(177,888.00)</td>
<td>$(177,888.00)</td>
<td>$(177,888.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$202,285.00</td>
<td>$522,372.75</td>
<td>$1,009,073.00</td>
<td>$1,009,073.00</td>
<td>$1,009,073.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers for headcount and FTES come from Table 1
# Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership
## Course Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>6 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6010</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6060</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6040</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
<td>Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6090</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Applied Research and Measurement in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>6 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6020</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6070</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Reform</td>
<td>Applied Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6080</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6110</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
<td>Educational Evaluation, Assessment and Planning</td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6030</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Policy Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mandatory Dissertation Seminars (no units)</strong></td>
<td>Qualifying Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #3</td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #5</td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6770</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6900</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #4</td>
<td>Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #6</td>
<td>Dissertation 3 (6 units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6900</strong></td>
<td><strong>EDLD 6900</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation 1 (includes 2nd mandatory dissertation seminar)</td>
<td>Dissertation 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preliminary Dissertation Defense</td>
<td>Final Dissertation Defense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- Course will use the new 4-digit course numbers when the program opens in Fall 2016.
- * Indicates fieldwork experience in course.
- Unless otherwise marked, all courses are 3 units.
October 20, 2015

Student
(address)

Dear Student:

On October 1, 2015 the core faculty of the DPEL Graduate Group met to review the progress of your entire doctoral cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones. We are pleased to report that the core faculty believes that overall you are making good progress in your studies, and anticipate that you will continue to advance in your educational career.

The core faculty noted in particular that you are thoughtful about the material presented, and that you have completed all of your coursework to date in an outstanding fashion. The faculty particularly noted that you have been taking advantage of working with faculty outside of the coursework and encourage you to continue that practice. Overall, the faculty felt you were making good progress in the program.

We congratulate you on your success to date. If you have any further questions about your review, please feel free to meet with either of us.

Sincerely,

CSUB Director
Sample Yellow Light Letter

October 21, 2015

Student
(address)

Dear Student:

   On October 1, 2015 the core faculty of the DPEL Graduate Group met to review the progress of your entire doctoral cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones.

   The core faculty were concerned about your academic progress to date. The faculty encourages you to complete the one core course that is needed for you to move to the specialization phase. It was noted that they believe you will be an outstanding representative of the program when you are finished and pursuing your career options.

   If you need assistance in completing the remaining core course, we hope that you will contact any of the faculty for assistance and guidance. If you have any further questions about your review, please feel free to meet with either of us.

Sincerely,

CSUB Director
October 21, 2015

Student  
(address)  

Dear Student:

On October 1, 2015 the core faculty of the DPEL Graduate Group met to review the progress of your entire doctoral cohort group. We discussed the performance of each student in coursework, with a particular focus on writing and conceptualization skills, and examined the progress of each student in meeting program milestones.

The core faculty are particular concerned about your academic performance. The faculty noted a weakness in your writing skills and with your understanding of quantitative methods. We urge you to consider pursuing a writing course, and supplementing the research courses you have had with additional studies. It was the feeling of the committee that you will have a difficult time passing your qualifying examination without further effort on your part in those two areas. In addition, the faculty noted that you have not completed one of your Core courses and a grade of "I" remains on your transcript.

Because of the issues noted above, it is imperative that you make an appointment with your advisor in the very near future to develop an academic plan that will get you back on target for completing your degree. We hope that if you need assistance in completing the remaining courses, that you will contact any of the faculty for assistance and guidance. If you have any further questions about your review, please feel free to meet with either of us.

Sincerely,

CSUB Director
Policy and Procedures for the Qualifying Examination

The qualifying examination will be scenario-based questions related to material covered during the core courses. Two scenarios, one PreK-12 and one Post-secondary, will be developed by the program director and approved by the Qualifying Examination Committee (QEC). Each faculty member teaching a Core course will develop one question pertaining to his/her course material related to each scenario (a total of two questions) and a scoring rubric outlining what is acceptable in a student response.

Faculty teaching Core courses will receive the scenarios at the end of the semester before the qualifying examination is administered. Questions written by faculty teaching Core courses will be submitted to the QEC along with the rubric designed to assess responses to that question at the beginning of the semester in which the qualifying examination will be administered.

The questions written to address PreK-12 and Post-secondary scenarios will generally be the same for each scenario, written to address the specific context of the scenario. Students will be given nine questions according to their track (PreK-12 and Post-secondary) one month before the exam so they can begin to study for the exam. The QEC will select the three questions to be addressed during the four hour testing time. Students will address the questions in depth based on their core course materials.

As noted above, students will have four hours to take the exam, will use a computer lab in the building, and will not have access to references (hard copy or online) (they will not be able to use their own laptops). Two faculty members will monitor the exam (one if everyone is in the same lab).

Each faculty member submitting a question will submit a rubric that outlines what response they would expect from the students for that question. A sample rubric (or rubric format) will be developed so the Core faculty can insert the definitions of each cell.

An ad-hoc Qualifying Examination Committee will be appointed each year and will select the questions, administers the exam, and reads and scores the qualifying examinations. Members of the committee will be faculty members who have taught core courses. Two readers will be selected for each question, for a total of six readers. If there is a significant difference between the two readers, a third reader will be asked to read the paper. The two most similar scores will be used for that paper.

Two hundred dollars ($200) in the form of research “banking” funds will be made available to any faculty member monitoring the qualifying examination. The sum of $500 will be made available to any faculty member who participates in the reading of the qualifying examinations.

Students will be given two opportunities to pass the exam. If a student fails the first exam they will be given new questions from the same content areas in which he/she did not pass. The question will not be made available to the student prior to the examination date. The re-examination will be administered similar to the first examination using the same guidelines. The re-examination must be taken within 60 days of the first exam, unless otherwise approved by the program director. If the student does not pass the examination after the second attempt, the student will be dismissed from the program and not permitted to take additional courses.

Students who wish to appeal the decision made on their qualifying examination must use the university process for grade appeals as described in the University catalog.
Higher Education Qualifying Exam Item (from EDL 509)

To promote an inclusive environment, the university seeks to gather data from students and faculty regarding their perceptions towards campus-wide cultural diversity. In your work with Provost, your responsibilities are to administer a student and faculty questionnaire to guide university-wide progress monitoring and action planning activities. The questions to be addressed include:

1) What steps would you take to identify the criteria to use to select or develop questionnaires to measure student and faculty beliefs towards campus diversity? Your response should reference the stages of questionnaire development and describe what the measures would look like.

2) Describe how you would use obtained results to guide university-wide programmatic and policy decision-making around diversity issues (e.g., hiring, promoting cultural responsive practices).

3) Identify and describe the relevant measurement issues pertaining to the technical quality of the scores obtained from the questionnaires. Be sure to indicate the methods that you could use to investigate the psychometric properties of obtained scores?
| Rubric: EDL 509 | 2: Exceeds Expectations | 1. The student makes reference to survey/questionnaire selection or development with reference to:  
- Constructing a questionnaire with content validity based on important features of university-wide diversity. There are examples of appropriate items.  
- The need for either internal consistency (e.g., Cronbach’s coefficient alpha) or test-retest reliability with some discussion of how this is accomplished.  
- The need for validity evidence, including establishing the content validity of items before pilot testing, as well as criterion-related validity (either concurrent between student and faculty surveys, or predictive of some relevant future criterion).  
2. The student outlines student and faculty surveys with reference to:  
- Constructing surveys based in the content most related to dimensions of campus-wide diversity. There are examples of some of the items that are appropriate to such a survey.  
- The need for either internal consistency or test-retest reliability with some discussion of how this is accomplished.  
- The student speaks of the need for some dimension of content validity and/or criterion-related validity (either concurrent with student/faculty surveys, or predictive of some relevant future criterion). |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Meets Expectations | 1. The student makes reference to the stages of survey/questionnaire development (e.g., purpose of measure, pilot test).  
2. The student makes reference to the need for establishing the reliability and validity of survey scores, with some specific mention and justification for the type of method used to obtain evidence on the scales’ psychometric properties.  
3. The student notes some of the complexities of developing survey instruments, such as: item development, determining number of items, pilot testing items, and number of respondents, among others. |
| 0: Fails to Meet Expectations | 1. The student makes no specific mention of the stages of survey/questionnaire development or of the psychometric properties (reliability, validity) of obtained scores related to measuring student and faculty views towards campus diversity.  
2. The examples of the data gathering process are non-specific or not relevant to the problems. |
As the new principal of Lincoln Middle School, you see tremendous challenges, but also many opportunities to get out of PI status quickly and to enhance student learning. You sense that you need to conduct an in-depth analysis of the school and community using the tools of program evaluation, appreciative inquiry, and planning processes.

Describe the process that you would follow in conducting such an evaluation and arriving at a solution that stakeholders will not only accept, but will become invested "owners" of the plan for student success. Be sure to include major steps of the process that you use to ensure not only validity and reliability of the process, but also a high level of participation and "buy-in" throughout the process, including the monitoring component during implementation. Obviously, a complex process would also use some evaluation and planning tools to assist in the process. Be sure to include them along with justification for each tool in your description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Rubric: EDL 511 Pre-K-12 Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response specifically cites:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. evaluation techniques and strategies that ensure validity and reliability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes and describes essential processes for evaluation and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• includes possible limitations or weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the steps needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information/data gathering of some type either through archival data, stakeholder meetings/interviews, surveys, and/or other sources;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a planning process that includes at least some steps in sequential order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including the evaluation questions and a rough timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. tools that will be used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• list and describe at least three evaluation/planning tools to be used at any stage. These could include Baldrige techniques or others appropriate to the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Includes general, but not specific information about</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. evaluation techniques and strategies that ensure validity and reliability:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mentions and describes in general terms essential processes for evaluation and planning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the steps needed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information/data gathering of some type,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• a planning process that includes sequencing of the steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. tools that will be used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lists at least two program evaluation/planning tools to be used at any stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>is vague, omits or has limited reference to any of the essential elements as listed above</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policies and Procedures for Dissertation Research

Dissertation Committee Approval

The student's proposed dissertation committee chairperson and committee members must sign DPEL Form 4a [Dissertation Committee Approval for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership] to verify their agreement to serve on the dissertation committee. Once the committee signatures are obtained by the student, DPEL Form 4a must be submitted to the Director for approval.

Enrollment in Research Practicum/Doctoral Dissertation

Only those students who have completed: 1) the core course work and specialization; 2) passed the qualifying exam, and, 3) who have been advanced to candidacy may begin formal work on a doctoral dissertation.

Enrollment in dissertation (EDLD 6900) units is normally effected in three-unit or six-unit segments. Once the candidate has enrolled in 12 dissertation units, the maximum allowable, continuous enrollment must be maintained until the dissertation is filed (see Continuous Enrollment policy below). The program requires that students must enroll in EDLD 6910 (zero units through regular university enrollment) to maintain continuous enrollment.

The Dissertation Committee, Preparing for the Research Proposal, and the Preliminary Oral Defense

The dissertation committee will consist of at least three members, one will serve as chair. Co-chairs are allowed. More than three committee members are acceptable and may be requested by the student and the chair. Qualified individuals whose expertise is germane to the topic but who are not members of the DPEL Graduate Group must be recommended to the Director and Dean of Social Sciences and Education. The non-Graduate Group committee member must have an Ed.D. or Ph.D. A curriculum vita must accompany the request.

Only Core Graduate Group faculty can chair student dissertation committees. In some cases students have requested that the Chair of their dissertation be someone who is not a member of the DPEL Graduate Group, and thus, someone who does not have knowledge of the Program. A content area Co-Chair who is not a member of the Core Graduate Group may be selected, along with a Co-Chair who is a member of the Graduate Group. Both Co-Chairs of the Committee will have content responsibilities on the dissertation; however, only the Co-Chair who is a member of the DPEL Core Graduate Group will be responsible for the administrative paperwork.

A change of dissertation chair should only occur on very rare occasions. Reasons for the change should be documented in writing and should reflect very extenuating circumstances. The change must be signed off by the current chair and the newly proposed chair and approved by the Director. Meetings of the Dissertation Committee may be called at any time by the chairperson. The most important meetings are the Preliminary Oral Defense, where the proposal is presented to the committee for approval, and the Final Oral Defense, where the completed dissertation is presented to the committee for approval.
Preparing for the Research Proposal

The research proposal consists of a draft of the first three chapters (the introduction, the literature review, the methodology), and references. This proposal will inform prospective committee members of tentative research plans.

Working with the Committee

The student should consult with the Dissertation Chair and Committee frequently.

It is necessary to give the chairperson and committee members sufficient time to read the proposal and provide feedback. Committee members typically need two to three weeks to read, consider, and comment on drafts.

The student must schedule meetings, such as the proposal defense, with the committee. When an acceptable date/time is agreed upon, the student should call the DPEL office to arrange for meeting space and/or videoconference facilities.

Creating a Proposal

In planning and developing an acceptable research proposal, the student may find it useful to:

1. Work closely with chair and committee members;
2. Identify a general area of interest. The topic may emerge from past research efforts, present activities, or developing career plans;
3. Carry out an exploration of the literature to determine a basic body of facts and issues related to the chosen topic;
4. Seek opportunities for discussion of research ideas in a research group or with faculty;
5. Identify a problem in need of investigation. This may be a phenomenon to be investigated, to be measured, to be treated, or to be evaluated in some way. The student should:
   a. Analyze the problem to identify its components,
   b. Formulate research question(s), and
   c. Delineate methodology(ies);
6. Create an organizational system for efficient storage and retrieval of the research material; and
7. Conduct a focused search of literature which addresses the problem and the relevant variables:
   a. Use computerized information retrieval systems,
   b. Locate bibliographies, existing literature reviews, dissertations, and relevant reference materials related to the topic,
   c. Locate books, reprints, or photocopies of research articles from the developed bibliography,
   d. Read and synthesize the literature, with the goal of understanding the problem and previous research.

It is the student’s responsibility to schedule meetings with the dissertation committee, including the preliminary and final defenses. The DPEL office staff is available to schedule the video or phone conferencing equipment, but at least three weeks’ notice is required (no exceptions will be made; please plan your schedule accordingly). PLEASE REMEMBER TO PLAN AHEAD. COMMITTEE MEMBERS HAVE OTHER COMMITMENTS TO MEET.

The Preliminary Oral Defense

The purpose of the Preliminary Oral Defense is to provide a critical examination and assessment of the student’s plans. The student presents the rationale, the scope, and the proposed execution of the planned research; the proposal is discussed and evaluated by the committee. Form 5 [Scheduling of the Preliminary Oral Defense of the Dissertation Research Proposal] along with a copy of the formal research proposal and the methods section (Chapter 3) must be submitted to the DPEL office, to be approved by the Director three weeks prior to the scheduled date of the Preliminary Oral Defense.

The announcement of the student’s Preliminary Oral Defense must be posted one week in advance of this
formal meeting. The DPEL administrative office staff will not post the student’s Preliminary Orals until the student has obtained an approved DPEL Form 6 [Scheduling of the Preliminary Oral Defense of the Dissertation Research Proposal].

Preliminary Orals are to be scheduled through DPEL during the academic year, either during the semester or the intercession. Teleconference arrangements and room assignments can be scheduled through the DPELFS office. Orals can be scheduled at other times upon approval of the committee, the DPEL Director, and the Dean of Social Sciences and Education.

At the date and time of the Preliminary Oral Defense, the student will provide the Committee members with DPEL Form 7 [Preliminary Oral Defense Required Changes] so that the committee members may outline the changes that are needed before Form 8 [Completion of the Preliminary Oral Defense the Dissertation Proposal] is signed off. When the modifications have been completed and are satisfactory to the committee, the student will obtain signatures from his/her committee on Form 8 which is attached to the final formal proposal and deposited in the DPEL office.

If the research plan includes human subjects, appropriate clearances must be obtained.

Writing the Dissertation

After completing the Preliminary Oral Defense, the student carries out the research plan described in the approved proposal, collects data and analyzes it, and continues writing the dissertation. The student’s dissertation committee serves to guide the student in this endeavor.

The student should work with the committee chair to develop a system for reviewing drafts and for sharing drafts with other committee members at appropriate times. The student should allow the faculty members at least two weeks for a thorough reading of the last draft. The student should submit drafts of the dissertation to committee members in appropriately typed form. The completed final draft also includes the abstract, copyright page, title page, acknowledgments, table of contents, list of tables and figures, references, and appendices.

The student will submit the manuscript to committee members for a final reading. The final dissertation may take a variety of forms depending upon the type of research undertaken and as approved by the Dissertation Chair. The conventional five-chapter dissertation, consisting of an Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion may be altered to reflect more appropriately a specific research design. [A Guidelines for Dissertations will be available on the CSUB DPEL website]

The Final Oral Defense

Prior to scheduling the Final Oral Defense, the student’s committee should carry out a thorough review of the completed dissertation to ensure that the manuscript will be ready for final typing following the Defense. Form 10 [Scheduling of Final Oral Defense of the Dissertation] must be submitted three weeks prior to the defense so the defense can be publicly posted. NOTE: It is the student’s responsibility to set a date for the final defense and acquire faculty signatures, after consultation with the dissertation committee.

At the Final Oral Defense, students will make a public presentation based on their dissertation projects. The details of place and time for dissertation presentations will be publicly announced in order to permit interested faculty and students to attend and ask questions. The announcement of the student’s Final Oral Defense must be posted at least one week in advance of this formal meeting. The DPEL administrative office staff will not post the student’s Final Oral Defense until he/she has an approved DPEL Form 10 [Scheduling of the Final Oral Defense of the Dissertation]. This examination may be scheduled to take place on campus during the academic year either during a semester or the intercession. Orals can be scheduled at other times upon approval of the committee, the DPEL Director, and the Dean of Social Sciences and Education.

The Final Oral Defense is conducted as an open forum guided by the candidate’s chairperson and Dissertation committee. The purpose of this formal meeting are threefold: 1) to examine and assess the quality of the dissertation; 2) to evaluate the ability of the student to present work; and, 3) to provide an opportunity to share the work with the campus community.
There are three possible outcomes of the Final Oral Defense:

- The Defense is satisfactory and the manuscript is accepted as submitted with only minor copy editing revisions. The Dissertation Committee members sign DPEL Form 11 [Report of the Final Examination and Filing of the Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership], and may, at this time, also sign the Committee Membership/Approval Page.

- The Defense is satisfactory, but the need for substantive revisions of the manuscript is apparent. The Committee members sign DPEL Form 11, but withhold their signatures from the Committee Membership/Approval Page until changes have been made that satisfy the requirements of all members.

- The Defense is judged to be unsatisfactory. This decision may be reached because the dissertation is judged to be acceptable but the student fails to present it satisfactorily or because the dissertation is unacceptable. Committee members do not sign the DPEL Form 11 or the Committee Membership/Approval Page. A second Oral Defense may be scheduled when the Chair finds that the student is prepared and the committee members agree that the required remediation has been accomplished.

**Policy on Graduates Participating In Graduation Ceremonies**

Students will be permitted to participate in Graduation Ceremonies (including Hooding and Commencement) only after final changes have been made to the dissertation as required by the committee; the Dissertation Committee Chair has signed all forms related to the completion of the dissertation; and the final dissertation document has been sent to the Division of Graduate Studies for final review. Students must also meet department timelines pertaining to graduation.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This manual sets forth the requirements for the preparation and submission of dissertations for the California State University, Bakersfield Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (CSUB DPEL). It is the student’s responsibility to prepare the dissertation in accordance with the instructions in this manual.

The scholarly work done by the student prior to the final preparation of the dissertation is outside the province of this manual. It is assumed that once the research is complete, a final draft is examined and approved by the dissertation chair and the candidate’s dissertation committee. At that point, the candidate is ready to prepare a document for final submission to the CSUB Office of Academic Programs.

The language in which all dissertations are written will be English. This manual also assumes that every dissertation will demonstrate effective communication skills. It is the responsibility of the student that the dissertation demonstrates clarity, correctness, and organization. A student may use the assistance of a professional editor if he or she receives the prior approval of the research advisor; the editorial assistance is limited to the use of language and not to subject matter content or meaning; and all editorial assistance is acknowledged in the preface of the final document.

Characteristics that a dissertation will demonstrate are:

- The establishment of a historical context for the presentation of an innovative and creative approach to the problem analysis and solution.
- A clear understanding of the problem area as revealed by analysis and synthesis of a broad literature base.
- A well-defined research design.
• Clarity in composition and careful documentation.

• Results of sufficient merit to be published in refereed journals or to form the basis of a book or monograph; sufficient detail so that other scholars can build on it in subsequent work.

• The preparation of the author to assume a position within the profession.

Questions regarding dissertation format that are not answered in this manual should be directed to the Director of the Doctoral program in Educational Leadership.

Students should consult the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* for complete style information (reference format, table and figure layout, special language, numbers, abbreviations, etc.).
CHAPTER 2: FINAL PREPARATION AND PROCEDURES

Submission of Paper Documents

Upon passing the final defense of the dissertation, candidates for the degree of Doctor of Education must submit the completed and signed Report of the Final Examination and Filing of the Dissertation (Form 11) to the program office. The Report of the Final Examination form must include the typed names of the committee members and dissertation chair and the signatures of each member on that committee.

Students must also submit the final publication copy of the dissertation, which includes the original, signed paper copy of the Committee Membership/Approval Page, to the Dissertation/Thesis office in the CSUB State Division of Graduate Studies. Instructions for preparation of the dissertation follow:

Document Preparation

Print Requirements

1. Text must be set in 13-point Times New Roman. Script fonts are not acceptable. (The CSUB State Dissertation/Thesis office provides a formatting template for your use that will govern the appearance of the dissertation.)

2. All dissertations must be clean and carefully reproduced; pages that are crooked or that have gray edges, streaks, or spots are not acceptable.

3. All type must be sharp, clear, and unbroken. Visible differences in quality or contrast of print resulting from a faulty or worn printer are unacceptable and will require a reprinting of those portions of the dissertation.
Paper Requirements

The original publication copy may be printed on regular copy paper, as it will be sent to ProQuest/UMI for filming. Publication copies for binding and library placement must be printed on archive-quality (20 lb./25% cotton) laser paper. The dissertation/thesis consultant in the CSUB State Division of Graduate Studies will oversee the printing and duplication process for you.

Margins

1. The text of the document must be left justified.
2. The left margin will be set at 1.5”. The top margin will be set at 1.2”. The bottom and right margins will be 1”. Tables and figures use the same margins as text.
3. Headings (i.e., titles of pages, chapter titles) and running text will be set at exactly 24 points below the page number.
4. A subheading at the bottom of a page will be followed by at least two full lines of type. If space does not permit two lines plus a 1” margin, the subheading will begin on the next page. Similarly, a new paragraph toward the bottom of a page will run for at least two lines or be started on the next page. The final few words of a paragraph will not be continued on the next page. At least two full lines of type are required to continue a paragraph on the next page.

Pagination

1. Each page must be numbered, with the exception of the Title Page, which counts as page i but does not show a number.
2. The preliminary pages—including the Abstract, Copyright Page, Committee Membership/Approval Page, Acknowledgement, Table of Contents, List of Tables, and List of Figures—will be numbered with lower-case Roman
numerals (ii, iii, iv, etc.) centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page. The first page that will show a page number is page ii.

3. All remaining pages—including text, illustrations, appendices, and references—carry consecutive Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3, etc.). The page number will be placed in the upper right-hand corner of the page, right aligned, 0.83” from the top edge and 1” from the right edge.

Spacing

1. The text of the document will be “exactly 24 points” (per the dissertation template).

2. Exceptions are made for the following material, which will be single-spaced:
   - Table and figure captions
   - Tabular material as necessary
   - Appendix material as appropriate

3. Quoted material of over 40 words calls for block quote format: Indent 0.83” from the left margin and carry out to the right margin. Text of block quotes will be set at “exactly 24 points.” (Use the “Block Quote (APA)” style in the template.)

4. References will be set at exactly 24 points (“References” style in template.)

Centering

Centered material is to be centered between the left and right margins.

Indentation

The first line of all paragraphs of running text will be indented 0.5”.

References

1. Citation forms must be consistent with the most recent edition of the

2. All dissertations will have a References section (see Reference Material on page 19).

**Tables and Figures**

**Definitions**

1. The word “Table” is used for tabular data in the body of the dissertation and in the appendices.
2. The word “Figure” designates all other illustrative material used in the body and in the appendices, including, for example, graphs, charts, drawings, images, and diagrams.

**Preparation**

1. All figures and tables, including numbers and captions, will fit within a 6” by 9” area in order to comply with margin regulations.
2. Where material for figures and tables is too large to fit within margin requirements, it may be reduced either by xerography or by means available to the word processing programs (reduction of point size in fonts). Care must be taken that the final reduction be clear and legible.
3. Page numbers, table titles, and figure captions must be the same size as the rest of the text (not reduced).

**Placement**

1. Tables and figures that must be positioned horizontally (landscaped) will face the outer edge of the page, with the widest margin at the binding edge.
2. Tables and figures less than one half-page in length will be included on the same page with the text whenever possible, separated from the text above or below by double spacing. If they exceed a half-page in length, they will
be placed on a separate page. Two or more small tables or figures may be placed on a single page.

3. Table numbers and titles will be consistent with APA format.
4. Figure numbers and captions will be consistent with APA format.
5. The placement of the table or figure does not affect the position of the page number (see Pagination on page 3).

**Numbering**

1. Tables and figures appearing in the body of the paper must be referred to in the text, and will follow as closely as possible the first reference to them.
2. Tables and figures are numbered in separate series. Each table and figure, including any in the appendices, has a number in its own series. Each series is numbered consecutively in Arabic numerals (e.g., Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12); or within chapters (e.g., Figure 10.1, Figure 10.2, Figure 10.3).
3. Each table and figure will be separately numbered. Figures will be complete on one page.
4. If a table continues to the following page, the top line should read “Table 10 (continued).” The title is not repeated. Column headings should be repeated.

**Titles and Captions**

1. Tables will be identified by the word “Table” and be numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals. Double space after the table number and type the table title in italics. Capitalize all major words of the table title, including prepositions of four or more letters (e.g., use “With” and “Between” and “of” and “to”). See the APA manual for sample table titles.
2. Figures will be identified by the word “Figure” and be numbered consecutively using Arabic numerals. The word “Figure” and its
corresponding number are typed in italics. Captions for figures are continued on the same line as the figure number. The captions are not italicized. Figure captions are placed below the figure and must follow APA style for capitalization: capitalize only the first word of the caption, any proper noun or adjective, and the first word after a colon. (Page 10 of this manual has a sample figure caption.)

3. These titles/captions will appear in the preliminary pages in the List of Tables or List of Figures (see List of Tables on page 17 and List of Figures on page 19.)

Citations

When referring to a table or figure in the text, the full word and number will be used (e.g., Table 10 or Figure 6). The table or figure reference must precede the table or figure itself.
CHAPTER 3: ARRANGEMENT OF CONTENTS

Every dissertation has three parts: the preliminary pages, the text, and the reference material. Each part has several sections, which are normally arranged in the order they are discussed below.

Elements of the dissertation will be arranged in the following manner:

1. Preliminary Pages
   a. Title page
   b. Abstract
   c. Copyright page
   d. Committee Membership/Approval page
   e. Acknowledgement(s) (optional)
   f. Table of Contents
   g. List of Tables
   h. List of Figures

2. Text (usually divided into chapters and sections)

3. Reference Material
   a. References
   b. Appendix

Preliminary Pages

Title Page

1. All information on the title page is centered (see Figure 1).

2. The title of the dissertation will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin. Words will be used in place of formulas and symbols in the title. The inverted pyramid
TITLE OF DISSERTATION

by

John Lee Doe
B.A. (California State University, Bakersfield) 2001
M.S. (California State University, Bakersfield) 2005

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate in Education

California State University, Bakersfield Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership

California State University, Bakersfield
2015
Figure 1. Example of title page.
form is followed for the title when the title consists of more than one line. If the title is more than one line, double space between the lines.

3. The author’s name will be spelled out in full and must match the name on university records; no middle initials are permitted.

4. A listing of earlier schools and degrees immediately follows the author’s name.

5. The submission statement names the degree sought, the program and school, the university, and the year.

6. The last line of the title page (the year) will be centered 1” from the bottom edge of the page.

7. Do not number the Title Page. The Title Page counts as “i” but the number does not appear.

Abstract

1. An abstract of no more than 350 words in length must appear immediately after the title page in all doctoral dissertations (see Figure 2).

2. The abstract will consist of the dissertation title followed by the text.

3. The abstract will state briefly the problem discussed in the dissertation, describe the research procedures or methodology, and summarize major findings and conclusions. Language should be kept as clear and concise as possible.

4. The abstract will not include footnotes, citations, illustrative materials, or tables.

5. The candidate’s full name as on the title page appears in the right-hand corner of the first page as the first line of text, 0.83” from the top edge and 1” from the right edge of the paper. The month and year the degree is to be conferred appears on the second line below the student’s name.
Figure 2. Example of Abstract form.
“Educational Leadership” appears as the third line of text, below the month/year as the name of the degree program. All three lines above will be right-aligned.

6. The title of the dissertation will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin. The word Abstract appears a double space below the title of the dissertation. The text of the abstract begins at the left margin one triple space below the word Abstract.

7. Abstract pages are numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page.

**Copyright Page**

1. A copyright notice on a dissertation signals to readers that the author holds the copyright registration. Registration establishes a public record of the copyright. For U.S. publications, registration is required before an infringement lawsuit can be filed. The dissertation/thesis consultant will oversee the University Microfilms International (UMI) copyright registration for this university.

2. Doctoral candidates should obtain the UMI information packet from the Director of the Doctoral program in Educational Leadership.

3. Candidates should sign on the appropriate form line and pay the requisite fee.

4. The copyright notice will appear on a page immediately following the abstract with the following text centered in the middle of the page:
5. The copyright page is numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page.

6. Inclusion of copyrighted materials in a dissertation requires that the student obtain a letter from the copyright owner authorizing use of the materials. The letter must also state that the copyright owner is aware that Proquest/UMI will microfilm the dissertation and may sell copies of it on demand. One copy of each copyright permission letter must be submitted with the dissertation to ProQuest/UMI before it can be published in the dissertation. This letter can be found on the “Thesis” section of the Division of Graduate Studies website.

**Committee Membership/Approval Page**

1. All information on the Committee Membership/Approval page is centered. (see Figure 3).

2. California State University, Bakersfield are centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin. Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is centered right below the Universities’ names.

3. The candidate’s full name appears after “This dissertation was presented by”.

4. The defense of the dissertation date appears after “It was defended on”.
Figure 3. Example of Committee Membership/Approval page.
5. The Committee Membership/Approval Page must include the names and signatures of the dissertation chair and committee members. Do not provide academic titles (i.e., “Dr.” or “Ph.D.”) before or after committee members’ names.

6. The committee chair must be listed first, with the name typed below the line, followed by the designation “Chair”.

7. Names of the remaining committee members will be placed in order accordance to committee preference, with the name of each member typed below each line.

8. The full department name is centered under each committee member’s name.

9. The Committee Membership/Approval Page is numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page.

Acknowledgement(s)

1. The heading ACKNOWLEDGEMENT or ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin; double space below it to the text.

2. The acknowledgement is optional and, if used, should be brief. Acknowledgements in the form of a brief statement of appreciation for special assistance or support, including research and editorial assistance, are what will be included in this section.

3. Acknowledgement pages are numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page.

Table of Contents

1. See Figure 4 for an example of the Table of Contents.
2. The heading TABLE OF CONTENTS will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin; double space below it to the text. The actual listing (text) begins at the left margin.

3. The titles of chapters are listed in the Table of Contents, as well as those of all subdivisions.

4. Indentation in the Table of Contents reflects the level of each division, as shown in Figure 4.

5. Wording, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation in the Table of Contents must be identical to that of the actual titles in the body of the dissertation.

6. Table of Contents pages are numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page.

7. All material following the Table of Contents is listed, with the exception of lists of tables and figures which are listed separately (see List of Tables on page 17 and List of Figures on page 19). Material that precedes the Table of Contents (e.g., Title Page, Committee Membership/Approval Page, etc.) is not listed.

List of Tables

1. The heading LIST OF TABLES will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin; double space below it to the text. The listing of tables (text) begins at the left margin.

2. Wording, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation in the List of Tables will be identical to that of the titles that appear on the tables in the text.
### TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION** .................................................................

**CHAPTER** .............................................................................

**ANOTHER CHAPTER** .............................................................

  A section of the second chapter ............................................

  Another section ....................................................................

    Subsection of the section..................................................

    Another subsection.........................................................

  Another section ....................................................................

    Subsection of the section..................................................

    Another subsection.........................................................

**ANOTHER CHAPTER** .............................................................

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION** ............................................... 

**APPENDIX A. TITLE OF THE FIRST APPENDIX** ....................... 

---

*Figure 4. Example of Table of Contents.*
3. The List of Tables pages are numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page and continues the numbering from the last page of the Table of Contents.

**List of Figures**

1. The heading LIST OF FIGURES will appear in capital letters. This heading is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin; double space below it to the text. The listing of figures (text) begins at the left margin.

2. Wording, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation in the List of Figures will be identical to that of the captions that appear on the figures in the text.

3. The List of Figures pages are numbered with small Roman numerals centered 0.83” from the bottom edge of the page and continues the numbering from the last page of the List of Tables.

**Text**

**Chapters and Divisions**

1. Each chapter starts on a new page, with the chapter number and title in capital letters. This title is centered and dropped by exactly 24 points from the top margin; double space below it to the text. See example below.

   **CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION**

2. Level 1 section headings are centered, boldface and written in title case (lower and uppercase letters), separated by double spaces from the text above and the text below. See example below.
**Background**

3. Level 2 headings are flush left, boldface, written in title case, and are separated by double spaces from the surrounding text. See example below.

**History**

4. Level 3 headings are indented, boldface, lowercase paragraph headings ending with a period. See example below.

**Participants in the study.** The text continues after the heading.

5. Level 4 headings are indented, boldface, italicized lowercase paragraph headings ending with a period. See example below. See example below.

*Sleep-deprived group.* Text . . . .

See Table 3.1, p. 62 of the APA 6th edition for format of headings.

6. The first line of all paragraphs of running text will be indented 0.5”.

7. The division headings and subheadings are not numbered.

8. The following are normally the chapter titles and section headings of the dissertation:

   - Chapter 1: Introduction
   - Purpose of the Study
   - Background
   - Context of the Study
   - Significance of the Study
   - Theoretical Framework
   - Definitions
   - Summary
   - Chapter 2: Review of the Literature
   - Chapter 3: Methodology
Purpose of the Study
Research Design
Research Questions
Participants/Sample
Data Collection
Instrumentation
Pilot Study
Procedures
Data Analysis
Limitations
Summary
Chapter 4: Results/Outcomes
  Review of Methodology
  Results of Research Questions
  Summary of the Findings
Chapter 5: Discussion/Summary/Conclusion
  Summary of Findings
  Discussion of Research Question
  Recommendations
  Implications for Practice
  Implications for Future Research

9. Dissertations that are qualitative in nature may use different chapter titles
   and/or section headings as approved by the dissertation chair and
   committee.

10. If the previously published material by the student is included in the body
    of the document, it must be presented in a manner consistent with the
remainder of the text (i.e., identical typeface, margins, and consistent numbering of tables, figures, and footnotes). Reference citations should be integrated with those for the rest of the document.

11. If the previously published material is placed in the appendix, its size will be adjusted to ensure that the margins are sufficient to support microfilming. Appended previously published material will retain the originally published numbers for tables, figures, footnotes, and bibliographic entries.

Reference Material

References

1. Any books, articles, websites or other published sources (retrievable data) that have been used (cited in the text) either in direct quotation or by reference, must be listed in the References. Personal interviews/raw data (not retrievable) do not appear in the reference list.

2. The heading REFERENCES will appear on the first page of the References itself, centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin. The actual listing of sources begins at the left margin one double space below the word REFERENCES.

3. The list of sources is set at “exactly 24 points” (per “References” style in the template). The first line of the citation starts at the left margin and the second and subsequent lines of that citation are indented 0.5”.

4. The American Psychological Association Publication Manual should be used to format the references.

5. The References continues the page numbering sequence that began with chapter 1.
Appendices

1. Appendices contain supplementary or illustrative material or explanatory data too lengthy to be included in the text or not immediately essential to the reader’s understanding of the text.

2. Each appendix will be listed with its title in the Table of Contents (e.g., APPENDIX A. TITLE OF THE APPENDIX).

3. If there is only one appendix, the heading APPENDIX will be used. If more than one appendix is needed, the appendices may be divided into APPENDIX A, APPENDIX B, etc. Each appendix must begin at the top of a new page. The heading for each appendix is centered and dropped by a double space from the top margin followed by the title of the appendix, centered and separated by double spaces from the surrounding text. The title is written in capital letters.

4. The appendices continue the page numbering sequence that began with chapter 1.
CHECKLIST FOR DISSERTATION SUBMISSION

☐ A final publication copy of the dissertation. Student must verify that all pages are presented in correct numerical order and the proper size and orientation; that all tables and figures are present; that all references cited in the text are listed in the References; and, that the Table of Contents lists correct page numbers and titles.

☐ Completed and signed Report of the Final Examination and Filing of the Dissertation. The Report of the Final Examination form must include the typed names of the committee members and dissertation chair and the original signatures of each member on that committee.

☐ One copy of the Committee Membership/Approval page. This page must include the original signatures of each member on that committee.

☐ Completed and signed UMI Forms & Instructions (included in the Dissertation Submission packet obtained from the Director).

☐ Nonexclusive Distribution License form (included in the Dissertation Submission packet) for inclusion of the dissertation in the Dissertation/Thesis Scholar.

☐ Copyright permission letter(s) from the copyright owner(s) must be included if copyrighted material is used. A sample permission letter can be obtained from the Academic Programs website.
## APPENDIX A. CSUB DPEL WRITTEN DISSERTATION RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1 Introduction</th>
<th>2 Review of Literature</th>
<th>3 Methods / Approach</th>
<th>4 Results / Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, &amp; findings. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend. Not comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, &amp; findings. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Not comprehensive.</td>
<td>Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend. Not comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Somewhat comprehensive.</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, &amp; findings. Somewhat comprehensive.</td>
<td>Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Somewhat comprehensive.</td>
<td>Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend. Somewhat comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend. Comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, &amp; findings. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses. Comprehensive.</td>
<td>All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend. Comprehensive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Score 1:** Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Comprehensive.
- **Score 2:** Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused. Comprehensive.
- **Score 3:** Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Somewhat comprehensive.
- **Score 4:** Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear. Somewhat comprehensive.
- **Score 5:** Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear. Not comprehensive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 Discussion/Summary/Conclusions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes.Displayed poor grasp of understanding.Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.</td>
<td>Major topics or concepts inaccurately described.Considerable relevant discussion missing.Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.</td>
<td>Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions.Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes. Somewhat comprehensive.</td>
<td>Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly engaging or thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area.Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, but included no recommendations.Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.Comprehensive.</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Writing Quality</td>
<td>The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 5th edition APA.</td>
<td>The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 5th edition APA conventions.</td>
<td>The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 5th edition APA conventions.</td>
<td>The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 5th edition APA.</td>
<td>The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 5th edition APA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
## APPENDIX B: CSUB DPEL ORAL DISSERTATION DEFENSE RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Organization</strong></td>
<td>Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time.</td>
<td>Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well timed.</td>
<td>Some information presented out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.</td>
<td>Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.</td>
<td>Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Originality</strong></td>
<td>Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach inappropriate and/or ignored previous well-established work in area.</td>
<td>Problem/purpose limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.</td>
<td>Problem/purpose moderately original and creative. Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative.</td>
<td>Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach appropriate or innovative.</td>
<td>Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced new or expanded on established ideas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Significance/ Authenticity</strong></td>
<td>Project has no significance/authenticity to field and will make no contribution.</td>
<td>Project has little relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make little contribution.</td>
<td>Project only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.</td>
<td>Project has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make good contribution.</td>
<td>Project extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Discussion/ Summary/ Conclusions</strong></td>
<td>Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.</td>
<td>Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.</td>
<td>Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.</td>
<td>Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations.</td>
<td>Discussion was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Delivery</td>
<td>Presenter unsettled, uninterested, and unenthusied. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance.</td>
<td>Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.</td>
<td>Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.</td>
<td>Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.</td>
<td>Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced presentation/performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

| Student’s Name: _______________________________ | Reviewer’s Name: _______________________________ | Date: _________________ |
APPENDIX C. CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING DISSERTATIONS

CSUB Doctoral Program in Educational
Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations

Directions: This form is designed to be used both as a student “self-assessment” tool and as the summative evaluation of the student’s final dissertation product. The student can use the tool to determine the degree to which their dissertation meets the criteria as outlined below. This form will also be used as the student’s summative evaluation of their dissertation product and will be completed by each committee member and given to the student at the end of their final defense.

Each criterion is cross referenced with both of the rubrics designed for the oral defense and the written dissertation.

I. Dissertation Format Quality Assessment

A. Selecting a Topic of Study

___Yes ___No ___N/A  Is the topic researchable given time, resources, and availability of data? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  Is there personal interest in the topic in order to sustain attention? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  Will the results of the study be of interest to others? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity, Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Introduction, Methods/Approach, Results/Outcomes, Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  Is the topic likely to be publishable in a scholarly journal? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity, Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Introduction, Methods/Approach, Results/Outcomes, Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the study a) fill a void, b) replicate, c) extend, or d) develop new ideas in the scholarly literature? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction, Methods/Approach, Results/Outcome, Discussion/Summary/Conclusion, Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Title of the Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are unnecessary words eliminated? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a double title, is the colon in the correct place? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the title no longer than 12 words? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are articles and prepositions eliminated? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the title include the focus or topic of the study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the title brief? (Oral: Discussion &amp; summary; Written: Discussion and Summary, Writing Quality)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For Quantitative Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the study identify a theory, model, or conceptual framework to be tested in the study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the study state whether the independent and dependent variables will be related or whether two or more groups will be compared in terms of the dependent variable(s)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the study illustrate an effect or relationship? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction, Discussion &amp; Summary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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D. For Qualitative Studies

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the study add to the further understanding of the topic? (Oral: Originality; Written: Methods/Approach, Discussion and Summary)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the study use words that convey an emerging design because of the inductive mode of the qualitative research process? (Written: Introduction, Methods / Approach)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the study eliminate words that suggest a directional approach to the study if a qualitative methodology? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods /Approach, Discussion and Summary)

II. Dissertation Content Quality Assessment

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

A. Introduction

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction set the stage for the entire study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction create reader interest in the topic? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction establish the problem that leads to the study (see Problem Statement)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction place the study within the larger context of the scholarly research? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction reach out to a specific audience? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the introduction conclude with a statement of purpose? (Oral: Discussion & Summary)
B. Purpose of the Study

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Is the purpose concise and to the point? (Oral: Organization, Discussion & Summary; Written: Introduction, Methods/Approach, Results/Outcome)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does the purpose use such words as “purpose, intent, and objective” to call attention to this statement as a central controlling idea in a study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction, Methods/Approach, Results/Outcomes)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does the purpose clearly mention the central concept or idea being expressed? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction, Methods / Approach, Results/Outcomes)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does the purpose provide a general definition of the central concept or idea? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does the purpose include words denoting the method of inquiry to be used in data collection, analysis, and the process of research? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does the purpose mention the unit of analysis or research site? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

C. Statement of the Problem

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does problem statement stimulate interest in your study? (Oral: Originality, Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does problem statement convey an issue to which a broad readership can relate? (Oral: Originality; Written: Introduction)

___Yes ___No ___N/A  
Does problem statement specify the problem leading to the study? (Oral: Originality; Written: Introduction)
Does problem statement indicate why the problem is important by giving a historical/theoretical background? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

Does problem statement avoid using idiomatic expressions or trite phrases? (Oral: Organization; Written: Writing Quality)

### D. Significance of the Study

Does the significance of the study set the stage for the entire study? (Oral: Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

Does the significance of the study create reader interest in the topic? (Oral: Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

Does the significance of the study establish the same problem that leads to the study and was identified in the Purpose of the Study (Oral: Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

Does the significance of the study place the study within the larger context of the scholarly research? (Oral: Significance/Authenticity; Written: Introduction)

Does the significance of the study reach out to a specific audience? (Oral: Significance/Authenticity Written: Introduction)

### E. Definition of Terms

Are all terms that individuals outside the field of study may not understand defined? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

Are all terms defined when they first appear? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)

Are all terms that need defining included in this section? (Oral: Organization; Written: Introduction)
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW

F. Literature Review

___Yes ___No ___N/A Is the literature review organized around and related directly to the thesis or research question developed in the Introduction? (Oral: Organization; Written: Review of Literature)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review contain ample research studies to highlight ways in which the problem has been or might be studied? (Written: Review of Literature. Methodology)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review synthesize results into a summary of what is and is not known? (Written: Review of Literature, Discussion and Summary)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review identify areas of controversy in the literature? (Written: Review of Literature)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review formulate questions that need further research? (Written: Review of Literature, Discussion and Summary)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review place each work in the context of its contribution to the understanding of the subject under review? (Written: Review of Literature)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review describe the relationship of each work to the others under consideration? (Written: Review of Literature)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review identify areas of prior scholarship to prevent duplication of effort? (Written: Review of Literature)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the literature review point the way forward for further research? (Written: Review of Literature)
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Does the literature review place one's original work (in the case of theses or dissertations) in the context of existing literature? (Written: Review of Literature)

Is the literature review organized into categories or themes? (Written: Review of Literature)

Does the literature review have its own introduction, body, and concluding sections? (Written: Review of Literature, Writing Quality)

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

G. Purpose of the Study

Does the Methodology include a description of the purpose of the study that is consistent with the purpose as outlined in Chapter 1?

H. Research Design

Does the methodology identify the specific type of research design selected (e.g., case studies, grounded theory, quasi-experimental design, etc.)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology section include a discussion of the type of methodology used (e.g., quantitative or qualitative)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology explain the purpose of the method using citations? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology explain why that method was selected? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)
I. Research Questions

Yes  No  N/A  Is (are) the research question (questions) clearly stated? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Is (are) the research question (questions) specific in its (their) focus? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Does (do) the research question (questions) match with the intended methodology? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

J. Participants/Sample

Yes  No  N/A  Does the methodology describe the population of the study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Does the methodology identify and explain the sampling design using citations? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Does the methodology explain why that sampling design was selected? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Is the sampling design appropriate to the methodology selected? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Yes  No  N/A  Is the sample described in enough detail to understand who is included in this study but in a manner that still maintains confidentiality? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

K. Data Collection/Procedures

Yes  No  N/A  Does the methodology detail the steps of how, when, and who will collect and analyze the data? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)
Does the methodology describe how data will be triangulated, if applicable? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology describe, in detail, how confidentiality of subjects will be maintained throughout every aspect of the study? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology describe how findings will be validated or audited, if applicable? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach, Discussion & Summary)

L. Instrumentation

Does the methodology describe the instruments or data extraction and manner in which the data will be collected using citations? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology describe how the instruments or variable selected were selected and/or designed using citations? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Does the methodology explain, using data, how valid and reliable the instruments are (if applicable)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

Are the instruments contained in the appendix? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

M. Pilot Test

Does the methodology explain how the instruments were piloted/tested (if applicable)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)
N. Data Analysis

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the methodology identify and describe how data will be analyzed using citations? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methods/Approach)

O. Limitations

___Yes ___No ___N/A Are all the potential weaknesses of the study described? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methodology)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Are the limitations appropriate to the methodology? (Oral: Organization; Written: Methodology)

CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS/OUTCOMES

P. Results and Outcomes

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the Results and Outcomes section begin with a review of the methodology? (Oral: Discussion and Summary; Written: Results and Outcomes)

Q. Summary of the Findings

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the Results and Outcomes report key findings of the study? (Oral: Discussion and Summary; Written: Results and Outcomes)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Are key findings supported by references to the data? (Oral: Discussion and Summary; Written: Results and Outcomes)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Do key findings address the research questions or hypothesis? (Oral: Organization, Discussion and Summary; Written: Methodology, Results and Outcomes)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Are key findings reported in an organized manner (such as by research question or hypotheses)? (Oral: Organization; Written: Results and Outcomes)
___Yes ___No ___N/A If found, are key findings that contradict each other reported? (Oral: Organization; Written: Results and Outcomes)

CHAPTER 5 – SUMMARY/ CONCLUSIONS/DISCUSSION

R. Summary of Findings

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does this section begin with a summary of the primary interpretation of the findings and the conclusion? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

S. Conclusions

___Yes ___No ___N/A Is literature used to contradict or affirm the interpretation of findings and conclusion? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Is the conclusion affirmed by the findings? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Are conclusions presented in an organized manner (such as by research question or hypotheses)? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions, Delivery; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

T. Discussion

___Yes ___No ___N/A Does the discussion proceed in an organized manner (such as by research question or hypotheses)? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions, Delivery; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

___Yes ___No ___N/A Is the theory or hypothesis that was tested affirmed or denied? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)
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Do the findings and their interpretation support the conclusion regarding the theory or hypothesis? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

Do you address what your data do not tell you about your research questions? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

Are the recommendations based on the findings? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

What are the key recommendations for practice? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

What are the key recommendations for future research on this topic? (Oral: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions; Written: Discussion/Summary/Conclusions)

Does the Abstract contain the purpose of the study? (Written: Writing Quality)

Does the Abstract contain the study population? (Written: Writing Quality)

Does the Abstract summarize the methodology? (Written: Writing Quality)

Does the Abstract summarize the primary finding? (Written: Writing Quality)

Does the Abstract summarize the significance of the study? (Written: Writing Quality)
Is the Abstract less than 120 words (APA)?

(Written: Writing Quality)

Program Description
The purpose of the Doctoral program in Educational leadership is to enhance the talents and skills of individuals who plan to devote their lives to the implementation of educational practices informed by research. The program provides students with a broad view of educational problems and a strong background in social science theory. In addition, the program prepares students to conduct and interpret inquiries on which sound educational policy and practice can be anchored.

Students in the program benefit from the teaching and research expertise of established scholars and practitioners. The faculty hail from a number of academic disciplines including educational administration, teacher education, social work, business, English, and sociology, as well as from surrounding school districts.

All courses are taught in Bakersfield and are held during the late afternoons, evenings, and/or weekends to accommodate full-time working professionals. There are two tracks within the program: one for students who hope to apply their leadership knowledge and skills in P-12 educational settings, and the other for students who hope to apply their knowledge and skills to community college/higher education settings.

Admission Requirements and Application
Students are admitted in yearly cohorts that move through the program together. All students are admitted to the program for Fall semester only.

Applying to the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is a two-part process. First, students must apply to the University through an online application found at CSUMentor.edu. Second, students must apply to the program using Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership application forms found on our website. The application deadline, which varies slightly each year, and more detailed instructions for applying to the program may also be found on our website [to be created after standalone program is approved for CSUB]. Students must be admitted to both the University and the Educational Leadership program to enroll in the program.

The following minimum requirements must be met to be eligible for admission to the program:
1. Master’s degree from an accredited institution
2. Grade point average of at least 3.0 in upper-division undergraduate and master’s degree coursework
3. Submission of Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores on the three general GRE areas, taken within the last five years
4. Sufficient preparation, graduate training, and experience in educational leadership to benefit from the program
5. Demonstrated educational leadership potential and skills including successful experience in school, postsecondary, community, and/or policy leadership
6. Demonstrated academic excellence, problem-solving ability, and interest in critically assessing and bringing about improvements in current educational policies and practices
7. Positive review of other application materials including three letters of recommendation, a written statement of purpose, examples of professional writing, a statement of support from the applicant’s employer, and a personal interview with the Admissions Committee.

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is a competitive program with limited space available for students in each cohort. Meeting the minimum eligibility requirements for admission does not guarantee admission to the program.

**Transfer Credits**
Graduate credit from another accredited college or university may be applied toward the fulfillment of requirements in the student’s graduate program at CSUB, if accepted by the faculty of the DPEL Graduate Group. In addition, graduate-level work taken through Extended University may be used to satisfy prerequisite requirements or specific degree requirements when such work is approved in advance by the Director of the DPEL.

A maximum of 9 semester units from another college or university or from Extended University may be accepted toward the DPEL, and all such units must satisfy the time limit requirements specified by the graduate program.

Any units accepted by the program may be counted toward the specialization courses and may not be counted towards completion of the core courses. Courses must be graduate-level courses with a grade of B or better. Course syllabi, catalog descriptions of the courses, and a copy of the transcript showing the posted grades for the courses must be submitted to the program director along with the request to accept the transfer credits.

**Other Graduate Policies**
The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership uses the CSUB Division of Graduate Program’s general policies for academic issues not specified elsewhere (e.g., planned educational leave, unauthorized leave of absence, time limits for completing the graduate program).

**Student Classifications**

**Classified Graduate Student**
Students will be admitted to the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership as a Classified Graduate Student, or advanced from Conditionally Classified, if they meet all requirements for admission listed in the previous section.
Conditionally Classified Graduate student
Students will be admitted as Conditionally Classified if they are deficient in one or more of the admission requirements listed about, but in the judgment of Admissions Committee, will be able to remedy their deficiencies in a timely manner. Students must remedy their deficiencies before they enter Phase 2 (Specialization Phase) of the program or sit for the qualifying examination. Some common deficiencies that cause a student to be Conditionally Classified are the lack of GRE scores or official transcripts documenting a student’s undergraduate grade point average.

Advancement to Candidacy
Student who have completed all core courses, passed the qualifying exam (which is based on core course content), and received a positive recommendation from the Graduate Group will be advanced to candidacy. Students may not register for dissertation units until they have been advanced to candidacy.

Requirements for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
Students in the program move through three phases of study, comprising 60 units. Phase one involves nine core courses, phase two involves seven specialization courses, and phase three involves the dissertation. All students move through phase one as a cohort. In phase two students may choose to specialize in pre-K-12 or post-secondary educational leadership with courses focusing on a variety of topics including organizational studies, supervision, curriculum and instruction, assessment and evaluation, and sociocultural contexts.

Phase 1 Core (27 units)
EDLD 6010, 6020, 6030, 6040, 6060, 6070, 6080, 6090, 6110

Phase 2 Specialization (21 units)
EDLD 6770 (Specialization Topics repeated for credit with different topics)

Phase 3 Dissertation (12 units)
EDLD 6900 (repeated twice for credit)
Courses in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL)

EDLD 6010. Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Combines alternatives views of organizational theory with application to the structure of the school; to critical roles played by teachers, principals and other school personnel; and to examine the relationships among structural elements of schools.

EDLD 6020. Educational Reform (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines change in education settings in the context of organizational theory, structure, and culture; change processes; and change leadership strategies and styles. K-12 educational settings and higher education settings are used to test theories and change strategies.

EDLD 6030. Educational Policy Environments (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Determinants of policy in educational organizations and leadership. Analysis of structures used for legal, fiscal and political decisions and conflict management. Role of the educational leader in relation to intergovernmental activities aimed at educational reform.

EDLD 6040. Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines advanced research methodologies and data analysis techniques applicable to education and social science settings. Topics include experimental and quasi-experimental design, advanced statistical techniques, sampling distributions, nonparametric statistics, inference and hypothesis testing. Specific applications to the work of the education leader.

EDLD 6060. Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL and EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020. Seminar. Students will develop the philosophical and analytical skills to examine curriculum theory and practice, including the conceptualization of purposes of the organization of subjects matters, and of the instructional methods.

EDLD 6070. Applied Qualitative Research Methods (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines the purpose and nature of qualitative research including current applications in educational settings. Emphasis is directed toward critical analysis of current qualitative studies and will include field-based application.
EDLD 6080. Theories of Cross-Cultural Education (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Designed to explain and discuss the most relevant theoretical approaches dealing with cross-cultural, multicultural education. As diverse and conflicting perspectives are examined, students will experience the complexity of views and perceptions that leaders must address when working with multicultural populations coexisting in a pluralistic society.

EDLD 6090. Advanced Applied Educational Research and Measurement (3)

Prerequisite: Classified standing in DPEL. Review of approaches to designing and conducting educational research, including ethical issues. Emphasis on reading and evaluating research literature, and designing research projects. Psychometric theory, validity and reliability of tests, professional testing standards, hands-on experience with test evaluation are included.

EDLD 6110. Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Examines assessment practices, planning strategies, and evaluation processes in K-12 and higher education settings. Addresses current issues and trends in the field of education related to school accountability.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Examples of specialization topics offered at least once before are described below.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Leadership for Reading Instruction (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Students analyze forces driving reading/language arts mandates and their impact on the implementation of reading curricula. Using philosophical and corporate underpinnings of the "Reading Wars" students discover the praxis between theory, research, and practice.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Human Resource Leadership in Schools (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Application of Human Resource Management Theory, empirical findings, and best practices to school leadership. HR theories and practices including recruitment, staffing, motivation, performance management, and development are examined emphasizing the strategic role of HR in enhancing organizational effectiveness.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Resource Management and Fiscal Planning (3)
Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Develops advanced skills to effectively manage internal and external resources within the school setting. The course provides an overview for leveraging external resources, obtaining grants, developing external partners, and examining issues and studies related to financing public education.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Law (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Examination of Federal Law, California Ed. Code, California Code of Regulation, and program implementation. Freedom of expression, separation of church and state, personnel law, liability, governance requirements, and special education are covered.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Educational Leadership (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan, EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020, EDLD 6030, EDLD 6040, EDLD 6060, EDLD 6070, EDLD 6080, and EDLD 6110. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Topics and issues in educational leadership in the areas of organizational studies, curriculum, instruction and supervision, assessment and evaluation, and sociocultural studies. Analysis of research findings and an emphasis on the relationship of theory to practice.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Human Resources and Collective Bargaining in Higher Education (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Through the study of statutes, regulations, court decisions and case studies students will examine the major functions of human resources, such as: employer-employee relations, performance evaluation, recruitment and selection processes, employee discipline, interpreting bargaining agreement language, prevention of harassment and discrimination. There will be an emphasis on the critical role of human resources in education.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Leaders and Leadership (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. During this course, attention will be focused on the following questions: 1) What is leadership? 2) How does the research literature define leadership generally? Educational leadership? 3) What role does leadership play in the policy-making process? What role does it play in everyday practice? 4) How many notions of leadership changed in recent times? 5) What characteristics make an individual a leader? 6) What are the implications for leaders K-12 and higher education institutions?

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Literacy, Technology, and Disability (3)
Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student's academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This class will survey a range of theories, research and practice in the development of literacy for general and special populations with a special focus on the uses of technology as a tool for literacy development. While we will address a range of research and practices for emergent readers and comprehension, there will be a focus on authentic approaches students can use inside and outside the classroom. Special attention will be paid to the pedagogy of critical comprehension.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Post-secondary Legal Issues (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is designed to expose the student to a wide range of administrative problems at the college and university level that have legal implications. This course should assist current and prospective college and university faculty and administrators in recognizing the legal parameters around which decisions are made. The course will address the legal relationships between the higher education institution and its trustees, administrators, faculty, students, local/state/federal governments, educational associations, and business/industry communities.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Technology in Education (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is designed to explore the effective use of information systems and educational technology in administration, management and instruction in post-secondary education. Students will be able to plan, design, implement and evaluate a cost-effective means to apply current technology through leadership, resource allocation, trends, information security, curriculum integration and individual student learning.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Community College Administration (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course provides an understanding and development of knowledge of community college administration with emphasis on the California Community College system. The course combines theory, research, topics, issues, and debates of the profession. Practical applications will be explored while enabling students to develop a knowledge base grounded in current theory and research in community college administration.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Writing for Publication (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is intended to explore the world of publishing for educational research. In this course, students will gain an understanding of how educational researchers prepare manuscripts for publication. Students will also conduct in-depth explorations of the type of publishing venues that exist for the publication of educational researcher, such as: online journals, peer reviewed journals, methodological journals,
theory journals, and practitioner journals. Students will also learn different ways to: engage with journal editors, assess editorial boards of journals, select journals to publish in, and assess journal quality.

EDLD 6850. Individual Study (1-3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL, EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020, EDLD 6030, EDLD 6040, EDLD 6060, EDLD 6070, EDLD 6080, EDLD 6110, and permission of the director. Research for individual doctoral graduate students. CR/NC grading only.

EDLD 6900. Dissertation (3-6)

Prerequisites: advancement to candidacy for the Doctorate in Education and a minimum GPA of 3.0. May be repeated twice for credit. Contact the program office for specific guidelines on completing the dissertation. CR/NC grading only.

EDLD 6910. Dissertation Continuation (0)

Pre-requisite: For continuous enrollment while completing the dissertation. May enroll twice with department approval after three semesters of EDEL 6900. Additional enrollments must be approved by the Director.
Core Concepts and Curriculum Matrix
Indicating Inclusion of Core Curricular Elements in Proposed Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership

Please submit one form each Ed.D. specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Research Methods</th>
<th>Field-Based Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6010. Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
<td>I, IR, IRA</td>
<td>I, I, I, I, I, I, IR</td>
<td>IR, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6020. Educational Reform</td>
<td>IRA, IR</td>
<td>I, I, I, I, I, IR</td>
<td>IR, IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectives for Educational Leadership</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6070. Applied Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>IR</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>IRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6080. Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDLD 6110. Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>IRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*EDLD 6900. Dissertation</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>IRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate:  I = Element is Introduced  R = Element is reinforced  A = Element is addressed at an advanced level

*Note: in EDLD 6770, Specialization Topics, and EDLD 6900, Dissertation, all levels of mastery apply given the depth and breadth in respective fields/topics
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership at CSUB  
DPEL Outcomes Assessment Plan (DOAP)

I. Vision and Mission Statements

Vision

Changing leaders to lead change

Mission

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership prepares leaders with demonstrated potential to transform educational systems and settings that improve the life outcomes of all learners and their communities, and to serve as stewards of the profession.

II. Program and Student Learning Outcomes

Program Outcomes

The program will prepare diverse leaders, committed to social justice, who will:

1. Lead successful educational change and reform for teaching and learning in the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century through ethical, equitable and research-based best practices.
2. Employ critical and systems thinking to identify root causes of complex educational problems and develop meaningful solutions to address educational inequities.
3. Respect and engage diverse families, organizations and communities through collaborative partnerships and networking.
4. Collaborate with others to generate and apply a professional knowledge base that integrates both experiential and research knowledge to inform leadership decisions; be able to undertake appropriate critical inquiry and research studies to inform leadership decisions.
5. Construct and use program evaluations and assessments for the purpose of improving program quality.

Evaluation Questions for Program Outcomes

1. Lead successful educational change and reform for teaching and learning in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century through ethical, equitable, contemporary and research-based best practices:

How does the program prepare transformational leaders to lead educational reform through ethical, equitable, contemporary and research-based best practices?

2. Employ critical and systems thinking to identify root causes of complex educational problems and develop meaningful solutions to address educational inequities:

How does the program prepare candidates to examine complex educational problems through multiple lenses?
How does the program prepare candidates to develop and apply their understanding of how the origin, perpetuation and potential solutions for those problems are supported by various systems (e.g., social, cultural, political, financial, educational)?

3. Respect and engage diverse families, organizations and communities through collaborative partnerships and networking:

   In what ways does the program provide authentic, inclusive engagement with families, organizations and communities to promote equitable, multicultural partnerships?

4. Collaborate with others to generate and apply a professional knowledge base that integrates both experiential and research knowledge to inform leadership decisions; be able to undertake appropriate critical inquiry and research studies to inform leadership decisions:

   How does the program provide candidates with the skills and opportunities to conduct critical inquiry collaboratively generate professional knowledge and implement solutions?

5. Construct and use program evaluations and assessments for the purpose of improving program quality:

   In what ways does the program prepare candidates to construct and use program evaluations and assessments for the purpose of improving program quality?

6. Additional program evaluation question:

   How are the values of social justice, equity and ethics promoted throughout the program?

**Student Learning Outcomes**

Students will be able to:

1.1 Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort
1.2 Identify and navigate ethical complexities of educational leadership
1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to social justice, ethics and equity
1.4 Evaluate and use evolving technologies to inform practice, enhance learning, and increase professional knowledge

2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice
2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and potential solutions
2.3 Assess critically the successes and failures of educational systems
2.4 Analyze systemic and/or root causes of educational inequities and design and implement meaningful solutions
2.5 Align decisions and actions as leaders with stated (and evolving) philosophy of educational leadership

3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader
3.2 Build collaborative partnerships with students, families and communities
3.3 Build collaborative partnerships and networks with colleagues and other professionals
3.4 Create a safe culture and instructional program that is conducive to all students’ learning and staff professional growth

4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success
4.2 Undertake and complete an applied research study related to educational issues, problems and practice

5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations
5.2 Design and interpret assessments and assessment data using quantitative reasoning and make leadership decisions based on the data
5.3 Communicate assessment data and outcomes to stakeholders both orally and in writing
6.1 Provide leadership that infuses social justice, equity and ethics into educational programs.

### Student Outcomes as Demonstrated by Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>SLO Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Demonstrate strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Identify and navigate ethical complexities of educational leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Evaluate and use evolving technologies to inform practice, enhance learning, and increase professional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Apply various theoretical lenses, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they use multiple lenses to critique existing systems and identify and evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>SLO Evaluation Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and potential solutions</td>
<td>In what ways do students demonstrate they are able to critically assess the successes and failures of educational systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Assess critically the successes and failures of educational systems</td>
<td>In what ways do students demonstrate they are able to critically assess the successes and failures of educational systems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Analyze systemic and/or root causes of educational inequities and design and implement meaningful solutions</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they are able to develop an action plan to address root causes solve identified problems of practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Align decisions and actions as leaders with stated (and evolving) philosophy of educational leadership</td>
<td>In what ways do students demonstrate they align their decisions and actions with their philosophies of educational leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate awareness of how identity (and associated equities/inequities) impacts student learning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Build collaborative partnerships with students, families and communities</td>
<td>How do students identify and demonstrate practices that collaboratively promote a safe culture, student learning and professional growth?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Build collaborative partnerships and networks with colleagues and other professionals</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate their reflection and analysis of the impact of personal beliefs and biases on collaborative decision making, ethical practice and equity in leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Create a safe culture and instructional program that is conducive to all students’ learning and staff professional growth</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they are able to use a variety of inquiry and research methods to take action in enhancing educational effectiveness and student success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success</td>
<td>In what ways do students demonstrate they are able to complete applied research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Undertake and complete an applied research study related to educational issues, problems and practice</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they are able to complete applied research?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations</td>
<td>In what ways do students demonstrate they are able to design and interpret assessment data using qualitative and quantitative reasoning to conduct program and policy evaluations in order to improve practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Design and interpret assessments and assessment data using quantitative reasoning and make</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO</th>
<th>SLO Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leadership decisions based on the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Communicate assessment data and outcomes to stakeholders both orally and in writing</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they are able to communicate outcomes from the assessment process to stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infuse through leadership the values of social justice, equity, and ethics into educational programming.</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate they provide leadership in ensuring the values of social justice, equity and ethics are infused in their educational programs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## III. Curriculum Map

### Curriculum Map – Student Outcomes by Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes/Courses</th>
<th>EDLD 6010</th>
<th>EDLD 6090</th>
<th>EDLD 6020</th>
<th>EDLD 6040</th>
<th>EDLD 6060</th>
<th>EDLD 6080</th>
<th>EDLD 6070</th>
<th>EDLD 6110</th>
<th>EDLD 6030</th>
<th>Specialization Courses/Diss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Identify and navigate ethical complexities of educational leadership</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Evaluate and use evolving technologies to inform practice, enhance learning, and increase professional knowledge</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and potential solutions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Assess critically the successes and failures of educational systems</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Analyze systemic and/or root causes of educational inequities and design and implement meaningful solutions</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Align decisions and actions as leaders with stated (and evolving) philosophy of educational leadership</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Build collaborative partnerships with students, families and communities</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Build collaborative partnerships and networks with colleagues and other professionals</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Create a safe culture and instructional program that is conducive to all students’ learning and staff professional growth</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcomes/Courses</td>
<td>EDLD 6010</td>
<td>EDLD 6020</td>
<td>EDLD 6040</td>
<td>EDLD 6060</td>
<td>EDLD 6080</td>
<td>EDLD 6070</td>
<td>EDLD 6110</td>
<td>EDLD 6030</td>
<td>Specialization Courses/Diss.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Undertake and complete an applied research study related to educational issues, problems and practice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Design and interpret assessments and assessment data using quantitative reasoning and make leadership decisions based on the data</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Communicate assessment data and outcomes to stakeholders both orally and in writing</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infuse through leadership the values of social justice, equity, and ethics into educational programming</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R-A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  I=Introduced; R=Reinforced, A=Advanced

EDLD 6010  Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations
EDLD 6090  Advanced Applied Research and Measurement in Education
EDLD 6020  Educational Reform
EDLD 6040  Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods
EDLD 6060  Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership
EDLD 6070  Applied Qualitative Research methods
EDLD 6080  Theories of Cross-cultural Education
EDLD 6070  Applied Qualitative Research methods
EDLD 6110  Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning
EDLD 6030  Educational Policy Environments

Note: Only outcomes are identified for CORE courses (those noted above). Specialization courses vary from semester to semester and those outcomes are determined when the course is prepared for that semester.
IV. Assessment Methods

Direct Measures
1. Embedded Fieldwork Projects (Client Evaluation)
2. Case Studies (Rubrics)
3. Qualifying Exam (Problems of Practice) (Rubrics)
4. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Preliminary Defense) (Rubrics)
5. Dissertation (Problem of Practice) (Final Defense) (Rubrics)
6. Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey)

Indirect Measures
1. Faculty Annual Review of Student Progress (based on Dispositions) (Survey)
2. Town Hall Meetings
3. Graduate Survey
4. Employer Survey
5. External Review of Dissertations (Rubric)

Measurement Instruments

The following is a description of each of the measures used to measure student outcomes and program outcomes in order of use along with information about how each is used.

360 Pre and Post Disposition Survey (see Appendix A) This assessment is distributed to students at the beginning of the program and again at the end of the program. Students complete it as a "self-assessment", and it is also distributed to seven other individuals with whom the individual works (one must be their supervisor). The data is summarized and the combined means of the other assessors are given to the student with their own assessments so they can compare to see if their views are consistent (or inconsistent) with others who have assessed them. The assessment is also taken at the end of the program and the data from the pre and post surveys for self and others is compared to see what growth has been realized during the program. The assessment is used to measure individual's leadership dispositions.

Annual Student Evaluation (see Appendix B) Each year each student is assessed by the faculty members from their courses the prior year using the instrument in Appendix B. After the instrument has been completed by the teaching faculty, they meet to discuss each student's progress and work in each course. Based on the assessments and comments by the teaching faculty, each student is written a personal letter outlining their strengths and any recommendations for growth.
**Embedded Fieldwork Assessment.** (Appendix) In many of the courses there is a component of embedded fieldwork or "laboratories of practice" where collaborative groups of doctoral students work with school site and college-based leaders to complete a project for that client directly related to the course curriculum. Clients are given the Embedded Fieldwork Assessment to complete at the end of the course and when the project has been completed. This instrument provides feedback about how well the students were able to undertake and complete work directly related to the course (student outcomes assessment). These assessments are collected at the end of a cohort's program of study and reviewed by the Assessment subcommittee of the doctoral faculty Graduate Group to assess the degree to which program outcomes are being met.

**Qualifying Examination and Rubric.** The Qualifying Examination is a problem-based scenario that is administered after students complete the Core sequence of courses. The exam is administered in a four-hour block and is meant to see how well students are able to apply the course content to real issues and problems in their educational arenas. A question is submitted by each Core course faculty member along with a rubric that is designed to identify what is and is not an appropriate response to each question. Core course faculty are provided with a sample rubric to follow as they design their individual question rubric.

**Dissertation Criteria and Oral and Written Rubric.** The dissertation is normally a study exploring the application of practice to an educational issue or problem. It is through the dissertation that a variety of student outcomes are measured. The instrument used to assess student outcomes is the Dissertation Criteria for Evaluating Dissertations. Each student is provided with a copy of the Criteria when they begin work on their dissertation. The instrument is used by the faculty during the oral defense to evaluate the work included in the dissertation. This instrument is used both to complete the dissertation rubric, which is aligned with the Criteria document, and to give to the student as feedback on the quality of their work. At the end of each cohort program, these dissertation rubrics are collected for all students who completed their dissertations and reviewed by the Outcomes Assessment subcommittee of the doctoral faculty Graduate Group.

**Graduate Survey** (see Appendix D) - The graduate survey is sent to students who have graduated from the program immediately after graduation ceremonies. The instrument is designed to get important
student feedback about both student and program outcomes. The questions on the survey are designed around program outcomes.

**Employer Survey** (see Appendix E) - Similar to the graduate survey, this instrument is sent to the program graduate's immediate supervisor immediately after the student has graduated. This instrument is designed to be feedback about the skill sets and abilities of graduates related to the stated program outcomes.

Two other important assessments are also used as follows:

**A portfolio** review of a sampling of work by students from each course (e.g., embedded fieldwork projects, written assignments and other artifacts selected by each course faculty) is gathered during the three-year program for each cohort. These assignments are reviewed by the doctoral faculty Graduate Group Outcomes Assessment subcommittee. The review is to determine if the program is meeting its stated outcomes.

**Town Hall meetings** designed around Inquiry questions are held annually for current students. The inquiry questions contain at minimum those below, but may also include inquiry questions submitted by the students. Students are provided with the questions well before the Town Hall meeting and invited to add other questions. Town Hall meetings are designed to obtain feedback from students about how well they believe the doctoral program is meeting stated program outcomes.

1. How has the program enhanced/changed your abilities and skills as an educational leader?
2. How has the program changed the way you think about your role as an educational leader?
3. How could the program be changed/enhanced to meet your goals in being educational leaders?
4. Is the curriculum you have experienced in the program relevant to the practice of educational leadership in your setting?
5. Are the courses aligned to facilitate your learning leadership skills and practices?
6. What program changes would you recommend to strengthen the program and to align the program with your goals of being and educational leader?
V. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Methods Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes/Assessment Method</th>
<th>Emb Fldwk *</th>
<th>Case Studies *</th>
<th>QE **</th>
<th>Prelim **</th>
<th>Final Def. **</th>
<th>Admin. Disposit *</th>
<th>Annual Review *</th>
<th>Town Hall #</th>
<th>Grad Survey #</th>
<th>Employer Survey #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Strategic leadership and effective communication skills in an educational reform effort</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Identify and navigate ethical complexities of educational leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Develop leadership vision that demonstrates commitment to ethics and equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Evaluate and use evolving technologies to inform practice, enhance learning, and increase professional knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Apply various theoretical lenses, research and personal experiences to identify problems of educational practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evaluate problems of practice through critical examination of existing systems and potential solutions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Assess critically the successes and failures of educational systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Analyze systemic and/or root causes of educational inequities and design and implement meaningful solutions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Align decisions and actions as leaders with stated (and evolving) philosophy of ed. ldrshp</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Examine and evaluate personal beliefs and biases to understand how they impact the ability to be an ethical, equitable leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Build collaborative partnerships with students, families and communities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Build collaborative partnerships and networks with colleagues and other professionals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Outcomes/Assessment Method</td>
<td>Emb. Fldwk *</td>
<td>Case Studies *</td>
<td>QE **</td>
<td>Prelim **</td>
<td>Final Def. **</td>
<td>Admin. Disposit *</td>
<td>Annual Review *</td>
<td>Town Hall #</td>
<td>Grad Survey #</td>
<td>Employer Survey #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>3.4 Create a safe culture and instructional program that is conducive to all students’ learning and staff professional growth</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Use a variety of inquiry and research methods in investigating issues and problems related to educational effectiveness and student success</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Undertake and complete an applied research study related to educational issues, problems and practice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Design and conduct program and policy evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Design and interpret assessments and assessment data using quantitative reasoning and make leadership decisions based on the data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Communicate assessment data and outcomes to stakeholders both orally and in writing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Infuse through leadership the values of social justice, equity, and ethics into educational programming</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>When Implemented</th>
<th>When Reviewed for Action (Closing the Loop)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded Fieldwork</td>
<td>Annually – in designated courses</td>
<td>End of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Annually – in designated courses</td>
<td>End of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Exam</td>
<td>Annually by cohort</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation (Preliminary Defense)</td>
<td>Annually by cohort</td>
<td>Throughout the Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation (Final Defense)</td>
<td>Annually by cohort</td>
<td>Throughout the Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 360 Degree Administrative Dispositions (Pre-Post Survey)</td>
<td>Beginning of the first year and end of last year – by cohort</td>
<td>End of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Annual Review</td>
<td>Fall and Spring</td>
<td>Fall and Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meetings</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>End of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>End of each year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Review of Dissertations</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Process for Closing the Loop

Data collected from these instruments are analyzed by the Graduate Group faculty at special meeting called specifically to review these data. That meeting is normally held in the fall of the year so that the information from the graduates and employers can be included in the review. Changes and enhancements to the program are made through the doctoral faculty of the Graduate Group. Where there are policy implications, the Academic Policy and Planning subcommittee design new or revise policies and/or procedures to be approved by the full Graduate Group faculty. While it is important to have a variety of data to review before making program changes, information that emerges from Town Hall meetings and other data collection points may be used in a formative manner and acted upon immediately once the data are deemed reliable and valid.
Appendix A Administrator Disposition
Survey- Self

Name: ___________________________ Date: ___ ___ ___ ___

Instructions: You will be completing a survey of administrator dispositions during the same time period that seven members within your organization will rate their perception of you relative to these same items. This questionnaire is designed to help assess how others perceive you in the work environment right now and to what extent others' perception of you match your own self-assessment. This information will be an important and useful data set regarding your rated administrator disposition. The code at the top confidentially identifies you as rated participants.

Using the scale below, indicate your perception of yourself by circling or marking a number from 1 to 10 next to the item. Circle or mark only one response for each item on the form. Please respond to all items. Once you have completed the Feedback Questionnaire, seal it in the self-addressed stamped envelope and place it in the mail. Thank you for your response.

SCALE

10-Definitely like me  5-Somewhat unlike me
9  4
8-Like me  3-Unlike me
7  2
6-Somewhat like me  1-Definitely unlike me

<p>| Part I | |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Expresses verbal and/or non-verbal recognition of feelings, needs, and concerns of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2 | Committed to collaboration and communication with families. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 3 | Communicates necessary information to the appropriate persons in a timely manner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 4 | Deals appropriately and tactfully with people from different backgrounds. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 5 | Generates enthusiasm and works to influence others to accomplish common goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 6 | Believes stakeholders should be involved in management processes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 7 | Motivates others to change behaviors that inhibit professional and organizational growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 8 | Acknowledges achievements and accomplishments of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Definitely like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Somewhat like me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Somewhat unlike me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Unlike me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Definitely unlike me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Responds in a timely manner to others who initiate contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Believes administrators should develop alliances and use outside resources that improve the teaching and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Committed to the inclusion of all members of the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Believes it is important to dialogue with other decision-makers who impact education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Believes all students are entitled to access the knowledge, skills, and values needed to be successful adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Committed to an informed public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Anticipates responses of others and acts to reduce negative impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Believes families are partners in the education of their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Believes diversity brings benefits to the school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mobilizes community resources to benefit children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Believes administrators must take risks to improve school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Believes in life-long learning for self and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Demonstrates the belief that all students are entitled to access the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Collaborates and communicates with families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Involves stakeholders in management processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Uses varied approaches to positively impact student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Communicates with other decision-makers who impact education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Communicates that a safe and supportive learning environment is essential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Believes schools should prepare students to be contributing members of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Believes administrators should work with faculty, staff, and students to develop a caring school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Committed to providing every child a quality education.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Takes risks to provide a safe learning environment and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of school operations.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Expects high standards of learning.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Believes schools are an integral part of the larger community.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Encourages others to use a variety of approaches in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Committed to high expectations, high-quality instruction and individual and collective accountability.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Demonstrates ethical principles in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Committed to the principles stated in the Bill of Rights.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Believes student learning is the fundamental purpose of schooling.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Believes one should accept the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Demonstrates the belief that all people can learn.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Believes education is the key to opportunity and social mobility.</td>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Reflects on learning and professional practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Analyzes situational (intra/inter personal and contextual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contexts that result in more informed decision-making.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Makes well-reasoned ethical judgments that rely on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflection and result in professional action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Works effectively with diverse populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Values diversity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Collaborates professionally with others in the field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Committed to continuous learning about the profession.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructions for Administering the Educator Administrator Disposition Questionnaires

During the semester you will collect data from others in your own organization about your Administrator Dispositions. You will be issued a code that you will share with each respondent and will be identified at the top of each respondent's questionnaire. You will receive a questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope to give to each respondent who has knowledge of and has observed or worked with you in an educational setting. Request each respondent to confidentially and independently complete the questionnaire and place it in the mail in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Please note that you will arrange for seven (7) respondents. Respondents should include your direct supervisor and six others (colleagues/subordinates/peers). You will also complete a questionnaire for yourself, for a total of eight completed questionnaires.
Administrator Dispositions Survey - Others

Name of Doctoral Student: ____________________________ Date: _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Instructions: The person that gave you this questionnaire is participating in a survey of administrator dispositions. This questionnaire is designed to help assess how others perceive this person in the work environment right now. The information will be useful to the person rated in evaluating his or her administrator disposition. Sometimes people within an organization tend to protect each other by trying to go easy or be nice. You can be most helpful by giving your candid assessment of this person. Your data will be anonymously collated with others and presented to the person in a confidential report. Do not put your name on this form. The code at the top identifies the person you are rating. Please do not discuss this questionnaire with others, for what is needed is your independent perception of this person.

Using the scale below, indicate your perception of this person by circling or marking a number from 1 to 10 next to the item. Circle or mark only one response for each item on the form. Please respond to all items. Once you have completed the Feedback Questionnaire, seal it in the self-addressed stamped envelope and place it in the mail. Thank you for your participation and valuable feedback.

SCALE
10-Definitely like this person
9
8-Like this person
7
6-Somewhat like this person
5-Somewhat unlike this person
4
3-Unlike this person
2
1-Definitely unlike this person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Expresses verbal and/or non-verbal recognition of feelings, needs, and concerns of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Committed to collaboration and communication with families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communicates necessary information to the appropriate persons in a timely manner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deals appropriately and tactfully with people from different backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Generates enthusiasm and works to influence others to accomplish common goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Believes stakeholders should be involved in management processes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Motivates others to change behaviors that inhibit professional and organizational growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCALE</strong></td>
<td><strong>SCALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-Definitely like this person</strong></td>
<td><strong>5-Somewhat unlike this person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Like this person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-Somewhat like this person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-</td>
<td>1-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Believes in life-long learning for self and others.**

**Demonstrates the belief that all students are entitled to access the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults.**

**Collaborates and communicates with families.**

**Involves stakeholders in management processes.**

**Uses varied approaches to positively impact student learning.**

**Communicates with other decision-makers who impact education.**

**Communicates that a safe and supportive learning environment is essential.**

**Believes schools should prepare students to be contributing members of society.**

**Believes administrators should work with faculty, staff, and students to develop a caring school community.**

**Acknowledges achievements and accomplishments of others.**

**Does the work required for high levels of organizational performance.**

**Responds in a timely manner to others who initiate contact.**

**Believes administrators should develop alliances and use outside resources that improve the teaching and learning.**

**Committed to the inclusion of all members of the school community.**

**Believes it is important to dialogue with other decision-makers who impact education.**

**Believes all students are entitled to access the knowledge, skills, and values needed to be successful adults.**

**Committed to an informed public.**

**Anticipates responses of others and acts to reduce negative impact.**

**Believes families are partners in the education of their children.**

**Believes diversity brings benefits to the school community.**

**Mobilizes community resources to benefit children.**

**Believes administrators must take risks to improve school.**
## EDUCATOR ADMINISTRATOR DISPOSITION INDEX

### SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 - Definitely like this person</th>
<th>5 - Somewhat unlike this person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Like this person</td>
<td>3 - Unlike this person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Somewhat like this person</td>
<td>1 - Definitely unlike this person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statements and Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Ratings 1-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed to providing every child a quality education.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes risks to provide a safe learning environment and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of school operations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expects high standards of learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes schools are an integral part of the larger community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages others to use a variety of approaches in teaching and learning.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to high expectations, high-quality instruction and individual and collective accountability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ethical principles in the decision-making process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed to the principles stated in the Bill of Rights.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes student learning is the fundamental purpose of schooling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes one should accept the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates the belief that all people can learn.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believes education is the key to opportunity and social mobility.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 3 (Dispositions)

|   | Statement                                                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|
| 42| Reflects on learning and professional practice.                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 43| Analyzes situational (intra/interpersonal and contextual) contexts that result in more informed decision-making. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 44| Makes well-reasoned ethical judgments that rely on reflection and result in professional action. |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 45| Works effectively with diverse populations.                             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 46| Values diversity.                                                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 47| Collaborates professionally with others in the field.                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |
| 48| Committed to continuous learning about the profession.                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS CONFIDENTIAL SURVEY. PLEASE MAIL IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE

Instructions for Administering the Educator Administrator Disposition Questionnaires

During the semester you will collect data from others in your own organization about your Administrator Disposition. You will be issued a code that you will share with each respondent and will be identified at the top of each respondent's questionnaire. You will receive a questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope to give to each respondent who has knowledge of and has observed or worked with you in an educational setting. Request each respondent to confidentially and independently complete the questionnaire and place it in the mail in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Please note that you will arrange for seven (7) respondents. Respondents should include your direct supervisor and six others (colleagues/subordinates/peers). You will also complete a questionnaire for yourself, for a total of eight completed questionnaires.
### Appendix B

#### Student Annual Assessment

Directions: Circle the number in each disposition cell that reflects your judgment of the performance of the student in that area.

**Scoring:** 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Most of the time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Disposition 1: Reflection</th>
<th>Disposition 2: Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Disposition 3: Professional Ethics</th>
<th>Disposition 4: Valuing Diversity</th>
<th>Disposition 5: Collaboration</th>
<th>Disposition 6: Life-long learning</th>
<th>Student participates in class</th>
<th>Student is a skilled writer</th>
<th>Student submits work in timely manner</th>
<th>Student is ready for specialization</th>
<th>Recommend Corrective Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please include specific comments regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of specific students. These comments are essential to our review, and your responses be held confidential and shared only with other members of the annual review committee.
Appendix C
Embedded Fieldwork Client Evaluation

Semester __________________________ Name of Your Organization __________________________
Name(s) of Individual(s) Completing this Evaluation __________________________
Name(s) of Students: __________________________

You have participated in an embedded fieldwork project by DPEL students this semester. Embedded fieldwork is curriculum-based practical experiences done in the field that provides engagement with and service to the local community. Thank you for participating in this important component of our doctoral program. We are interested in gathering information that would assist us in making these experiences more beneficial for both clients and students and are asking that you complete and return this short evaluation related to your experience with our students this semester. Again, thank you for your participation in DPEL.

1. Please briefly describe the nature of the embedded fieldwork project that was completed for your organization. Please include what your general expectations were for this particular embedded fieldwork experience.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

2. Please rate your satisfaction with the degree to which the DPELFS students completed the project (circle the appropriate number).

1  2  3  4
Completely Dissatisfied Somewhat Satisfied Completely Dissatisfied Satisfied Satisfied
Dissatisfied

3. How would you rate the quality of the work completed by the students?

1  2  3  4
Poor Fair Good Excellent
4. In two or three sentences please indicate the impact the embedded fieldwork had on your organization.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

5. Were all the components of the embedded fieldwork project that you expected to receive actually delivered? _______ Yes _______ No

6. If you responded "No" above, what would you have liked to receive that was not delivered?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you have any suggestions about how the embedded fieldwork in our program might be enhanced or improved (if yes, please describe)? Yes _______ No

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

7. What was the most important benefit to you in participating in this embedded fieldwork project?

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
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8. Would you consider participating in another embedded fieldwork project with students in DPEL?
   _____ Yes   _____ No

9. If no, why not?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

10. If yes, please describe a possible project for the future that you would be interested in having considered for DPEL embedded fieldwork.
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________

11. Other comments:
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________

    Thank you!
Exit Questionnaire for DPEL Graduate

Name: _________________________  Date: __________

1. As a result of receiving your Ed.D. from DPEL, please rate the current competency level of your knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the areas listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access current literature, using available technology, relative to educational leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write literature reviews for problems related to school administration and reform, social and cultural contexts of schools, primary language and customs related to academic development, and issues related to school effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of research methodologies in investigating issues related to school effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate understanding of how theory informs practice with respect to school effectiveness and in the academic development of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership in educational reform with respect to instructional practices and policies, teacher education, curriculum, school-community relations and home and school learning environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of educational issues, competing interests, and the ultimate effects of policy decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking educational program evaluations and assessments in educational settings</td>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational leadership through policy development, team building, conducting research, devising solutions, and taking appropriate actions to implement proposed solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of educational issues and problems, and relating such within the framework of the four major areas of study (organization and leadership; evaluation and assessment; sociocultural aspects of education; and curriculum)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability and commitment to regularly reflect on my learning and practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and analyze the implications of intrapersonal, interpersonal, and contextual issues in educational settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect on ethical considerations when making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize and consider the value of cultural, linguistic, cognitive, and physiological diversity when working with diverse populations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and other individuals in the educational community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in continuous professional growth and life-long learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the choice that reflects your feelings related to the following statements.

2. The DPEL Program significantly improved my ability to provide leadership in educational reform:

   a) with respect to instructional practices and policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b) with respect to teacher education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c) with respect to curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   d) with respect to home and school learning environments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate the degree to which the DPELFS staff members were attentive to your individual needs as a doctoral student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly</th>
<th>Attentive</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not Attentive at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   __

   Comments:

4. Please indicate the degree to which the DPEL Director was attentive to your individual needs as a doctoral student.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Attentive</th>
<th>Attentive</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Not Very</th>
<th>Not Attentive at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
5. Has earning a doctorate affected your career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greatly affected</th>
<th>Somewhat affected</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Not affected</th>
<th>Not affected at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

6. Please describe any examples of the following educational leadership activities in which you have participated:

A) Policy Development

B) Team Building

C) Conducting Research

D) Devising and Implementing Solutions

7. When you began the doctoral program, what was your job title?

8. What is your current job title?

9. Are there program improvements DPELFS should make? Yes No

If yes, please explain:

Thank you!
(Please return your completed survey to DPEL in the enclosed envelope)
Appendix E

Questionnaire for *Employer* of DPEL Graduate

Name of Graduate: __________________ Date: ____________

1. Please rate the abilities of the above named DPEL graduate to demonstrate competency in the areas listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
<th>NIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access current literature, using available technology, relative to educational leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write literature reviews for problems related to school administration and reform, social and cultural contexts of schools, primary language and customs as they relate to academic development, and issues related to school effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a variety of research methodologies in investigating issues related to school effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate understanding of how theory informs practice with respect to school effectiveness and in the academic development of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide leadership in educational reform with respect to instructional practices and policies, teacher education, curriculum, school-community relations and home and school learning environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of educational issues, competing interests, and the ultimate effects of policy decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking educational program evaluations and assessments in educational settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational leadership through policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Honorable Carol Liu, Chair  
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Honorable Patrick O’Donnell, Chair  
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Honorable Jose Medina, Chair  
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Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Members of the Legislature:

Pursuant to Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005 (SB 724, Scott), which authorized the California State University (CSU) to independently award the Doctor of Education degree, representatives from the Legislative Analysis’s Office (LAO), Department of Finance (DoF), and CSU jointly evaluated the doctoral programs implemented under the legislation and submitted their report in January 2011.

In the initial report, the team determined it was too soon to evaluate the impact of the Ed.D. programs on school and community college reform efforts and student achievement—areas designated for evaluation in the statute. As a result, the LAO recommended that CSU identify indicators for assessing the effects of the education doctorate programs on system reform and student achievement, and report on program outcomes in 2016 when more data would be available.

The attached CSU report is in response to the statutory requirement and the recommendations of the LAO at the time the 2011 report was submitted. It demonstrates the exceptional success and impact of the CSU education doctorate.

My office is available to answer any questions about the report.

Sincerely,

Loren J. Blanchard, Ph.D.  
Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic and Student Affairs
Members of the Legislature
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January 2016
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California State University
Executive Summary

In accordance with Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005, the statutory authorization for the CSU Ed.D. degree, the program's purpose is to respond to the need for effective administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts. Consistent with the statute, the Ed.D. program enables professionals to earn their degree while working full-time and is undertaken in partnerships with P-12 districts and community colleges.

The practitioner orientation and reform focus that are central in the authorizing legislation have shaped the CSU Ed.D. programs, which currently serve nearly 800 students on 15 campuses and include more than 1,000 graduates. The statutory focus on addressing the state's urgent need for administrators to lead reforms has resulted in an emphasis on addressing issues of diversity, equity, and social justice and on closing the achievement gaps.

Impacts of CSU Ed.D. Programs: Qualitative Indicators

CSU Ed.D. programs conduct follow-up studies with graduates and their employers using program assessment procedures established as part of their accreditation by WASC. Programs report a range of types of evidence demonstrating impacts of graduates on P-12 and community college reforms, including input provided by employers. Reforms relate to increasing access, enhanced opportunities, program success and completion, and accountability.

CSU Ed.D. programs routinely administer surveys of graduates to assess program impacts. The programs use rigorous survey methodologies and analyze and use the data as part of annual assessment and continuous improvement. Responses of graduates to these surveys identify program impacts on their effectiveness as leaders and reforms they guide, and on student outcomes in their schools, districts, county offices, or community colleges.

Impacts of CSU Ed.D. Programs: Quantitative Indicators

Ed.D. students are required to conduct a rigorous research dissertation on a significant educational issue. Most study a problem of practice at their own site or organization and as graduates continue their work on initiatives they have initiated or participated in while in the program. Dissertations about these reforms provide solid evidence of impacts.

P-12 Reforms and Evidence of Impacts of Ed.D. Programs and Graduates

Several practice and policy reforms that were examined by P-12 candidates, often from more than one school or school district, provide evidence of program and graduate impacts on major state reforms and on student success and achievement. Reforms that have been areas of focus include Linked Learning, SLCS, STEM reforms, after-school programs, addressing needs of historically underserved students and their families, special education reforms, transitional kindergarten, and teacher pipeline programs.

Community College Reforms and Evidence of Impacts of Ed.D. Programs and Graduates

Studies of practice and policy reforms conducted by candidates in the Ed.D. community college specialization program provide evidence of impacts on reforms and student achievement in that education sector. Reforms have focused on access and diversity, developmental education in mathematics and English, Student Learning Outcomes, and academic and student support for such groups as Veterans, ESL students, and groups historically underrepresented in post-secondary education, including African-American, Latino, and Hmong students.

Conclusions

There is clear evidence of the impact of the CSU Ed.D. programs on P-12 and community college reforms and on student learning, development, and achievement. Impacts have been attained through careful program design, implementation, and assessment that follow the explicit purposes of the authorizing legislation—to address the urgent need for effective leaders of California’s elementary and secondary school and community colleges.
Introduction

This report responds to Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005, which authorized the California State University (CSU) to independently offer the Ed.D. degree. The statute required a statewide evaluation by the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), the Department of Finance, (DoF), and CSU in January 2011. The evaluation report submitted at that time focused on implementation and found that the CSU programs were fulfilling the purposes of the enabling legislation.

Although Chapter 269 called for a review of evidence on the effects that graduates of the programs are having on school and community reform efforts and on student achievement, the 2011 report did not address that issue. The evaluation team from the three agencies concluded that it was too soon to evaluate the impact of the new degree programs on outcomes since the first cohort of Ed.D. students had just graduated.

The LAO issued a Policy Brief as a follow-up and considered the question of how impacts that could not be assessed in 2011 should be addressed. It recommended that CSU identify a number of common indicators, use them to assess Ed.D. program effects on system reforms and on student achievement, and report on outcomes in January 2016.

Background and Overview

The CSU was authorized to offer the Doctorate of Education degree (Ed.D.) through Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005 (Senate Bill 724—Scott). Seven CSU campuses began offering Ed.D. programs in fall 2007. In response to regional needs and demand, 15 CSU campuses now offer independent Ed.D. programs. The programs serve students who are working as full-time education professionals, equipping them with knowledge and skills for effective leadership of California’s public schools, districts, and community colleges. All offer a specialization in Pre-Kindergarten-grade 12 (P-12) leadership, and ten also offer community college leadership specializations. The programs are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollments in the CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The current enrollment in the 15 CSU Ed.D. programs in fall 2015 are shown in Table 2 below. The programs have grown steadily since their establishment, expanding from enrollment of slightly more than 600 students in fall 2009 (the first year with candidates in all three years of the program) to nearly 800 (794) in fall 2015.

Of the 794 current students, 62% (495) are enrolled in the P-12 specialization and 38% (299) are enrolled in the community college specialization. Many of the students are first-generation college-goers, attracted by the focus of the programs on equity and diversity and the ability to earn the degree while working full-time.

Table 2. CSU Ed.D. Program Enrollments, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Islands*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Channel Islands program began in 2015 and will now begin enrolling students. Source of data: CSU enrollment reporting system, preliminary data for Fall 2015. Some very minor changes could occur in the final data counts.

Gender of Students in the CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The gender of the Ed.D students by sector is given in Table 3 below. Females constitute 67% (529) of the students and males 33% (269). There has historically been underrepresentation of females in educational leadership positions in both California and the nation, and the CSU Ed.D. programs are helping to reduce this gender gap.

Table 3. Ed.D. Student Gender, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>337 (68%)</td>
<td>188 (63%)</td>
<td>525 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>158 (32%)</td>
<td>111 (37%)</td>
<td>269 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495 (100%)</td>
<td>299 (100%)</td>
<td>794 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ethnicity of Students in the CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The ethnicity of students in the CSU Ed.D. programs in fall 2015 is shown in Table 4. As in each previous year, the students are a highly diverse group. These distributions have been relatively stable since the programs began in 2007. There is significant underrepresentation of Hispanic, African-American, and Asian individuals in educational leadership roles in California and nationally, and CSU’s Ed.D. programs are helping to recue this gap.

Table 4. CSU Ed.D. Program Enrollments: Ethnicity, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>P-12</th>
<th>Community College</th>
<th>Total Number</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Including Filipino)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Latino</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Completion of Students in CSU Independent Ed.D. Programs

The average time to completion in CSU Ed.D. programs is 3.25 years; most students complete the program in three years. The completion rate has been high—approximately 92.5%—reflecting the cohort model and the focus on studying issues relevant to and making connections with student’s professional roles. There have been more than 1,000 graduates to date: 95 in 2010 and an average of 180 in subsequent years.

Places of Employment and Position Changes of Ed.D. Program Graduates

Place of employment among the fall 2015 Ed.D. students is shown in Tables 4 and 5. The distributions conform closely to the emphasis of the legislation on preparing students for positions of leadership within P-12 education and community colleges.

Table 4. Ed.D. P-12 Student Place of Employment, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P-12 Students</th>
<th>Place of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School site</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district office</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Schools</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Ed.D. Community College Student Place of Employment, Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community College Students</th>
<th>Place of Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Region</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes of Professional Position among Ed.D. Graduates**

Since the beginning of the program, Ed.D. graduates have shown significant advances in their professional positions. While the majority remain with their employer upon graduation, they often obtain a higher-level position at their site or move from a school or community college campus to a significant district-level position.

Examples of position changes for P-12 and community college candidates are shown in Tables 6 and 7 below. Many P-12 graduates have become Principals, Assistant Superintendents, or Superintendents, and many community college graduates have become Deans, Vice Presidents, or Presidents of their colleges or nearby ones.

Across all programs, more than 90% of students/graduates hold administrative positions. More than 80% have been promoted to administrative or advanced management positions during or after completing the program. Among graduates, more than 40% have advanced to top-level administrative positions in P-12 and community colleges.

Implementing the provisions of the authorizing legislation, the programs focus explicitly on responding to the need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts. Carrying out the statute's provisions, the degree programs enable professionals to earn the degree while working full-time.

Consistent with the statutory authorization, the Ed.D. programs are delivered through partnerships with California’s public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges. Their leaders actively participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation.

The practitioner orientation and reform focus that are central in the authorizing legislation have shaped the CSU Ed.D. programs. The explicit attention to these issues in the statute has resulted in an emphasis on preparing leaders capable of effectively addressing issues of diversity, equity, and social justice—closing achievement gaps.

The statutory provisions combined with Ed.D. program requirements have a substantial influence on the potential to obtain evidence on the impact of the program and its graduates on P-12 and community college reforms and student achievement. A primary requirement established by the CSU system is that each candidate in the program is to conduct a rigorous research dissertation that is focused on a problem of practice or a policy issue.

A particularly robust source of evidence of impacts of the programs on reforms and on student achievement is found in these dissertations. Many of them are studies of significant reforms initiated and/or led by Ed.D. students and containing thorough quantitative and qualitative data assessing impacts.

Graduates typically advance in their professional leadership roles within their schools, districts, and community colleges. This is generally facilitated through the conduct of a dissertation that is highly relevant to their roles and responsibilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position at Start of Program</th>
<th>Position After Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math Lab Teacher California Elementary School</td>
<td>Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Content Expert Elementary School District</td>
<td>Elementary School Principal Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor California High School</td>
<td>Vice Principal Same High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Principal Same Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal California Middle School</td>
<td>Principal Same Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal California High School</td>
<td>Principal Same High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Principal Same Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal California High School</td>
<td>Principal Same High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Principal California High School</td>
<td>Principal Same High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Director of Educational Services Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Area Director Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent Nearby School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Superintendent Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Superintendent Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Elementary School</td>
<td>Superintendent Nearby School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California Middle School</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Instruction Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California High School</td>
<td>Chief Business Officer Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal California High School</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of Educational Services Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services California School District</td>
<td>Deputy Superintendent Same School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education California School District</td>
<td>Superintendent Same School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Ed.D. Community College Students/Graduates: Position Change Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position at Start of Program</th>
<th>Position After Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Dean of Student Equity and Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Community College</td>
<td>Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Community College</td>
<td>Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Member</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Community College</td>
<td>Large California City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Analyst, Institutional Planning and Analysis California Community College</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Planning and Analysis Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator, Special Education Programs and Services California School District</td>
<td>Director, Counseling, Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Director of Outreach Programs California Community College</td>
<td>Dean of Counseling Services Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Counseling Services California Community College</td>
<td>Dean of Student Services Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Service Learning California Community College</td>
<td>Dean of Continuing Education Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean of Instruction California Community College</td>
<td>Dean of Instruction Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Librarian California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President for Instruction Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Outreach California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Services Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of High Potential Program California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Services Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Services California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Services Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President of Instructional Services Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Instructional Services California Community College</td>
<td>Vice President of Instructional Services Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Development and Matriculation California Community College</td>
<td>President Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Student Learning California Community College</td>
<td>Executive Vice President Same California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Student Services California Community College</td>
<td>President Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Instruction California Community College</td>
<td>President Nearby California Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impacts of CSU Ed.D. Programs: Examples of Qualitative Indicators

Three sources of qualitative indicators have been used to respond to the reporting provision in Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005 for evidence of impacts of the programs and their graduates on P-12 and community college system reforms and student achievement. First is a range of indicators reported by the Ed.D. programs based on tracking their program graduates and seeking input from current employers/supervisors. Second are surveys and interviews with program graduates themselves. Third are sources of evidence from the Ed.D. research dissertations of candidates.
Reports of Impacts from Follow-up with Graduates Conducted by Ed.D. Programs

CSU Ed.D. programs conduct follow-up studies with graduates deploying program assessment procedures established as part of their approval by the CSU Chancellor's Office and accreditation by WASC. Programs reported a range of types of evidence demonstrating impacts of graduates on P-12 and community college reforms from input provided by current employers or supervisors. Examples of impacts for P-12 graduates are given below.

Follow-up of P-12 Graduates: Examples of Their Impacts

Graduate who is now a School District Superintendent: Developed and implemented an equity-focused district Local Control Accountability Plan (LCAP)

Graduate who is now a School District Assistant Superintendent: Developed and oversaw district’s Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) and LCAP, aligning funding with planning and accountability

Graduate who is now a Middle School Principal: Developed and managed School Site Plan for student achievement designed to ensure the highest level of success for every student

Graduate who is now an Elementary School Principal: Instituted school reforms aimed at increasing student achievement that reflected in significant gains that are seen in student performance on School Report Card

Graduate who is now an Elementary School Principal: Score reports demonstrate impact of leadership on school’s Academic Performance Index (API); school designated as a top Common Core performer

Graduate who is now an Elementary School Principal: Instituted reforms preparing students for Smarter Balanced Assessments; school outperformed matched schools

Graduate who is now an Elementary School Principal: Has been effective as a leader disseminating reforms promoting bi-literacy that stemmed from her dissertation

Graduate who is now an Elementary School Principal: Led rigorous differentiated instruction approaches that resulted in an increase from 20% to 73% proficiency on ELA assessments

Graduate who is now a High School Principal: Implemented reforms that are reflected in score reports that demonstrate the impact in the school’s increase from the bottom quartile to the top quartile on the API

Graduate who is now a High School Principal: Dissertation reforms increased student engagement and improved school learning environment and were adopted by school district

Graduate who is now Dean of a Charter School: Developed a pipeline for middle grade students preparing them to succeed in rigorous Linked Learning medical pathways

Follow-up of Community College Graduates: Examples of Their Impacts

Graduate who is now a Community College President: Implemented an Organizational Leadership Academy designed to increase shared governance and a common vision focused on equity and excellence

Graduate who is now a Community College President: Oversaw development of a Leadership Certificate Program for campus students; it contributed to increasing graduation rate 155% over three years

Graduate who is now a Community College Vice President for Student Services: Is one of the leaders of the College Student Success and Support Program (3P) and Student Equity program aimed at closing the achievement gaps

Graduate who is now a Community College Dean of Student Services: Oversaw creation of two successful student career-related organizations; both have resulted in students obtaining internships and employment
Graduate who is now a Community College Dean of Counseling Services: Developed targeted counseling practices that have resulted in higher educational attainment among career technical education students

Graduate who is now a Community College Director of Career Counseling: Integrated counseling and certificate/degree applications with classes, resulting in significant increases in Career Technical Education (CTE) completion rates

Graduate who is now a Community College Vice President of Instructional Services: Participates with English/Reading Instructors in developmental education course reforms to improve student success

Graduate who is now a Community College Vice President of Instructional Services: Led initiative preparing Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) faculty to foster success among underrepresented students, including more STEM applications

Graduate who is now a Community College Vice President of Instructional Services: Initiated professional development for adjunct faculty that has strengthened their instructional practices and work with students

Graduate who is now a Community College Faculty Member: Joined the California Acceleration Project and is implementing major reforms in remedial courses that are demonstrating improved student outcomes

Graduate Surveys and Interviews

CSU Ed.D programs routinely administer surveys of graduates to assess program strengths, areas for improvement, and impacts. They deploy rigorous survey methodologies, analyzing the data as part of annual assessment processes that are used for continuous program improvement. The responses of graduates to these surveys identify program impacts or their success as leaders and their impacts on reforms and student achievement. Examples of survey responses that reflect these outcomes and program impacts from P-12 graduates are given below. (In many cases, the material is excerpted from a longer response due to the length of the graduates’ survey responses.)

P-12 Graduate Survey Responses Regarding Impacts

The Ed.D. program is addressing the biggest need in California education—building capacity to close achievement gaps for all demographic groups of students. It empowered me to lead reforms promoting learning for all students.

The Ed.D. program was geared to having us explore how we, as educational leaders, are designing systems to improve achievement of ALL students. It is no longer sufficient to simply open the school doors and assume all students get an opportunity to learn.

Earning my Ed.D. has allowed me to open dialogue and discussions within our district that have resulted in improved instructional practices and the use of data to ensure success for all students.

As a result of the Ed.D. program, I have led a District Professional Learning Community that has established many new community partnerships that I have forged, which has helped teachers support student success.

The Ed.D. program afforded me the opportunity to learn new school counseling standards, to assess our District’s counseling program, and to institute needed reforms that have increased college-going rates.

I designed a system of professional support and collaboration for our district’s Principals; it has enabled them to work together to implement new standards, to improve schools, and to improve student learning.

The Ed.D program had an enormous impact on me as a leader, enabling me to turn around a declining elementary school from 390 students to a thriving school of 1200, with API scores increasing dramatically.
The Ed.D. program enabled me to better understand, participate in, and transform special education services in our district and to lead colleagues in critical reforms that have improved student outcomes.

The program has helped me understand best instructional practices for special needs students, which I share with every district I work with to strengthen instruction. Results have been improved student learning.

Because of my doctoral studies, the Human Rights Campaign hired me to lead a national project for educators aimed at advancing school climate and educational success for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer (LGBTQ) youth.

The Ed.D. program led to my taking on a new position and planning reforms to improve student outcomes for more than 15,000 students with disabilities in our district. We have seen reductions in grade retention.

My dissertation focused on developing college-going culture among first-generation Latino youth. I am now using the approaches I developed in middle level reforms. More students are planning to attend college.

The program had a tremendous and positive impact on my ability to lead a school. Through it, I was also able to get a contract with Corwin Press for a book about promising reforms in K-12 math instruction.

**Community College Graduate Survey Responses Regarding Impacts**

We learned to think differently about how we examine problems, understand and create new meaning, and drive solutions, resulting in new programs that shift how we support student learning.

As an administrator in higher education, I have had an opportunity to reexamine strategic plans for my college and restructure operational processes in a supportive way that also promotes student success.

In my dissertation, I developed a leadership theory and framework for practice, Conscious Leadership. Using it, our college leaders are becoming more purposeful and intentional in ways that support our students.

The program gave me tools that have enabled me to stay fully focused on meeting students' needs and supporting their success and development even through very challenging changes in office structure and staffing.

I am one of the change agents at my college who has started a Supplemental Instruction Program. The Ed.D. program enabled me to make the connections and have the confidence to make this happen.

The Ed.D. program has exposed me to concepts like validation, social capital, and self-efficacy, which frame my perspective in leading our college and helping our students.

The program gave me the expertise to be effective in writing grants. Since I graduated six years ago, our college has received more than $12 million in grants that provided opportunities our students otherwise would not have.

I took from the Ed.D. program the Leadership E-Portfolio idea, and we now are helping students create a LinkedIn profile and critique a resume. Students report more confidence in workforce interviews and more job placements.

**Summary of Qualitative Indicators of Program Impacts**

The outcomes presented above give a qualitative view of the impacts of the CSU Ed.D. programs on P-12 and community college reforms and student achievement. The deliberate focus on reforms and effects on students reflects the close conformity of the programs to the statutory rationale for establishing the CSU Ed.D.—to address the state's urgent need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts.
Illustrative qualitative data have been presented, and hundreds of additional examples are available in the evaluations and graduate surveys conducted by the Ed.D. programs. All of the programs systematically collect and use outcome data for monitoring their effectiveness and graduate success in an annual cycle of program improvement. This evidence-based program assessment model is common across the programs and is due to the ongoing assessment procedures the CSU Chancellors Office and WASC required for program approval and accreditation.

Impacts of CSU Ed.D. Programs: Examples of Quantitative Indicators

Examples of quantitative indicators of effects of CSU programs and graduates on reforms and student achievement derived from dissertations are presented in the next section. The examples respond to the statutory provisions of Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005 for "any available evidence on the effects that the graduates of the programs are having on elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts and on student achievement."

Ed.D. candidates' dissertations are a particularly good source of evidence of the programs' and the graduates' impacts on reforms and student achievement. Each student is required to conduct rigorous dissertation research on a significant educational issue. Most study a problem of practice at their own site or organization and, as they continue their employment there, further pursue initiatives they have initiated, participated in, or led through their dissertations.

Another reason the Ed.D. dissertations are well-suited as a source of evidence of impacts relates to the regulations established for the programs by the CSU Chancellor's Office, which were designed to ensure conformity to the statutory provisions. The CSU Doctor of Education Degree Programs Executive Order 991 (September 27, 2006) states that Ed.D candidates are required to complete a dissertation that shall be:

"...the written product of systemic rigorous research on a significant educational issue....expected to contribute to an improvement in public P-12 or Community College professional practices or policy, generally in the context of a particular educational institution."

"The dissertation shall identify the research problem and questions, explain the significance of the undertaking...and set forth the sources for and methods of gathering and analyzing the data, and offer a conclusion or recommendations."

Many dissertations have involved Ed.D. candidates directly in leading, managing, or contributing to P-12 or community college system reforms. Their involvement has frequently made a thorough evaluation possible, with implementation and success factors examined as well as impacts that include student achievement outcomes.

Examples of P-12 and community college candidates' dissertations that are directly associated with reforms and impacts on student achievement are provided below. For each, three dissertations or sets of dissertations are described in detail as illustrative cases. Other examples of highly relevant dissertations are summarized.

Dissertations Addressing Practice and Policy Reforms and Indicators of Impacts

P-12 Reforms and Evidence of Impacts of Ed.D. Programs and Graduates

Several practice and policy reforms that were examined by candidates from one or more school districts provide solid evidence of program and graduate impacts on P-12 reforms and on student achievement. These reforms include Linked Learning, small learning communities (SLCs), STEM reforms, literacy reforms, after school programs, outreach to historically underserved students and their families, special education reforms, transitional kindergarten, and teacher pipeline programs.
Case #1: Linked Learning Reforms

Linked Learning is a transformation of California high schools that integrates academics with career-based learning and authentic real-world workplace experiences. Dissertations examined Linked Learning reforms that Ed.D. candidates led or played instrumental roles in developing and carrying out. Significant effects were seen on the high school experiences of African-American youth in Long Beach, on urban youth in four high schools in the San Francisco East Bay region, on reforms in counseling and related effects on counseling services and student post-secondary plans of students, and on high school opportunities and outcomes among special needs students.

One Ed.D. candidate entered the program as a high school Vice Principal who was responsible for overseeing two certified Linked Learning Pathways. Her dissertation studied the effects of Linked Learning on African-American students who participated in the two high school pathways. She found that African-American youth in the Linked Learning Pathways experienced highly positive relationships with teachers and high expectations for them among teachers and counselors, with these adults not allowing them to drop out of the Linked Learning Pathway or Honors and Advanced Placement courses. Linked Learning was implemented in conjunction with SLCs, AVID, and GEAR UP, and with individualized support services to ensure that all African-American students benefited from the programs available at the school sites. The African-American pathway students had an increase in API scores of 45 points over a three-year period, while comparable non-pathway students had a 20-point increase. The Ed.D. graduate who conducted the research is now a leader in Linked Learning at the school district level and is using the findings of her research in planning additional pathways designed to foster success of African-American high school students through high quality Linked Learning opportunities.

Another dissertation studied the success of urban youth in a Bay Area district that offered Linked Learning certified academies under the direction of an Ed.D. candidate who oversaw and studied them. The candidate's dissertation demonstrated that pathway students had significantly better academic outcomes than matched non-pathway peers. On the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) used to measure college readiness and on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) in English/Language Arts and math, pathway students performed significantly better than matched non-pathway peers. The Ed.D. candidate examined the factors associated with the differences and found that small cohorts, student support, and student connection to the school community were especially important. He is using the findings in managing Linked Learning in his school district and sharing them with other urban districts.

Another candidate responsible for counseling services in her school district examined the roles played by counselors in Linked Learning Pathways and compared them with roles of non-pathway counselors. She found that the pathway counselors provided individualized face-to-face counseling for all pathways students, developed school services, expanded work-based earning opportunities, assisted students in planning for post-secondary education, training, and career opportunities, and fostered a culture of high expectations for all students in pathways. Students in the pathways had high school completion and college-going rates that were better than comparable non-pathway students. This Ed.D. graduate is using her results in leading counseling in her school district and is also teaching in some of the largest Counseling Education programs in the Los Angeles region, using her dissertation findings in preparing California's next generation of counselors.

A candidate responsible for special education within her district examined the academic outcomes for special needs students associated with Linked Learning high school placements. She compared the performance of students with disabilities enrolled in certified Linked Learning Pathways with the performance of comparable non-pathway peers. Students in the Linked Learning Pathways demonstrated significantly better scores on the CAHSEE English/Language Arts exam and the Early Assessment Program (EAP) in English/Language Arts. The students performed at the same level on the math exams of both assessments as their matched non-pathway peers. As an Ed.D. graduate, the researcher is using the findings in planning expanded placements of special needs high school students in Linked Learning pathways and seeking strategies for enhancing their mathematics achievement.
Small Learning Communities and Associated High School Reforms

A number of dissertations examined SLCs that Ed.D. candidates had a central role in leading as top-level school administrators. The studies generally demonstrate positive impacts on teachers and staff, on the culture of the school site, on access to learning opportunities, on students' sense of belonging and efficacy, and on student high school graduation and college-going rates. However, it is important to recognize that the SLCs studied were typically one dimension of a comprehensive high school reform that might also include other core components such as Linked Learning, California Career Academies, International Baccalaureate (IB) programs, and Advanced Placement initiatives. The dissertations addressing SLCs focused specifically on their attributes and effects, but it is not possible to disentangle these from effects of related reforms at the high schools.

One Ed.D. candidate conducted a case study of an SLC in which she had a leadership role in the Los Angeles Unified School District, examining its implementation and associated outcomes. The dissertation found that the SLC led to increased feelings of efficacy among teachers and teacher reports of enhanced student engagement, academic performance, and post-secondary college-going plans.

A second Ed.D. candidate conducted research on the impact of SLCs in the Long Beach Unified School District in conjunction with Linked Learning Pathways. The candidate demonstrated the complex changes in leadership approaches and in administrative operations that were undertaken simultaneously, resulting in successful district-wide implementation of both reforms. The dissertation reported significant gains in high school A-G college preparatory course-taking, in high school graduation rates, and in 2-year and 4-year college-going rates.

Case #2: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Reforms

One Ed.D. candidate who is a district administrator involved with STEM reforms examined the effect of the Lesson Study process used by an elementary district for strengthening teachers' Common Core in Math instructional practices and associated student learning outcomes. The dissertation found that the Lesson Study professional development resulted in significantly increased teacher understanding of the Common Core Standards of Mathematical Practice and how to integrate them into math instruction. Observational data showed that the teachers who participated in the Lesson Study process used the Standards of Mathematical Practice significantly more often than a matched comparison group. The research also found that the Lesson Study approach significantly enhanced teacher collaboration and their focus on student-centered instruction and learning in their classrooms. Student data demonstrated significantly higher scores in math on District Benchmark Assessments and on the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessment for students whose teachers participated in the Lesson Study process. The Ed.D. graduate has used the results of the research within her own district and has participated with others involved in the study in presentations of the research findings at California statewide STEM Conferences.

An Ed.D. candidate responsible for overseeing math instruction at her school district conducted a dissertation examining strategies for increasing achievement of African-American males in algebra. The research explored reforms in algebra practices at the urban middle school where the candidate was the Principal. The study found that strategies for increasing achievement included thinking-based instruction, peers working together in algebra activities and assignments, and teachers working together in collaborative inquiry groups planning and assessing instruction. The research identified obstacles to student success, including rigid pacing guides, which often required that students slow down or speed up regardless of their being deeply engaged in learning activities. The dissertation demonstrated significant achievement gains on California Standards Test (CST) and SBAC scores for students whose teachers participated in the algebra reforms. The graduate presented the research to leaders at her school and district and is now helping to expand the reforms to other schools.

Additional Ed.D. work addressing STEM reforms included two groups of candidates who studied reforms through parallel dissertations. Each candidate examined a facet of a reform in studies connected through common
attention to the effectiveness of implementation of the reform, effects on teachers’ knowledge and confidence in teaching STEM subjects, their instructional practices, and impacts on student learning and engagement.

One group of students examined the creation and operations of an innovative specialized STEM elementary demonstration school, unusual in that virtually all of the nation’s specialized STEM schools are high schools. The demonstration school gave special attention to the Common Core State Standards in Math (CCSS-M), the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and engineering design principles, serving as an exemplar in the implementation of California’s new standards. The site also served as a clinical preparation site for CSU student teachers and used a co-teaching design, in which student teachers co-taught with regular classroom teachers.

The Ed.D. program played an important role in the reform through the roles of Ed.D. candidates studying it. One dissertation examined the implementation of co-teaching at the demonstration school and its impact on student teachers, classroom teachers, and the school’s elementary grade students. It found that the co-teaching design led to strong knowledge and confidence in STEM teaching among teacher candidates and current teachers and was associated with high levels of performance of students on school district assessments of math and science achievement.

A second project that involved Ed.D. students in contributing to research examined the effect of enhanced teacher preparation in math and science on elementary teachers. It examined the impact of a school district/CSU campus partnership that enabled new and current teachers to pursue a Foundational Level Math or Science Credential. The effects of the rigorous program of five courses addressing content and pedagogy were pass rates of more than 90% on the California Subject Examinations (CSETs) in math and science needed to earn Foundational Level credentials. Other outcomes were in the area of confidence in teaching math and science, where statistically significant increases occurred in association with the advanced STEM teacher preparation.

Another group of Ed.D. students examined an Alternative Induction Program (AIP) in the same district that was established during the period of widespread school district layoffs in California and included a special focus on enhancing elementary teachers’ knowledge and instructional practices in STEM. The program worked with laid-off teachers, most of whom were relatively new teachers due to the California’s statutory Last-In/First-Out (LIFO) reduction in force policy. Most were elementary teachers because district layoff approaches included expanding elementary class size, thereby reducing the number of K-6 classroom teachers needed.

One dissertation examined the impact of the program on beginning teachers who had been laid off. The Ed.D. candidate assisted with the assessment of the induction program in which beginning teachers were able to participate. The dissertation found that the intense STEM focus of the induction experience led to increased confidence and expertise in teaching STEM among the participating beginning teachers.

Another dissertation examined the impact of the AIP on the Induction Mentors who had the laid-off beginning teachers participating in the program and serving as co-teachers in their classrooms. The Ed.D. candidate assisted the district by conducting a comprehensive assessment of these program impacts. The Induction Mentors participated in specialized STEM learning experiences that were provided for the AIP candidates to strengthen their preparation in math, science, technology applications, and engineering design, following the new California standards.

The dissertation documented positive effects on the interest, confidence, and instructional practices in STEM of the Induction Mentors and high levels of student learning and achievement. The dissertation found that the Mentors benefited significantly from the STEM professional development and that it increased their interest in teaching STEM subjects, their knowledge of the Common Core and the Next Generation Science Standards, and their use of instructional practices reflecting the standards. Each of the dissertations provided valuable implementation and outcome data as well as feedback to the district that enhanced the AIP project's success.

Another CSU Ed.D. graduate is a middle school science teacher who is one of the state’s leaders in educational applications of technology, including tablet computing. The candidate examined the impact of tablet computing,
one of the state's primary technology reforms, on student academic engagement in the 18 schools in his district. He found that student engagement with tablets does not necessarily equate with academic engagement with tablets. He also found that there was no relationship between a student's time using a tablet and their view of the value of technology in the classroom setting. These findings led to recommendations for structuring student experiences with tablets that connect them closely with academic subjects and assignments.

Overall, the dissertation found that the district's teachers were using tablets in ways that enabled students to do research, collect information and images, word-process findings, create presentations, and make presentations to their classmates and teacher. Tablets were being used in a range of learning-centered activities consistent with the new California standards. These included students creating and giving presentations, conducting research, performing simulations, and analyzing data. Nonetheless, the researcher's conclusion was that considerably more can be done to meaningfully integrate tablets directly into student academic activities, assignments, and learning. As a graduate, he is using the dissertation findings in the many district, regional, and statewide presentations and professional development workshops he gives. He is focusing on the steps needed to realize the teaching and learning reforms afforded by the paradigm shift to tablet-enhanced learning.

**Case 3: After-school Programs**

Several dissertations examined the impact on K-12 student learning, achievement, and non-cognitive outcomes of high quality after-school programs that Ed.D. candidates designed, were involved with, or led. Several found that sustained participation in well-designed, well-staffed, and well-supplied after-school programs that were aligned with in-school learning led to significant K-12 student outcomes.

One study, conducted by a statewide leader in STEM education, examined the impact of a reform that included after-school and summer programs and was designed to provide engaging, hands-on science learning activities for low-income and minority students in the Central Valley. The candidate helped organize intensive professional development in STEM for the program staff. Data were collected on the fidelity of implementation and on student interest in and attitudes toward STEM and on their knowledge of the STEM subjects studied. The results showed a high degree of fidelity and positive outcomes on both student attitudes and knowledge. The candidate conducted interviews with the students, and three strong themes emerged. They were that the K-12 students valued being able to (1) explore in STEM, (2) engage in hands-on activities rather than simply reading from a textbook, and (3) work collaboratively with other students. The Ed.D. graduate is now in a top leadership position at a nonprofit educational publisher and is using her dissertation findings in product design and in planning the content of professional development for school districts and county offices of education.

Another study examined the WriteGirl out-of-school time (OST) creative writing program and its impact on participating adolescent girls' self-efficacy, creative writing, self-confidence, and educational goals. The Ed.D. candidate helped to plan the content and delivery of the program. The research found that the creative writing program had a significant positive impact on participants' self-confidence and their attitudes toward writing and their academic success in writing. Increases were found in participants' classroom grades in writing and on their performance on the California Standards Test in English/Language Arts. It was found that the girls particularly valued the opportunity to write creatively and to work with peers in planning and in reviewing their writing. The researcher, now a graduate, has continued to work with the program, building on her dissertation findings, and has given a number of presentations about it at state and national professional conferences.

A third study examined the effects of an after-school intervention program on struggling third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade students' English/Language Arts and math achievement. The candidate is an administrator in the school district that implemented the after-school program. Credentialled teachers received training to teach English/Language Arts and math in an after-school enrichment program. The after-school activities and sequence were directly aligned with the regular school day curriculum. Students were required to attend regularly in order to provide a meaningful, continuous learning experience. Information about the program and its goals was shared with parents so they could reinforce them at home. Outcome measures were student
homework completion, school attendance, district benchmark assessments, and CST assessments in English/Language Arts and math. Performance of the struggling third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade students on the assessments was compared through pre-tests prior to the program and post-tests at the end of the program with a matched comparison group. The results showed that the students in the after-school program demonstrated significantly more homework completion, better school attendance, and larger growth on the two achievement measures than the comparison group students. The researcher has, as a graduate, used her research in guiding after-school programs for the district, which seeks to place children in the lowest quartile of achievement in these programs to reduce the need for grade retention.

**Addressing Needs of Historically Underserved Students and Their Families**

Several Ed.D. candidates conducted dissertations about programs they initiated, managed, or led for historically underserved students and their families. They undertook reforms focused on increasing access and success of underrepresented students and studied impacts on high school A-G completion, GPA, graduation, IB, AP, and EAP performance, and college-going rates, often finding positive impacts. In other cases, impacts were mixed, but Ed.D. candidates contributed to reforms by expanding knowledge about them.

**Special Education Reforms**

A number of Ed.D. candidates designed, led, or oversaw reforms aimed at improving access and success among P-12 special needs students. Most focused on inclusive practices and on such strategies as Universal Design for Learning. Ed.D. candidates' research demonstrated positive impacts on self-confidence, aspirations, and achievement of special needs students affected by the reforms they led or managed. Where interventions did not lead to significant impacts, candidates identified obstacles that needed to be overcome to achieve success.

**Transitional Kindergarten**

A group of Ed.D. candidates studied the state's transitional kindergarten (TK) programs, which were authorized in 2010. They began operating in 2012-13 and were required to be offered by all districts by 2015-16 to children from 4 years and 9 months to five years of age (traditionally too young for school entry). The intent of the authorizing statute was to provide separate and unique experiences for transitional kindergarten and kindergarten students, while giving districts the flexibility to determine how best to meet the curricular needs of each child. TK represents an area requiring new practices across the state that presents substantial challenges for achieving high-quality program implementation.

Dissertations about TK were undertaken by six CSU Ed.D. students in a collaborative project in which each candidate studied a different facet of implementation. Leaders in the fields of transitional kindergarten and early childhood education and administrators in the California Department of Education were made aware of the dissertation research early in the process in order for them to later become users of the results.

The Ed.D. candidates documented best practices that were occurring in this newly emerging field as well as struggles of schools and districts included due to the lack of trained teachers, the absence of professional development for teachers or school administrators in transitional kindergarten principles and practices, and the limited availability of developmentally appropriate curriculum and instructional resources.

The Ed.D. candidates used the findings to strengthen the implementation of transitional kindergarten at their sites and organizations and more broadly across their regions. The results of the dissertations were used by policy makers at the state level as well as by administrators at school districts and county offices of education. In this rapidly developing field, the impact of the CSU Ed.D. programs and graduates has been particularly notable, with Ed.D. dissertation research having made a major contribution to the knowledge base.
Teacher Pipeline Programs

A number of dissertations examined the California Teacher Pathway, an urban grow-your-own teacher preparation pipeline in effect on several campuses that CSU began a decade ago. The dissertations focused on outcomes and on the factors that were critical for achieving program success. They examined the support being provided to the aspiring teacher candidates and what support was needed for attaining high levels of program completion and earning a credential among pipeline completers. The Ed.D. dissertations identified the types of continuous academic and personal support needed and the importance of a cohort model. They examined success factors from the time students entered a community college until they transferred to CSU, earned a baccalaureate degree, and completed a teaching credential. One impact of the Ed.D. programs and graduates in this area was again to make a major contribution to development of the knowledge base in an emerging field. Additionally, findings were provided to program managers, who used them to strengthen program implementation.

Community College Reforms and Evidence of Impacts of Ed.D. Programs and Graduates

Several practice and policy reforms that were examined by candidates in the community college specialization provide solid evidence of impacts on reforms and student achievement. Reforms addressed access and diversity, developmental education in math and English, Student Learning Outcomes, and academic and student services for such groups as Veterans, English-As-A Second Language (ESL) students, and groups historically underrepresented in post-secondary education, including African-American, Latino, and Hmong students.

Illustrative Case #1: Developmental Education in Mathematics

A number of candidates whose roles were connected to developmental education conducted dissertations on the effectiveness of innovative approaches. One candidate, for example, examined the effectiveness of an open-entry, two-course mathematics sequence that contextualizes mathematics using statistics as its basis. The candidates’ dissertation was aimed at exploring this approach for overcoming low completion rates in community college developmental mathematics sequences and gateway mathematics courses that prevent a majority of students, particularly minority students, from achieving their community college educational goals or being able to transfer.

The dissertation found that 86% of the cohort successfully completed the two-course statistics sequence, earning a C or higher grade in transfer-level statistics. The completion rate for the statistics sequence cohort far exceeded the national rate of approximately 33% of community college students with developmental mathematics needs participating in comparable developmental math courses. Nearly all of the statistics sequence cohort was Latina/o or African American, groups normally having among the lowest rates of success in developmental mathematics.

In addition to successfully completing college-level statistics, the students performed comparably or out-performed a group of mathematically better-prepared college students from four-year institutions. This result was found using test items from a nationally normed post-test, the Comprehensive Assessment of Outcomes for a first course in Statistics (CAOS).

The dissertation represents an important addition to the body of research on alternative, statistics-based pathways that enable community college students to succeed in developmental mathematics. According to state community college leaders, it has been and continues to be influential in discussions regarding approaches that are statistics-based as alternatives for redressing low community college developmental mathematics sequence competition.

Illustrative Case #2: Developmental Education in English

A second candidate played a central role in bringing to her community college Our Reading Toolbox: The Reading-Thinking Connection in a Community College, a nationally recognized approach for strengthening reading competency among students. The intervention includes a set of tools that foster a thinking-centered approach that
become an integral part of the students' learning experiences. Effects were evaluated on students' perceptions of themselves as learners, their performance in course activities, and their academic outcomes when using the Toolbox.

The candidate's research demonstrated statistically significant gains in participants' academic performance as measured by course assignments and grades when they used the Toolbox. It created a learning environment and course activities that featured a culture of thinking in the classroom. Second language learners demonstrated a statistically significant increase in comprehension after using the Toolbox. Using the Toolbox in a developmental reading class transformed students' perceptions about the reading process and themselves as readers. Students' ability to think purposefully about what they read, their writing skills, and their grades on class assignments increased dramatically over the course of a semester as they applied the Toolbox thinking-centered tools.

This work advances the use in California of national reforms drawing on Our Reading Toolbox, which focuses on the reading-thinking connection. The nationally respected League for Innovation in the Community Colleges has identified Our Reading Toolkit for its promise in improving success in community college developmental education (www.league.org/blog/post.cfm/our-reading-toolbox-the-reading-thinking-connection). The League notes that reforms for teaching developmental reading effectively to all students in community colleges are critical. It underscores the positive findings making this work, emphasizing the development of critical thinking skills in addition to learning the mechanics of reading and writing, a promising strategy. The Ed.D. graduate who introduced and studied the program is now working with several California community colleges in expanding use of Our Reading Toolkit.

**Illustrative Case #3: Advancing Educational Success of Veterans**

One Ed.D. candidate, himself a recent Veteran, examined the experiences of student Veterans at California Community Colleges and factors related to persistence and attrition. The dissertation included a survey with 261 student Veterans at three Southern California Community Colleges. It represents a significant contribution to the field of Veteran education and provides a foundation for post-secondary reforms to serve them effectively.

The dissertation found that the successful student Veteran is academically integrated with the institution. This includes regularly attending classes and meeting with an instructor as needed outside of class time. Student Veterans who felt stressed about school were almost 10% less likely to persist in school than those who did not feel stressed by school. The probability that a military Veteran would persist in their education was 11.5% higher for those who reported an "easy" or "very easy" registration for classes.

The majority of Veterans did not perceive their educational experience to have been "good" or "excellent." Veterans reported limited social integration with their community colleges—that is, little participation in college activities or organizations and little interaction with classmates outside of class. Those who found the experience positive were more likely to be planning to persist in their community college education. Of the student Veterans, 84% were using some form of Veterans Benefit Assistance, but only 28% felt they would have enough financial aid to complete their academic objectives.

The Ed.D. graduate now leads Veterans services and programs for the CSU system. He has drawn on the findings to lead initiatives aimed at ensuring access, success, and graduation among Veterans on CSU campuses. He is using his dissertation findings in working with Veteran education program leaders in the California Community Colleges to initiate reforms that recognize Veterans as non-traditional students and that enhance Veterans' transfer success.

As troop draw-down continues, reforms responsive to Veterans are essential to enhance their opportunities for reintegration. Nationally, Veteran success and completion rates in higher education are among the lowest of any population. The redesign of traditional practices the Ed.D. graduate is leading—ones that his dissertation showed are closely associated with high GPAs and with educational persistence—have state and national significance.
Additional Examples of Impacts on Reforms and Student Achievement

One candidate whose professional role is focused on leading a college-wide Student Learning Outcomes model studied a range of implementation techniques and their effects, using the findings in designing the college approach. A second candidate whose professional responsibilities include institutionalizing Student Learning Outcomes assessment conducted a dissertation on best practices and barriers to achieving this objective institution-wide. The candidate's dissertation identified best practices and analyzed the effects of strategies for overcoming barriers, and the candidate subsequently deployed these practices at the college.

In the area of access, one candidate was involved with a reform aimed at easing the transition of first-generation students of color to community college. The candidate studied a pilot program and identified key success factors and program impacts. The candidate was later able to use the findings to sustain and expand the pilot program.

Several candidates were involved with and conducted dissertations addressing Latino participation and success in community colleges. One candidate, for example, examined an innovative program designed to enhance the role of Latino fathers in setting the pathway to college for their children. The dissertation identified approaches that were especially effective. The candidate has continued to work with the program, which has been expanded.

Another candidate examined success and completion among Latino male community college students. The dissertation identified factors supporting student success and obstacles they faced. The Ed.D. graduate has been able to use the dissertation results in the development of targeted academic and student support services to enhance Latino male student success at his own college and others in his community college district.

A candidate who works with migrant populations examined parental influences on Latino student post-secondary enrollment and initiated an experimental program to enhance parental roles in advising their children. The candidate's dissertation examined the features that were needed to make such a program successful and the program outcomes. Based on the success of the work, the candidate was able to expand the experimental program and now oversees a program for Latino migrant parents and their children that is being implemented countywide.

Another candidate examined the impact of culture and acculturation on the academic achievement of Hmong Community College students. The candidate developed and studied a program designed to foster successful acculturation among these students. The candidate's dissertation identified key areas that needed to be addressed in order for programs to be culturally sensitive. The candidate was subsequently able to play a lead role in creating college-wide academic and student services to support acculturation and achievement among Hmong students.

The dissertations described above generally included quantitative evidence of impacts of Ed.D. programs and their graduates on reforms and student outcomes. Other dissertations did not include evidence of impacts but rather provided the rationale and context for perspectives having the potential to influence important reforms advancing student learning and achievement. One example is a dissertation on Closing the Equity Gap: Social Justice Leadership in California Community Colleges. It sets forth a vision and strategy for achieving greater enrollment and success of underrepresented students. The candidate who prepared it, a respected community college leader, has been able to use it in top-level discussions of advancing success and completion of all community college students.

Summary

This report has provided quantitative and qualitative indicators addressing the evaluation stipulation of Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005 (Senate Bill 724) related to impacts. The legislation requested "any available evidence on the effects that the graduates of the programs are having on elementary and secondary school and reform efforts and on student achievement." Consistent with the legislative framework, CSU Ed.D. programs were explicitly designed to advance reforms. They prepare leaders through partnerships with P-12 and community colleges and enable professionals to earn their degree while working full-time. Following the CSU system's program guidelines, all students conduct a rigorous dissertation on a significant educational practice or policy.
Taken together, these program features have resulted in a track record of Ed.D. programs and graduates being involved in reform efforts that are demonstrating positive effects on student learning, development, and achievement. In cases where candidates' work in reforms has not focused on or identified significant impacts, candidates have typically examined implementation of reforms, assessing obstacles to effectiveness and success factors. Through their dissertations, Ed.D. candidates have contributed to building the knowledge base on a broad range of significant practice and policy reforms in California's P-12 and community college education.
Appendix 1

Text of Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005
CSU Ed.D. Program Statutory Authorization
Appendix 1

TEXT OF CHAPTER 269, STATUTES OF 2005

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 66040) is added to Chapter 2 of Part 40 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 4.5. Doctoral Programs in Education

66040. The Legislature finds and declares both of the following:

(a) Since its adoption in 1960, the Master Plan for Higher Education has served the state exceedingly well, allowing California to create the largest and most distinguished higher education system in the nation. A key component of the Master Plan is the differentiation of mission and function, whereby doctoral and identified professional programs are limited to the University of California, with the provision that the California State University can provide doctoral education in joint doctoral degree programs with the University of California and independent California colleges and universities. This differentiation of function has allowed California to provide universal access to postsecondary education while preserving quality.

(b) Because of the urgent need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts, the State of California is hereby making an exception to the differentiation of function in graduate education that assigns sole authority among the California public higher education segments to the University of California for awarding doctoral degrees independently. This exception to the Master Plan for Higher Education recognizes the urgency of meeting critical public school and community college leadership needs and the distinctive strengths and respective missions of the California State University and the University of California.

66040.3. (a) Pursuant to Section 66040, and notwithstanding Section 66010.4 in order to meet specific educational leadership needs in the California public schools and community colleges, the California State University is authorized to award the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree as defined in this section. The authority to award degrees granted by this article is limited to the discipline of education. The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be distinguished from doctoral degree programs at the University of California.

(b) The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be focused on preparing administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges and on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in California public schools and community colleges. The Doctor of Education degree offered by the California State University shall be offered through partnerships through which the California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges shall participate substantively in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation. This degree shall enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.

(c) Nothing in this article shall be construed to limit or preclude the California Postsecondary Education Commission from exercising its authority under Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66900) to review, evaluate, and make recommendations relating to, any and all programs established under this article.

With regard to funding the degree programs authorized in Section 66040.3, the California State University shall follow all of the following requirements:
(a) Funding on a per full-time equivalent student (FTES) basis for each new student in these degree programs shall be funded from within the California State University's enrollment growth levels as agreed to in the annual Budget Act. Enrollments in these programs shall not alter the California State University's ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not come at the expense of enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs. Funding provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the California State University receives.

(b) Each student in the programs authorized by this article shall be charged fees no higher than the rate charged for students in state-supported doctoral degree programs in education at the University of California, including joint Ed.D. programs of the California State University and the University of California.

(c) The California State University shall provide any startup funding needed for the programs authorized by this article from within existing budgets for academic programs support, without diminishing the quality of program support offered to California State University undergraduate programs. Funding of these programs shall not result in reduced undergraduate enrollments at the California State University.

The California State University, the Department of Finance, and the Legislative Analyst's Office shall jointly conduct a statewide evaluation of the new programs implemented under this article. The results of the evaluation shall be reported, in writing, to the Legislature and Governor on or before January 1, 2011. The evaluation required by this section shall consider all of the following:

(a) The number of new doctoral programs in education implemented, including information identifying the number of new programs, applicants, admissions, enrollments, degree recipients, time-to-degree, attrition, and public school and community college program partners.

(b) The extent to which the programs established under this article are fulfilling identified state needs for training in educational leadership, including statewide supply and demand data that considers capacity at the University of California and in California's independent colleges and universities.

(c) Information on the place of employment of students and the subsequent job placement of graduates.

(d) Any available evidence on the effects that the graduates of the programs are having on elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts and on student achievement.

(e) Program costs and the fund sources that were used to finance these programs, including a calculation of cost per degree awarded.

(f) The costs of the programs to students, the amount of financial aid offered, and student debt levels of graduates of the programs.

(g) The extent to which the programs established under this article are in compliance with the requirements of this article.
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CSU Ed.D. Programs and Directors

The fifteen CSU independent Ed.D. programs and their Directors are listed below. The Program Directors helped significantly in the preparation of this report, providing virtually all of the data, interview and survey findings, and dissertations on which it is based. We wish to acknowledge these major contributions to the report and also the efforts of the Directors to ensure that the programs directly reflect the purposes of Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005, the legislation authorizing the CSU independent doctorate of education degree.

**CSU Bakersfield**
- Dr. Danny Whetton
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**CSU Channel Islands with CSU Fresno**
- Dr. Gary W. Kinsey (Channel Islands) and
- Dr. Ken Magdaleno (Fresno State)
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Directors

**CSU East Bay**
- Dr. Bradley Porfilio
  - P-12 Specialization Director

**CSU Fresno**
- Dr. Ken Magdaleno
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**CSU Fullerton**
- Dr. John Hoffman
  - Ed.D. Program Director
- Dr. Natalie Tran
  - P-12 Education Specialization Coordinator
- Dr. Dawn Person
  - Community College Specialization Coordinator

**CSU Long Beach**
- Dr. Anna Ortiz
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**CSU Los Angeles**
- Dr. Lois Andre-Bechely
  - P-12 Specialization Director

**CSU Northridge**
- Dr. Miguel Ceja
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**Cal Poly Pomona**
- Dr. Betty Alford
- Dr. Nancy Sanders
  - P-12 Specialization Directors

**CSU Sacramento**
- Dr. Julian Vasquez Heilig
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**CSU San Bernardino**
- Dr. Donna Schnorr
- Dr. Louie Rodriguez
  - P-12 Specialization Directors

**San Diego State**
- Dr. lan Pumpan
  - P-12 Specialization Director
- Dr. J Luke Wood
  - Community College Specialization Director

**San Francisco State**
- Dr. Robert Gabriner
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director

**San Jose State**
- Dr. Arnold Danzig
  - P-12 Specialization Director

**CSU Stanislaus**
- Dr. Kathryn Bell McKenzie
  - P-12 and Community College Specialization Director
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Section 1: Introduction

The *Doctoral Student Guidelines* serves as a reference for policies and procedures applicable to 1) doctoral students; 2) dissertation chairs and committee members; 3) Graduate Group (core and affiliated faculty); 4) members of the Advisory Board; and 5) administrative staff of the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership (DPEL).

The DPEL is an intensive, 60-unit program designed for full-time educators earning their doctorates. Course meetings are generally held on Saturdays. Students taking six to nine units per semester can anticipate completing the program in three years.

There are approximately 15-20 students in each entering cohort. The students take the first nine courses (27 units) as a cohort. In other words, for the first four terms, the students in a particular cohort attend all their courses together. These core courses are followed by 21 units of individualized specialization courses, culminating in the 12 unit dissertation.

*Please consult these Guidelines whenever you have any questions about DPEL. Call the DPEL office whenever you have questions not answered by these Guidelines.*
Section 2: Faculty Advisors

Each student will be assigned to a faculty advisor who will serve in that capacity until the student selects a dissertation chair.

1. Each member of the Core Graduate Group shall be available to serve as a faculty advisor.
2. Normally, no more than four incoming graduate students will be assigned to any one faculty member.
3. The faculty advisor will establish a file on each student and will assist the Graduate Program Assistant in planning the students’ program of study.
4. Faculty advisors may be changed upon request by the student or a faculty member.
5. As a student’s research interests become clearly defined, a faculty member other than the faculty advisor may assume the role of dissertation chair. The faculty advisor and the Graduate Program Assistant will then assist the dissertation chair as needed.
6. A faculty member will be limited to chairing no more than four student dissertation committees and advising no more than four registered students in one cohort at one time. A faculty member can petition the Executive Committee for a waiver of this limit.
Section 3: Time Limits for Matriculation to Degree, Annual Student Reviews, Satisfactory Progress, Disqualification, and Appeal of Disqualification

Time Limits for Matriculation to Degree

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is designed for completion of the degree requirements within three calendar years. Completion of degree requirements between three and a half and four years is normally acceptable. Normally, the qualifying examination will be taken after completion of core courses. The total time to qualifying examination and advancement to candidacy may not exceed three years, unless there are mitigating circumstances and the Graduate Group has approved the extensions; such extensions may not exceed one year.

Total registered time in the doctoral program is not expected to exceed five years, and extension beyond this period requires approval by the Graduate Group. Extension of the period for degree completion beyond the period of five years is normally granted to students in good academic standing, not to exceed a two-year period. During the two-year period, continuation each term after the extension is granted requires determination of satisfactory progress by the Graduate Group.

Extension of the period by more than two years can be granted only under special circumstances and is based upon criteria established by the Graduate Group. Such extension requires (a) special approval in accordance with the procedures established by the campus, and (b) demonstration that the student has maintained currency in the field, including current literature, course work validation, and research in the field. Students must maintain continuous enrollment and will pay full fees during any granted extensions.

Annual Student Reviews

The Core faculty will review student progress on an annual basis and letters will be sent out each year to students regarding their progress in the program.
**Satisfactory Progress**

Ed.D. students are expected to maintain satisfactory progress toward approved academic objectives as defined by the Graduate Group faculty and the University in accordance with the program of study. Students must maintain continuous enrollment in the program in order to be considered a student in good standing. Only courses included in the doctoral program of study will be used in the grade point average (GPA) calculation that determines the satisfactory progress of an enrolled doctoral student.

In order for students to maintain satisfactory progress in the doctoral program, several standards must be met. First, the student must maintain at least a 3.0 cumulative grade point average throughout the program. Second, the student may not have a grade point average below 3.0 in any two terms. Students who fall below a 3.0 grade point average in a semester will be notified that they are on academic probation. In addition, students receiving two C’s in courses will be dismissed from the program unless one of the “C” grades is repeated and improved. Students will be advised in writing they are on academic probation after receiving the first C and will be dismissed immediately after receiving the second C in any course in their program of study.

Students must repeat any class in which they have received a D or an F. These repeat courses do not replace failed courses (i.e., the grade point for the D or F remains in the calculation of the student’s overall GPA).

The student must advance to candidacy and complete all courses and examinations satisfactorily in the time period specified by the Graduate Group. The student must pass all required examinations within two attempts.

**Incomplete Grades**

Students will be allowed to carry no more than 6 semester units of incomplete coursework. Students carrying 6 semester units of incompletes will receive a letter of warning and be placed on Academic Probation by the Program. Students normally will not be permitted to enroll in
additional courses until all incompletes are cleared. Students must meet with the Director to appeal this restriction or to determine any other courses of action the student must take in order to rectify the situation.

Normally it is expected that the student will make up an I grade during the next semester; however, it must be made up within one calendar year immediately following the last day of the semester/session during which it was assigned. This limitation prevails whether or not the student maintains continuous enrollment. Failure to complete the assigned work will result in the I being counted as an IC, or failing grade for grade point average computation. An I grade not made up within one calendar year after the grade has been recorded is changed to an IC (or an NC if CR/NC grading was approved). Incomplete grades must be cleared before a degree is awarded. In the absence of the instructor who has assigned the incomplete, a student seeking to make up this grade should consult the department chair.

**Grade Substitution by Repetition of Courses**

Students may, with approval of an adviser, repeat a course for academic credit, regardless of what grade was originally earned in the course. However, the student is not eligible to petition for grade substitution. All course work taken, beginning with the first term of the student’s doctoral or master’s degree program, is used in determining the student’s grade point average and graduation eligibility.

**Disqualification**

If a student receives a grade point average below 3.0 in a second semester, they will be disqualified from the program. Students may appeal their disqualification through the appropriate appeal process established by the Graduate Group. After consultation with the Graduate Group faculty, students who fail to make satisfactory academic progress who are recommended for disqualification from the program by the Graduate Group must be notified officially in writing. A student who has been disqualified from the program, which has the effect of being terminated from the University, will not be allowed to continue in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, enroll in doctoral-level courses,
or register again in that doctoral program, without application and readmission.

**Appeal of Disqualification**

To ensure that a decision to disqualify a student from the program is just, basic due process requirements set by the Graduate Group must be met. This process, developed by the Graduate Group, must include the opportunity for appeal by the student.
## Section 4: Doctoral Program Course Sequence

Note: All courses are 3 units. Students must pass the Qualifying Exam during the fifth semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6010 Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
<td>EDL 6010 Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
<td>EDL 6010 Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>6 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6020 Educational Reform</td>
<td>EDL 6020 Educational Reform</td>
<td>EDL 6020 Educational Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6080 Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
<td>EDL 6080 Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
<td>EDL 6080 Theories of Cross-Cultural Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6030 Educational Policy Environments</td>
<td>EDL 6030 Educational Policy Environments</td>
<td>EDL 6030 Educational Policy Environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
<td>9 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #3</td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #5</td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #4</td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #6</td>
<td>EDL 6770 Specialization Courses PreK-12/HE course #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 6900 Dissertation 1 (includes 2nd mandatory dissertation seminar)</td>
<td>EDL 6910 Dissertation 2</td>
<td>EDL 6910 Dissertation 3 (6 units)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- * Indicates fieldwork experience in course.
- Unless otherwise marked, all courses are 3 units.

### Core Courses
27 units

### Specialization Courses
21 units

### Dissertation Units
12 units
Section 5: Doctoral Program Phases

Students in the program move through three phases of study, comprising 60 units. The Doctoral Program Phases (Core, Specialization, and Dissertation) provide a learning experience designed to give students knowledge about the strategies of scholarly investigation and application in practice. The final phase (i.e., the dissertation) must deal with specific, well-defined and important questions or issues which merit investigation. Dissertation topics must relate to some existing body of theoretical or empirical knowledge in the chosen field of study. The student should work closely with the professor he/she selects as dissertation chair to develop the topic question. The DPEL program policy permits a wide range in both subject matter and research perspective. No constraint is placed upon the topic to be chosen, except those inherent in proper scholarship and within the purview of the dissertation chair and committee.

The unique nature of the Ed.D. will also determine the nature of the dissertation. The student will normally be expected to construct a document with a clear theoretical framework, an adequate collection of empirical, philosophical, evaluative, historical, ethnographic and/or intervention data, a critical analysis of the data collected, and a direct and specific discussion of the implications of theory and data for educational policy and/or practice. The dissertation research will be conducted under the supervision of the major professor and the dissertation committee.

All of the DPEL forms can be found on the DPEL website: http://www.csub.edu/sse/departments/advancededucationalstudies/educational_leadership/index.html.

The student is responsible for keeping track of his/her courses and units. It is strongly recommended that the student record each doctoral course and verify that the appropriate number of units is completed during each phase.
Phase I: Core Courses

The Core Courses consist of nine courses of 27 semester units. During this phase DPEL students take these courses as a cohort. Core Courses and a description are listed below. Each Core course is 3 units.

EDLD 6010. Organizational Theory in Complex Organizations (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Combines alternatives views of organizational theory with application to the structure of the school; to critical roles played by teachers, principals and other school personnel; and to examine the relationships among structural elements of schools.

EDLD 6020. Educational Reform (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines change in education settings in the context of organizational theory, structure, and culture; change processes; and change leadership strategies and styles. K-12 educational settings and higher education settings are used to test theories and change strategies.

EDLD 6030. Educational Policy Environments (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Determinants of policy in educational organizations and leadership. Analysis of structures used for legal, fiscal and political decisions and conflict management. Role of the educational leader in relation to intergovernmental activities aimed at educational reform.

EDLD 6040. Advanced Applied Quantitative Methods (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines advanced research methodologies and data analysis techniques applicable to education and social science settings. Topics include experimental and quasi-experimental design, advanced statistical techniques, sampling distributions, nonparametric statistics, inference and hypothesis testing. Specific applications to the work of the education leader.

EDLD 6060. Conceptual Curriculum Perspectives for Educational Leadership (3)

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL and EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020. Seminar. Students will develop the philosophical and analytical skills to examine curriculum theory and practice, including the conceptualization of purposes of the organization of subjects matters, and of the instructional methods.

EDLD 6070. Applied Qualitative Research Methods (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Examines the purpose and nature of qualitative research including current applications in educational settings. Emphasis is directed toward critical analysis of current qualitative studies and will include field-based application.
EDLD 6080. Theories of Cross-Cultural Education (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Seminar. Designed to explain and discuss the most relevant theoretical approaches dealing with cross-cultural, multicultural education. As diverse and conflicting perspectives are examined, students will experience the complexity of views and perceptions that leaders must address when working with multicultural populations coexisting in a pluralistic society.

EDLD 6090. Advanced Applied Educational Research and Measurement (3)

Prerequisite: Classified standing in DPEL. Review of approaches to designing and conducting educational research, including ethical issues. Emphasis on reading and evaluating research literature, and designing research projects. Psychometric theory, validity and reliability of tests, professional testing standards, hands-on experience with test evaluation are included.

EDLD 6110. Educational Evaluation, Assessment, and Planning (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL. Examines assessment practices, planning strategies, and evaluation processes in K-12 and higher education settings. Addresses current issues and trends in the field of education related to school accountability.

Phase II. Specialization Courses

The Specialization phase is equivalent of 21 semester units. Prerequisites for all Specialization Courses are completion of core courses and a 3.0 cumulative GPA. Additionally, students must satisfy all conditions associated with admission, if applicable. Each cohort is surveyed during the Core Course phase of the program to identify topics of interest for specialization courses. The program attempts to offer the highest ranked course topics, depending on faculty availability. Students must take specialization units in their declared strand (P12 or HE). Cross-Strand courses are available to students of either strand. Students may also propose an individual study course by completing the Individual Study form. This form is submitted to the Director for approval. A selection of previously offered Specialization Courses are listed below. All Specialization Courses are 3 units, unless otherwise noted.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Examples of specialization topics offered at least once before are described below.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Leadership for Reading Instruction (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Students analyze forces driving
reading/language arts mandates and their impact on the implementation of reading curricula. Using
philosophical and corporate underpinnings of the "Reading Wars" students discover the praxis
between theory, research, and practice.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Human Resource Leadership in Schools (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan.
EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Application of Human Resource
Management Theory, empirical findings, and best practices to school leadership. HR theories and
practices including recruitment, staffing, motivation, performance management, and development
are examined emphasizing the strategic role of HR in enhancing organizational effectiveness.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Resource Management and Fiscal Planning (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan.
EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Develops advanced skills to effectively
manage internal and external resources within the school setting. The course provides an overview
for leveraging external resources, obtaining grants, developing external partners, and examining
issues and studies related to financing public education.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: School Law (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan.
EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Examination of Federal Law, California
Ed. Code, California Code of Regulation, and program implementation. Freedom of expression,
separation of church and state, personnel law, liability, governance requirements, and special
education are covered.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Educational Leadership (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan,
EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020, EDLD 6030, EDLD 6040, EDLD 6060, EDLD 6070, EDLD 6080, and
EDLD 6110. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Topics and issues in
educational leadership in the areas of organizational studies, curriculum, instruction and
supervision, assessment and evaluation, and sociocultural studies. Analysis of research findings
and an emphasis on the relationship of theory to practice.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Human Resources and Collective Bargaining in Higher
Education (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan.
EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. Through the study of statues,
regulations, court decisions and case studies students will examine the major functions of human
resources, such as: employer-employee relations, performance evaluation, recruitment and
selection processes, employee discipline, interpreting bargaining agreement language, prevention
of harassment and discrimination. There will be an emphasis on the critical role of human
resources in education.

**EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Leaders and Leadership (3)**

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan.
EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. During this course, attention will be
focused on the following questions: 1) What is leadership? 2) How does the research literature define leadership generally? Educational leadership? 3) What role does leadership play in the policy-making process? What role does it play in everyday practice? 4) How many notions of leadership changed in recent times? 5) What characteristics make an individual a leader? 6) What are the implications for leaders K-12 and higher education institutions?

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Literacy, Technology, and Disability (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This class will survey a range of theories, research and practice in the development of literacy for general and special populations with a special focus on the uses of technology as a tool for literacy development. While we will address a range of research and practices for emergent readers and comprehension, there will be a focus on authentic approaches students can use inside and outside the classroom. Special attention will be paid to the pedagogy of critical comprehension.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Post-secondary Legal Issues (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is designed to expose the student to a wide range of administrative problems at the college and university level that have legal implications. This course should assist current and prospective college and university faculty and administrators in recognizing the legal parameters around which decisions are made. The course will address the legal relationships between the higher education institution and its trustees, administrators, faculty, students, local/state/federal governments, educational associations, and business/industry communities.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Technology in Education (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is designed to explore the effective use of information systems and educational technology in administration, management and instruction in post-secondary education. Students will be able to plan, design, implement and evaluate a cost-effective means to apply current technology through leadership, resource allocation, trends, information security, curriculum integration and individual student learning.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Community College Administration (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course provides an understanding and development of knowledge of community college administration with emphasis on the California Community College system. The course combines theory, research, topics, issues, and debates of the profession. Practical applications will be explored while enabling students to develop a knowledge base grounded in current theory and research in community college administration.

EDLD 6770. Specialization Topics: Writing for Publication (3)

Prerequisite: classified standing in DPEL, approval of the Director for student’s academic plan. EDLD 6770 may be repeated for different course content. This course is intended to explore the world of publishing for educational research. In this course, students will gain an understanding of how educational researchers prepare manuscripts for publication. Students will also conduct in-
depth explorations of the type of publishing venues that exist for the publication of educational researcher, such as: online journals, peer reviewed journals, methodological journals, theory journals, and practitioner journals. Students will also learn different ways to: engage with journal editors, assess editorial boards of journals, select journals to publish in, and assess journal quality.

**EDLD 6850. Individual Study (1-3)**

Prerequisites: classified standing in DPEL, EDLD 6010, EDLD 6020, EDLD 6030, EDLD 6040, EDLD 6060, EDLD 6070, EDLD 6080, EDLD 6110, and permission of the director. Research for individual doctoral graduate students. CR/NC grading only. Units: 1-3, Repeatable up to 15 units

**Additional Potential Specialization or Independent Study Topics**

Collaboration in Professional Learning Communities

Effective Instructional Strategies Leadership in Math and Science Education

Data-driven Decision Making

Advanced Curriculum

Professional Ethics and Moral Issues in Education

Organization Development for High Performance

Student Development in Post-Secondary Education

Contemporary Issues in Post-Secondary Education Technology

Post-Secondary Education Collective Bargaining

Resource and Fiscal Planning Development and Marketing

Post-secondary Legal Aspects

Common Core Standards
Phase III. Dissertation

The Dissertation Phase begins with the advancement to candidacy for the Doctorate in Education. Mandatory dissertation seminars are held during the fifth semester. A total of 12 dissertation units are taken in the three subsequent semesters (3 units in the sixth semester, 3 units in the seventh semester, and 6 units in the eighth semester).

EDLD 6900. Dissertation (3)

Prerequisites: advancement to candidacy for the Doctorate in Education and a minimum GPA of 3.0. May be repeated twice for credit. Contact the program office for specific guidelines on completing the dissertation. CR/NC grading only.

EDLD 6910. Dissertation Continuation (0)

Pre-requisite: For continuous enrollment while completing the dissertation. May enroll twice with department approval after three semesters of EDEL 6900. Additional enrollments must be approved by the Director.

PROGRAM TOTAL: 60 UNITS
Section 6: Policy and Procedures for the Qualifying Exam and Advancement to Candidacy

To be eligible to take the Qualifying Exam, students must:

- Satisfactorily complete all Core courses (including clearing all incomplete grades)
- Satisfy any conditions associated with admission

The Qualifying Examination

Eligible students are required to apply for the Qualifying Exam by completing DPEL Form 2 Part I to the DPEL office 30 days prior to the exam date. The qualifying examination will be scenario-based questions related to material covered during the Core Courses. Two scenarios, one PreK-12 and one Post-secondary, will be developed by the program director (or designee) and sent to each faculty member who taught a Core course so they can develop the question using the scenario. Each faculty member teaching a Core course will develop one question pertaining to his/her course material related to each scenario (a total of two questions) and a scoring rubric outlining what is acceptable in a student response.

The questions written to address P-12 and Post-secondary scenarios will generally be the same for each scenario, written to address the specific context of the scenario. Students will be given five questions according to their track (PreK-12 and Post-secondary) one month before the exam so they can begin to study for the exam. The director (or designee) will randomly select three questions for each student to be addressed during the four hour testing time. These questions will be given to the student at the time of the exam. Students will address the questions in depth based on their core course materials.

As noted above, students will have four hours to take the exam, will use an on-campus computer lab, and will not have access to references (hard copy or online) (they will not be able to use their own laptops). Two faculty members will monitor the exam (one if everyone is in the same lab).

An ad-hoc Qualifying Examination Committee will be appointed each year and the Director (or designee) will select the questions, administer the exam, select the exam readers and also read and score some of the qualifying examinations (as appropriate). Two readers will be selected for each question. If
there is a significant difference between the two readers, a third reader will be asked to read the paper. The two most similar scores will be used for that paper.

Students will be given two opportunities to pass the exam. If a student fails the first exam they will be given new questions from the same content areas in which he/she did not pass. The question will not be made available to the student prior to the examination date. The re-examination will be administered similar to the first examination using the same guidelines. The re-examination must be taken within 60 days of the first exam, unless otherwise approved by the program director. If the student does not pass the examination after the second attempt, the student will be dismissed from the program and not permitted to take additional courses. Students who wish to appeal the decision made on their qualifying examination must use the university process for grade appeals as described in the University catalog.

**Advancement to Candidacy**

When the student has passed the qualifying exam and completed the selection of the dissertation committee, the student will fill out DPEL Form 4 [Application for Candidacy for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership] and submit this form to the Director for approval. The Dean of the School of Social Science and Education gives final approval of advancement to candidacy.
Section 7: Enrollment in Research Practicum/Doctoral Dissertation

Prerequisites

Only those students who have completed: 1) the core course work and specialization; 2) passed the qualifying exam, and 3) who have been advanced to candidacy may begin formal work on a doctoral dissertation.

Enrollment in Dissertation Units

Enrollment in dissertation (EDLD 6900) units is normally effected in three-unit or six-unit segments. Once the candidate has enrolled in 12 dissertation units, the maximum allowable, continuous enrollment must be maintained until the dissertation is completed. Students must register for “0” units after all regular course units have been taken.
Section 8: The Dissertation Committee, Preparing for the Research Proposal, and the Preliminary Oral Defense

The Dissertation Committee

The student’s Dissertation Committee counsels the student on all aspects of the doctoral research to foster the student’s progress, and to monitor the quality of the research and resulting dissertation. The doctoral student should begin to consider faculty who might make appropriate committee members during the Specialization Phase.

The Dissertation committee will consist of at least three members, one will serve as chair. Co-chairs are allowed. More than three committee members are acceptable and may be requested by the student and the chair. One member of the committee must be an individual who is considered a professional practitioner who also holds a doctorate.

Qualified individuals whose expertise is germane to the topic but who are not members of the DPEL Graduate Group must be recommended to the Director and Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education (see DPEL Supplemental Form A, Request for Consideration of a Non DPEL Graduate Group Dissertation Committee Member). The non-Graduate Group committee member must have an Ed.D. or Ph.D. A curriculum vita must accompany the request. Only Core Graduate Group faculty can chair student dissertation committees.

A change of dissertation chair should only occur on very rare occasions. Reasons for the change should be documented in writing and should reflect very extenuating circumstances. The change must be signed off by the current chair and the newly proposed chair and approved by the Director.

Meetings of the Dissertation Committee may be called at any time by the chairperson. The most important meetings are the Preliminary Oral Defense, where the proposal is presented to the committee for approval, and the Final Oral Defense (see Section 11), where the completed dissertation is presented to the committee for approval.
Dissertation Committee Approval

The student’s proposed dissertation committee chairperson and committee members must sign DPEL Form 4 [Dissertation Committee Approval for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership] to verify their agreement to serve on the dissertation committee. Once the committee signatures are obtained by the student, DPEL Form 4 must be submitted to the Director for approval. The Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education at CSUB gives final approval of committee composition.

Preparing for the Research Proposal

The research proposal consists of a draft of the first three chapters (the introduction, the literature review, the methodology), and references. This proposal will inform prospective committee members of tentative research plans. Students working with the Committee should note:

- Students are required to use the dissertation template available on the EdD website. Use the supplemental documentation to learn how to properly use the template.
- It is recommended that the student consult with the Dissertation Chair and Committee frequently.
- It is necessary to give the chairperson and committee members sufficient time to read the proposal and provide feedback. Committee members typically need two to three weeks to read, consider, and comment on drafts.
- The student must schedule meetings, such as the proposal defense, with the committee.
- When an acceptable date/time is agreed upon, the student should call the DPEL office to arrange for meeting space and/or videoconference facilities.

Creating a Proposal

In planning and developing an acceptable research proposal, the student may find it useful to:

1. Use the required dissertation template, available on the EdD website. Use the supplemental documentation to learn how to properly use the template;
2. Work closely with chair and committee members;

3. Identify a general area of interest. The topic may emerge from past research efforts, present activities, or developing career plans;

4. Carry out an exploration of the literature to determine a basic body of facts and issues related to the chosen topic;

5. Seek opportunities for discussion of research ideas in a research group or with faculty;

6. Identify a problem in need of investigation. This may be a phenomenon to be investigated, to be measured, to be treated, or to be evaluated in some way. The student should:
   a. Analyze the problem to identify its components,
   b. Formulate research question(s), and
   c. Delineate methodology(ies);

7. Create an organizational system for efficient storage and retrieval of the research material

8. Conduct a focused search of literature which addresses the problem and the relevant variables:
   a. Use computerized information retrieval systems,
   b. Locate bibliographies, existing literature reviews, dissertations, and relevant reference materials related to the topic,
   c. Locate books, reprints, or photocopies of research articles from the developed bibliography,
   d. Read and synthesize the literature, with the goal of understanding the problem and previous research.

9. It is the student’s responsibility to schedule meetings with the dissertation committee, including the preliminary and final defenses. The DPEL office staff is available to schedule the video or phone conferencing equipment, but at least three weeks’ notice is required (no exceptions will be made; please plan your schedule accordingly). **PLEASE REMEMBER TO PLAN AHEAD. COMMITTEE MEMBERS HAVE OTHER COMMITMENTS TO MEET.**
The Preliminary Oral Defense

The purpose of the Preliminary Oral Defense is to provide a critical examination and assessment of the student’s plans. The student presents the rationale, the scope, and the proposed execution of the planned research; the proposal is discussed and evaluated by the committee. Form 6 [Scheduling of the Preliminary Oral Defense of the Dissertation Research Proposal] must be submitted to the DPEL office three weeks prior to the scheduled date of the Preliminary Oral Defense. The research proposal is to be submitted to the DPEL office for a preliminary APA compliance review three weeks prior to the Preliminary Oral Defense.

The announcement of the student’s Preliminary Oral Defense must be posted one week in advance of this formal meeting. The DPEL administrative office staff will not post the student’s Preliminary Orals until the completed DPEL Form 6 [Scheduling of the Preliminary Oral Defense of the Dissertation Research Proposal] has been received.

Preliminary Orals are to be scheduled through DPEL during the academic year, either during the semester or the intercession. Teleconference arrangements and room assignments can be scheduled through the DPEL office. Orals can be scheduled at other times upon approval of the committee, the DPEL Director, and the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education at CSUB.

Students are to bring Forms 5, 7, & 8 to the Preliminary Defense. At the start of the Preliminary Oral Defense, the student will provide the Committee members with DPEL Form 7 [Preliminary Oral Defense Required Changes] so that the committee members may outline the changes that are needed before Form 8 [Completion of the Preliminary Oral Defense the Dissertation Proposal] is signed off. If there are no changes required at the conclusion of the Preliminary Oral Defense, Forms 5, 7, & 8 can be completed and submitted. Otherwise, the completed Form 7 should be submitted and when the required modifications have been satisfactorily completed, the student will obtain signatures from his/her committee on Form 8 and submit to the DPEL office.
If the research plan includes human subjects, appropriate clearances must be obtained. See Section 9, “Human Subjects Research Procedures Information and Possible Exemptions.” Any exceptions to this policy must be granted by the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education at CSUB.
Section 9: Human Subjects Research Procedures Information and Possible Exemptions

DPEL students wishing to conduct research involving human subjects are required to review the policies and procedures for research involving human subjects at California State University, Bakersfield. The human subjects review process is very important and is taken very seriously. Any violations of campus or federal human subjects’ protection policies can have catastrophic results. The University can lose all federal funding and be banned from receiving future funding. Please read all requirements. The latest version of the CSUB Policy and Procedures for Research with Human Subjects may be obtained from http://www.csub.edu/grasp/research%20compliance/irb/humansubprotocol/. Failure to read and understand the requirements or fill out the forms correctly will result in major delays in your research. **You may not begin doing your research until you have received approval to do so.**
Section 10: Writing the Dissertation

After completing the Preliminary Oral Defense, the student carries out the research plan described in the approved proposal, collects data and analyzes it, and continues writing the dissertation. The student’s dissertation committee serves to guide the student in this endeavor.

The student should work with the committee chair to develop a system for reviewing drafts and for sharing drafts with other committee members at appropriate times. The student should allow the faculty members at least three weeks for a thorough reading of the last draft. The student should submit drafts of the dissertation to committee members in appropriately typed form. The completed final draft also includes the abstract, copyright page, title page, acknowledgments, table of contents, list of tables and figures, references, and appendices.

The student will submit the manuscript to committee members for a final reading. The final dissertation may take a variety of forms depending upon the type of research undertaken and as approved by the Dissertation Chair. The conventional five-chapter dissertation, consisting of an Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Results, and Conclusion may be altered to reflect more appropriately a specific research design. **It is the student’s responsibility to pay for all production expenses such as copies, postage, and envelopes.**
Section 11: The Final Oral Defense

Prior to scheduling the Final Oral Defense, the student’s committee should carry out a thorough review of the completed dissertation to ensure that the manuscript will be ready for final typing following the Defense. Form 10 [Scheduling of Final Oral Defense of the Dissertation] must be submitted three weeks prior to the defense so the defense can be publicly posted. Additionally, the dissertation is to be submitted for the final program-level APA review and the student is to register their intent to submit the dissertation to Graduate Studies via the Dissertation/Thesis Office website.

NOTE: It is the student’s responsibility to set a date for the final defense and acquire faculty signatures, after consultation with the dissertation committee.

At the Final Oral Defense, students will make a public presentation based on their dissertation projects. The details of place and time for dissertation presentations will be publicly announced in order to permit interested faculty and students to attend and ask questions. The announcement of the student’s Final Oral Defense must be posted at least one week in advance of this formal meeting. The DPEL administrative office staff will not post the student’s Final Oral Defense until he/she has an approved DPEL Form 10 [Scheduling of the Final Oral Defense of the Dissertation]. This examination may be scheduled to take place on campus during the academic year either during a semester or the intercession. Orals can be scheduled at other times upon approval of the committee, the DPEL Director, and the Dean of the School of Social Sciences and Education.

The Final Oral Defense is conducted as an open forum guided by the candidate’s chairperson and Dissertation committee. The purpose of this formal meeting are threefold: 1) to examine and assess the quality of the dissertation; 2) to evaluate the ability of the student to present work; and, 3) to provide an opportunity to share the work with the campus community.
There are three possible outcomes of the Final Oral Defense:

1. The Defense is satisfactory and the manuscript is accepted as submitted with only minor copy editing revisions. The Dissertation Committee members sign DPEL Form 11 [Report of the Final Examination and Filing of the Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership], and may, at this time, also sign the Committee Membership/Approval Page.

2. The Defense is satisfactory, but the need for substantive revisions of the manuscript is apparent. The Committee members sign DPEL Form 11, but withhold their signatures from the Committee Membership/Approval Page until changes have been made that satisfy the requirements of all members.

3. The Defense is judged to be unsatisfactory. This decision may be reached because the dissertation is judged to be acceptable but the student fails to present it satisfactorily or because the dissertation is unacceptable. Committee members do not sign the DPEL Form 11 or the Committee Membership/Approval Page. A second Oral Defense may be scheduled when the Chair finds that the student is prepared and the committee members agree that the required remediation has been accomplished.

It is strongly recommended that students bring the Committee Membership/Approval Page (laser printed on appropriate paper) to their final defense and have committee members sign this page at that time if the outcome of the defense is satisfactory. This will eliminate problems in obtaining signatures at a later date.

**Submitting the Final Manuscript**

Once the dissertation is approved by the Dissertation Committee ("passed" the final defense), the, the completed Form 11 [Report of the Final Examination and Filing of the Dissertation for the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership] is to be submitted to the DPEL office. In conjunction
with the Program-level APA review, the manuscript should be fully APA compliant. The dissertation
must then be approved by Office of Academic Programs prior to the conferring of the degree.
Dissertations are to be submitted to Academic Programs in accordance with the specified submission
procedures. Additional instructions for procedures regarding dissertation, submission, fees, and
binding requirements will be provided at a later date.
Section 12: Applying to Graduate and Graduation

Applying to Graduate

Students must apply to graduate at the beginning of the intended graduation term in accordance with University procedures and deadlines. Applications to graduate can be withdrawn (the fee forfeited); however, applications cannot be submitted late. Therefore, it is recommended that students complete the application process if there is even a remote possibility of graduation. The process to apply for graduation includes completing Form 9 [Application for the Granting of the Degree of Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership], taking the Degree Service Form and fee to the Cashier’s Office, and submission of Form 9 and fee payment receipt to the DPEL office for review. Deadlines for applying for graduation at CSUB may be obtained from the Academic Programs website. All incomplete grades, whether or not they are DPEL courses, must be cleared before the degree can be posted to the student transcript. Students must register an intent to submit a dissertation with the CSUB Academic Programs office at the start of the anticipated graduation term.

Policy on Graduates Participating in Graduation Ceremonies

Students will be permitted to participate in graduation ceremonies (including Hooding and Commencement) only after final changes have been made to the dissertation as required by the committee; the dissertation committee chair has signed all forms related to the completion of the dissertation; and the final dissertation document has been sent to the Division of Academic Programs and the Library for final review. Students must also meet all pertinent program timelines pertaining to graduation.

Graduation Ceremonies

Commencement ceremonies are usually held in May at CSUB. CSUB sponsors a hooding ceremony that is usually held the week before commencement.
The doctoral graduates are given special recognition during this ceremony. Information regarding doctoral regalia is usually distributed in March by the Runner Bookstore. Regalia may be ordered at this time for the hooding and commencement ceremonies.
February 27, 2015

Horace Mitchell, President
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, CA 93311

Dear President Mitchell:

I am writing to inform you that on February 19, 2015, the Committee on Accreditation, on behalf of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, assigned the status of Accreditation to California State University, Bakersfield and all of its credential programs.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credential
  Preliminary Multiple Subject
  Multiple Subject Intern

- Single Subject Credential
  Preliminary Single Subject
  Single Subject Intern

- Education Specialist Credential
  Preliminary Education Specialist Mild/Moderate Credential
  Education Specialist Mild Moderate Intern
  Preliminary Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Credential
  Education Specialist Moderate/Severe Intern
  Clear Education Specialist Induction Credential
  Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorders

- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
  School Counseling

In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, Bakersfield is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

Ensuring Educator Excellence
California State University, Bakersfield continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Should you or your staff have any questions relating to this action, you may address them to Cheryl Hickey, Administrator of Accreditation, at chickey@ctc.ca.gov.

The Commission and its staff are grateful to California State University, Bakersfield for its commitment to the preparation of professional educators.

Sincerely,

Mary Vixie Sandy, Ed.D.
Executive Director

cc: Kathleen Knutzen, Dean
    School of Social Sciences and Education

MVS/TC/CH/ta
Overview of This Report
This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at California State University Bakersfield. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of Accreditation.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards / Recommendations</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Diversity</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Total Standards</th>
<th>Program Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject, with Internship</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject, with Internship</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist: MM, with Internship</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist: MS, with Internship</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist: Clear Induction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:

- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report
Institution: California State University Bakersfield

Dates of Visit: November 16-18, 2014

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of Accreditation was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit’s operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The decision of the entire team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are Met. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California’s two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are Met.

Program Standards
Discussion of findings and appropriate input by individual team members and by the total team membership was provided for California State University, Bakersfield. Following discussion, the team considered whether the program standards were met, met with concerns, or not met. The CTC team found that all standards are Met in all programs.

Overall Recommendation
The team completed a thorough review of program documents, program data, and interviewed institutional administrators, program leadership, faculty, supervising instructors, master teachers, candidates, completers, and Advisory Board members. Based on the fact that all Common Standards are Met and that all program standards are Met the team unanimously recommends a decision of Accreditation.
On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

**Initial/Teaching Credentials**
- Multiple Subject
  - Multiple Subject including Internship
- Single Subject
  - Single Subject including Internship

**Advanced/Service Credentials**
- Education Specialist
  - Clear Induction
- Added Authorization: Autism Spectrum Disorder
- Pupil Personnel Services
  - School Counseling

**Education Specialist:**
- Mild/Moderate including Internship
- Moderate/Severe including Internship

Staff recommends that:

- The institution’s response to the preconditions be accepted.
- California State University, Bakersfield be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Bakersfield continues in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair: Shawn M. Quilter
Eastern Michigan University

California Co-Chair: Jo Birdsell
National University

NCATE/Common Standards Cluster: Rick Eigenbrood
Seattle Pacific University

Maureen D. Gillette
Northeastern Illinois University

Helene Mandell
University of San Diego

Marita Mahoney
California State University, San Bernardino

Programs Cluster: Vicki Graf
Loyola Marymount University

Gay Lynn Pendleton Smith
University of Phoenix

Diana Wheeler
National University

Staff to the Accreditation Team Katie Croy, Consultant

Lynette Roby, Consultant
May 15, 2015

Dr. Horace Mitchell
President
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
33 BDC
Bakersfield, CA 93311-1022

Dear Dr. Mitchell:

I am pleased to inform you that the Continuous Improvement Commission of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) at its April 26-30, 2015 meeting in Bethesda, Maryland, decided to continue the NCATE accreditation of the School of Social Sciences and Education at California State University, Bakersfield at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit and its programs meet rigorous standards set forth by the professional education community. A certificate that acknowledges the educator preparation provider's accomplishment is enclosed with the copy of this letter that has been sent to the head of your educator preparation provider. The Commission also made a distinct decision to recognize that the educator preparation provider is moving toward target on Standard 3.

Special congratulations are in order because the Commission cited no areas for improvement relative to any of the standards. You are welcome to use the information provided in the Board of Examiners' report as you see fit.

The next accreditation visit – using the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards – is scheduled for Fall 2021. As the transition to CAEP progresses, you will receive more information. I encourage your institution to begin now to plan for the CAEP standards and processes, and to take advantage of CAEP's capacity-building opportunities. As a first step, resources can be found on CAEP's website (www.caepnet.org). Additional resources are the CAEP Weekly Updates, the Accreditation Manual, and the Evidence Guide.

In the meantime, institutions are asked to complete the CAEP annual report each year during the accreditation period. We ask that you keep us informed of your provider's efforts to assure that you continue to meet expectations of the standards through the annual report.

Also for your information enclosed is a copy of our Policies on Dissemination of Information, which describe the terms and dates by which your current accreditation action becomes a matter of public record. This document also indicates organizations that will be notified of accreditation action. If your state has a partnership agreement, the state agency with program approval authority has access to these documents online through CAEP's Accreditation Information Management System (AIMS).
To celebrate your accreditation, I encourage you to use the online resources available at http://goo.gl/9nym3. The press packet includes a sample press release announcing an educator preparation provider's accreditation status to the media, as well as samples of announcements that can be sent to P-12 schools, foundations, businesses, policymakers, and other stakeholders in your area. Other strategies are also included for garnering media attention throughout the year. In addition, because the educator preparation provider is professionally accredited, we encourage you to use the NCATE logo on print materials such as brochures and catalogs, as well as on your educator preparation provider's website.

Congratulations again on this accomplishment. Should you have any questions regarding Commission's action or the items reported herein, please do not hesitate to contact Patty Garvin, Senior Director of Accreditation for Continuous Improvement and Transformation Initiatives at patty.garvin@caepnet.org.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Koch
Interim President

Enclosures

c: Dr. Steve Bacon, School of Social Sciences and Education
   Ms. Amanda Thrasher, School of Social Sciences and Education
   Ms. Cheryl Hickey, Commission on Teacher Credentialing;
   Ms. Teri Clark;
   Board of Examiners Team
ACCREDITATION DECISION

Accreditation is continued at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. The next onsite visit will take place in Fall 2021.

Please refer to the on-site report for strengths of the EPP and for additional information on findings.

STANDARDS SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP)</th>
<th>Advanced Preparation (ADV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>★ 1 Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ 2 Assessment System and Unit Evaluation</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ 3 Field Experiences and Clinical Practice</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ 4 Diversity</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ 5 Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ 6 Unit Governance and Resources</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

NONE

NOTE: Neither CAEP staff, team members, nor other agents of CAEP are empowered to make or modify Commission decisions. These remain the sole responsibility of the Commission itself. This Accreditation Action Report is available to members of the public upon receipt of a request in writing.