

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY
TEMPLATE FOR
SYSTEM-LEVEL INFORMATION



a resource for the preparation of

SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE PROPOSALS

TO THE

ACCREDITING COMMISSION FOR

SENIOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

for the

EDUCATION DOCTORATE DEGREE (ED.D.)
PROGRAM IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

SEPTEMBER 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------|
| I. | Overview/Abstract | 1 |
| II. | Annual Report..... | 2 |
| III. | Descriptive Background, History, and Context | 2 |
| IV. | Institutional Accrediting History Relevant to Substantive Change..... | 5 |
| V. | Program Need..... | 6 |
| VI. | Planning/Approval Process..... | 8 |
| VII. | Program Description | 10 |
| VIII. | Faculty..... | 27 |
| IX. | Student Support Services | 29 |
| X. | Information Literacy and Resources | 31 |
| XI. | Technology..... | 35 |
| XII. | Physical Resources | 36 |
| XIII. | Financial Resources | 36 |
| XIV. | Plan for Evaluating Educational Effectiveness | 41 |
| XV. | Plan for Teach-out Provisions | 45 |
| XVI. | Appendices | |
| | 1. Annual Report Including Audited Financial Statement | |
| | 2. CSU, _____ Implementation Proposal for Ed.D. Degree Program | |
| | 3. Independent Ed.D. Proposal Review Process* | |
| | 4. Ed.D. in Educational Leadership Program Implementation Proposal Format* | |
| | 5. Senate Bill 724 (Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005–Scott)* | |
| | 6. Ed.D. Program Core Educational Leadership Concepts* | |
| | 7. Title 5 of California Code of Regulations: The Doctor of Education Degree* | |
| | 8. New Course Proposal Form | |
| | 9. Course Syllabi for First Three Courses and Related to Dissertation | |
| | 10. Time Limits and Satisfactory Progress Toward Degree* | |
| | 11. Ed.D. Doctoral Advisement* | |
| | 12. Ed.D. Doctoral Mentoring* | |
| | 13. Sample Brochure and Admissions Material | |
| | 14. Doctoral Faculty Qualifications | |
| | 15. Abbreviated Vitae of Faculty | |
| | 16. Budgetary Assumptions | |
| | 17. Discontinuation Proposal for Joint Ed.D. Program | |
| | 18. NCATE Accreditation Report for College of Education | |

Notes:

1. Asterisks indicate systemwide documents. They are available on the Chancellor’s Office Academic Planning Web site: <http://www.calstate.edu/app/EdD>.
2. Many of the examples of local campus responses were provided by CSU Fullerton. We wish to thank their Educational Leadership faculty for make these materials available.

Section I: Overview/Abstract

A. Name of degree or program proposed

Ed.D. in Educational Leadership with a specialization in Pre-Kindergarten-Grade 12 Leadership and a specialization in Community College/Postsecondary Leadership.

B. Initial date of offering

Fall 2007

C. Projected number of students and what type of student is the program geared for, i.e. adult learners, part-time or full-time

The California State University (CSU) Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership is designed to train well-prepared administrative leaders for reform efforts in California’s Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade schools and its community colleges. The students will be adults who hold positions in educational institutions and will be enrolled part-time. The degree program is designed specifically for professionals in the field of education as a capstone degree. It is a degree for professionals in which theory and research will be applied to practice-based study of significant educational problems. Combined new admissions in the specializations on each campus typically will be between approximately 18 and 30 students annually, resulting in the projected enrollment shown below. Special efforts will be made to recruit and select a group of outstanding candidates with diverse backgrounds reflective of the State and its regions.

| Projected Enrollment | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Student Category | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 |
| New Admits | 18-30 | 18-30 | 18-30 | 18-30 | 18-30 |
| Continuing Students | -- | 16-26 | 32-48 | 34-48 | 34-48 |
| Total Students | 18-30 | 34-56 | 50-78 | 52-78 | 52-78 |
| Graduates | -- | -- | 16-26 | 18-30 | 18-30 |

D. Anticipated life of the program, i.e., one time only or ongoing, and what is the timeframe of courses, i.e., accelerated, weekend or traditional format.

The Ed.D. program will be part of the ongoing, permanent curriculum offered by the campuses. Courses will follow the traditional semester or quarter format.

E. Prior experience with this type of program--If the institution’s experience includes joint doctoral programs, then describe the institution’s role and responsibilities in the joint doctoral program distinct from the partnering institution.

History of Ed.D. in CSU System: The CSU system has been involved in - joint Ed.D. programs for more than 15 years. In 2002, the system launched a series of additional joint

Ed.D. programs involving CSU campuses and partner University of California (UC) campuses. Fourteen CSU campuses have participated in the joint programs. The joint Ed.D. programs were intended to have CSU and UC campuses serve as co-equal partners, with faculty from both systems involved in all aspects of Ed.D. program delivery, from admissions and advising to instruction and supervision of research. The system-level framework of the Ed.D. program is based in part on this experience. At the campus level, extensive experience exists with Master's degree programs in educational leadership.

[CSU, _____ began a joint Ed.D. in _____ in conjunction with CSU, _____, CSU, _____ and UC, _____. The joint Ed.D. program focuses on preparing educational leaders with expertise in _____ and helped establish a solid foundation for the independent Ed.D. program.]

CSU, _____ responsibilities in the joint program:

CSU, _____'s faculty teach courses in the Joint Ed.D. program in each of the following areas: _____, _____, _____. CSU, _____ faculty serve as dissertation chairs and as members of dissertation committees as well as primary readers for qualifying examinations of students in the program. CSU, _____ conducts recruitment of students and performs the screening of applications, admissions interviews, and detailed review of application files.]

Section II: Annual Report (See Appendix 1)

Section III: Descriptive Background, History and Context

- A. Brief description of the institution including the broader institutional context in which the new program or change will exist—Connect the anticipated substantive change with the mission, purpose, and strategic plan of the institution.

Brief Description of the CSU context in which the Independent Ed.D. will exist:

The CSU is the largest and 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 educators for California's K-12 schools 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 education leadership programs. In the recent several years, CSU campuses awarded:

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

The Preliminary Administrative Services credential programs are frequently articulated with CSU's master's degree programs in Educational Administration, enabling candidates to augment the professional credential through graduate study.

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>, underscored the importance of collaborative partnerships between higher education and the institutions in which educational leaders will serve.

The CSU has begun to play a major role in the delivery of Ed.D. programs through joint Ed.D. programs with the University of California (UC) that involve seven UC and 14 CSU campuses. Due to UC's capacity limitations, numbers of students enrolled in these joint Ed.D. programs have remained relatively small, with the total number of new students admitted across the State averaging approximately 100 annually. 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.

In the five years prior to the establishment of the joint Ed.D. programs, public sector production of Ed.D.s in California averaged between 35 and 45 degrees awarded annually. To address the need for increased preparation of highly qualified school and community college leaders, the California Legislature in 2005 enacted legislation authorizing the CSU to independently offer the Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) degree in education leadership (Senate Bill 724 (Chapter 269, Statutes of 2005–Scott)).

The CSU has developed a systemwide framework for implementing the program in accordance with the legislative provisions. The programs will link theory, research and practice in innovative ways and feature comprehensive participation of experts from Pre-K through grade 12 education and community colleges. The partnership design will enable students to engage in application of scholarly tools to significant problems of practice in ways that go beyond traditional Ed.D. programs. New programs are to be initiated on seven campuses in Fall 2007 and on each of 22 campuses by Fall 2011.

[Institutional Context at CSU, _____ and connection with the mission, purpose, and strategic plan of the institution:]

This new degree fit directly within the institutional mission, purposes, and strategic plan of CSU, _____. As articulated in the University mission and goals statement. "....." The nature of Pre-Kindergarten-grade 12 and community college education in our region is evolving, presenting new challenges and needs for the region. A central purpose of the University is "....." The Ed.D. program will address this purpose through our partnership with the leaders of the public school districts and community colleges in the region and the collaborative attention to solving pressing educational problems.]

[Specifically, establishment of the Ed.D. program relates to several components of the strategic plan of CSU, _____. These strategic plan components are: _____.]

- B. Listing of the number, variety and longevity of other programs at the proposed degree level currently being offered, including student enrollment data and completion and non-

completion rates for previous or current doctoral programs. At least three and no more than five years of data should be provided.

[California State University, _____ currently is involved with UC, _____ in a Joint Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership. CSU, _____ and CSU, _____ also participate. CSU, _____ is the primary partner responsible for the emphasis in _____.

In _____ 200_ the campus Academic Senate approved the joint Ed.D. program. The first __ students were admitted in 2003, __ were admitted in 2004, and another __ were admitted in 2005. The limited number of admissions were a result of decisions by UC, _____ regarding its capacity to work with joint Ed.D. students, due in large part to its roles in Ph.D. programs.]

| Joint Ed.D. Enrollment and Completion at CSU, _____ | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Cohort | 2003-04 | 2004-05 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 |
| One (2003) | _ students | _ students | _ students | | | |
| Two (2004) | | _ students | _ students | _ students | | |
| Three (2005) | | | _ students | _ students | _ students | |
| | | | | _ students to complete | _ students to complete | _ students to complete |

[Completion and non-completion rates for students in Joint Ed.D. program: All of the __ students in Cohort One passed their qualifying examination and completed their coursework in the first two years of the program. All __ students in Cohort Two have passed their qualifying examinations and are currently completing their second year of coursework. __ of the Cohort-two students have defended their dissertation proposals; other students in Cohort Two are making satisfactory progress toward dissertation proposal defense. Cohort Three students are currently completing their first year of coursework and will take the qualifying examination in the summer of 2006. Every effort is made to assist students with completion in three to four years, and most are expected to finish their degrees in summer 2009, with the remainder completing the following year, when all will have reached the normal UC five year period for degree completion.]

- C. If the institution currently offers a joint doctorate(s), indicate whether the program(s) will continue and provide details on how the proposed program fits into the strategic plan of the institution. If a teach-out is needed, refer to Section XV.

[The joint Ed.D. will not continue because it has been able to serve so few students. In fall 2007, when independent Ed.D. classes begin, all of the students in the joint Ed.D. will have completed their coursework and will be working on their dissertations. Most are expected to have completed their dissertations by summer 2009, when the students in the first cohort in the independent Ed.D. will be engaged in significant work on their dissertations.]

[The ordinary maximum time to degree under UC, _____ rules is five years but students may petition to continue for seven years. The table below shows when students

in each cohort of the joint program will reach that time limit. Our goal is to have students complete their dissertations as close to the optimal five-year completion date as possible.]

| Year cohort started | Year they reach 5 year limit | Year they reach 7 year limit |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Fall 2003 | Summer 2008 | Summer 2010 |
| Fall 2004 | Summer 2009 | Summer 2011 |
| Fall 2005 | Summer 2010 | Summer 2012 |

- D. If the institution currently offers a joint doctorate(s), indicate whether the program(s) will continue and provide details on how the proposed program fits into the strategic plan of the institution. If the program will be discontinued, refer to Section XV on teach-out requirements.

[CSU _____ will discontinue its role in the joint Ed.D. with UC _____ and the partner CSU institution(s). Please see Section XV(B) and Appendix 17.]

Section IV: Institutional Accrediting History Relevant to Substantive Change

- A. Brief response to issues noted in prior substantive change reviews since the institution's last comprehensive review.

[ALOs on individual campuses will provide this information.]

- B. Institutional responses to issues noted in prior commission or other Committee action letters or visiting team reports that are relevant to doctoral level education.

[ALOs on individual campuses will provide this information.]

- C. If the proposed program is within a school or related to other programs accredited by a professional accrediting agency, then list the agency, year accredited, and include in appendix a copy of the most recent evaluation report and agency action. Also, indicate whether the specialized agency needs to review and approve the proposed program prior to implementation.

[The Ed.D. program will be associated with the College of Education at CSU _____, which is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The last accreditation visit by NCATE was in ____, and the evaluation report, including its action recommending re-accreditation, is in Appendix 18. The next NCATE visit is expected to be in _____. NCATE does not need to review and approve the proposed program prior to implementation, but will include it in its next review.]

[Some students who enroll in the Ed.D. program will also complete their Professional Administrative Services Credential Program while enrolled in the Ed.D. program. The Professional Administrative Services Credential program is included under the required California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) accreditation of credential programs. The last CCTC visit was in _____. The educational leadership programs were

recommended for re-accreditation with no stipulations. The next CCTC accreditation visit is projected to be in _____. The CCTC does not need to review and approve the doctoral program prior to implementation, and does not include it in its review.]

Section V: Program Need

A. Program need/rationale framed by the institution's mission and strategic goals.

There has been for the past decade and continues to be a substantial unmet workforce need for an affordable and accessible Ed.D. in California. The need cannot be accommodated through current programs in the State. During the past five years, public sector program Ed.D. degrees awarded 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.

The growth in California's Pre-K-12 and community college student populations 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 years 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 are or will be eligible for retirement in the next five years.

In order to fill leadership positions in large school districts, executive search firms typically receive and need close to 100 applications In California, the number has ranged from 25 to 40. Most districts seek Superintendents with a doctorate, and the limited supply adversely affects filling the positions.

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

The features of doctoral preparation needed by California's K-12 administrators has been articulated by superintendents. A California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) study found that public school district superintendents who were surveyed described "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 need for the Ed.D. for California's community college leaders is exceptionally large. Currently, the only public sector Ed.D. program in the state specifically designed for

community college leaders is the CSU Long Beach joint Ed.D. with UCI. Because UCI has not been able to accommodate more than 18 new students per year from its four CSU partners, the CSU Long Beach program has typically been able to admit no more than 6 students per year. The result has been under-utilization of a high quality program with significant student demand.

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, Sacramento-area community college presidents stressed that *the Ed.D. was the single most important need for improving leadership capacity* within their colleges.

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. They had a strong belief that a doctoral program would enhance their effectiveness.

In one of the surveys (which included over 600 respondents), even more saw the Ed.D. as an opportunity to improve knowledge and skills than an opportunity for professional advancement (73%) or a way to improve their salary (37%). Nearly three-quarters of respondents thought the Ed.D. had the potential to improve education in California.

Twenty-four of the 28 public school superintendents in Orange County responded to a survey in which they were asked to rate the importance of various factors on a 5-point scale. The need for moderately priced doctoral programs for educators offered by public universities was rated 4.4. The state's need for doctoral-level trained superintendents was rated just under 4, and the need for doctoral-level trained assistant superintendents was rated just slightly lower.

California's production of education doctorates is significantly lower than other states. Other states use this professional degree in education to meet the leadership needs of their public schools and community colleges, and California trails these states significantly.

California's public universities have a much smaller role in producing education doctorates than is found in other states. Nationally, education doctorates awarded by public universities per Capita is 1 to 47,265. The per Capita figure in California is 1 to 215,054.

While the Joint Ed.D. experiment has provided important experience to the CSU system and its campuses, it has shown only limited success in meeting state needs due to limitations deriving from UC's practices. The joint degree structure has been cumbersome and bureaucratically complex, adding to program costs.

If the joint Ed.D. path were to continue to be the primary vehicles for meeting demand, the public sector in California could produce at most a total of between 130 and 150 education doctorates per year. It would require the CSU to add approximately 615

doctorates per year for the public universities 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 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 \$15,000 to \$20,000 per year. The consequence is that obtaining the Ed.D. is prohibitive to large numbers of potential candidates, a problem that has affected the ability of the state to diversify its administrative leadership, which is currently more than 90% white, despite a school population that has been a majority-minority for over ten years.

[Campuses may draw from this information in relating the element, “Program need/rationale framed by the institution’s mission and strategic goals” to their own institution.]

- B. Local program need/rationale framed by the campus mission and strategic goals.

[Campuses will prepare a local campus section providing data for their local region.]

- C. Process and results used to establish the need—Please provide a summary of the findings not the full study.

[Campuses will prepare this section describing the local needs assessment and findings.]

- D. Evidence used to support enrollment projections and to support the conclusion that interest in the program is sufficient to sustain it at expected levels.

[Campuses will prepare this section with local evidence relevant to demand.]

Section VI: Planning/Approval Process

- A. Description of the planning and approval process within the institution, indicating how faculty and other groups (administrators, trustees, stakeholders, etc.) were involved in the review and approval of the program, including any campus established criteria for doctoral level work.

[Campuses will prepare a section describing the local processes for approval of the program and criteria for doctoral level work.]

- B. Description of the review process at the System level, if the institution is part of a university system, including any system requirements for doctoral level work.

The CSU planning and approval process for independent Ed.D. programs is a comprehensive one, illustrated in the flow chart in Appendix 3. Primary steps include:

- The campus seeks authorization from the CSU Board of Trustees to propose an Ed.D. program within a specified time frame
- The campus faculty develop the Ed.D. proposal
- The proposal undergoes review through the campus approval processes
- The proposal is submitted to the CSU Faculty Ed.D. Consultation Group for feedback
- The approved proposal is submitted by the campus to the Chancellor's Office
- The campus revises the proposal as needed based on system-level feedback
- The CSU Chancellor's Office (Academic Program Planning) sends the completed proposal to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)
- The campus sends its Substantive Change Proposal to WASC.

The CSU developed systemwide standards for the Ed.D. through an Academic Senate Committee experienced with Ed.D. programs. The standards are on the Academic Program Planning Web site (www.calstate.edu/APP/Ed.D/). They address primary program components and are contained in the Title 5 Regulations for the program:

- Admissions Criteria
- Cohort Structure
- Faculty Qualifications
- Core Educational Leadership Concepts
- Degree Requirements
- Examinations
- Dissertation Requirements
- Doctoral Advisement
- Doctoral Mentoring
- Requirements for Satisfactory Progress

Specific system requirements for doctoral level work include:

- Student learning objectives and a program of study that address the programs' core educational leadership concepts structured at the doctoral-level
- A program of study of 60 semester units in which 80% of the units must be in courses organized primarily for doctoral students, with only 20% of units allowable through courses for both master's and doctoral students.
- Student assessments that include a doctoral-level qualifying examination, dissertation proposal examination, and dissertation defense
- A capstone dissertation that must demonstrate a strong scholarly and professional foundation of knowledge and the ability to apply this knowledge to rigorous study of Pre-K-12 or community college education.

- C. Evidence that the approval process included a review of those issues or elements most important in the evaluation of the program, i.e. capacity, educational effectiveness, etc.

The elements required in the Program Proposal are identified in Appendix 4. The proposal format conforms closely with the WASC Substantive Change Manual, is customized to address the requirements of SB 724, and includes the following elements:

- Overview
- Timelines
- Program Rationale and Student Learning Objectives
- Justification for the Program
- Partnership with Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and/or Community Colleges
- Information about Participating CSU Campus(es) and Department(s)
- Governance Structure for the Program
- Information about Participating Faculty Members
- Information about Resources
- Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree
- Assessment and Accreditation
- Student Support.

Section VII: Program Description

A. Curriculum requirements:

- i. Relationship among the program philosophy, design, pedagogical methods, and target population.

Senate Bill 724 Section 66040.3 (b) states: “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 legislation (Section 60040 (b)) further states that the CSU Doctor of Education degree shall respond to “the urgent need for well-prepared administrators to lead public school and community college reform efforts.” The degree is to be designed to “meet specific educational leadership needs” in these sectors and to be distinguished from doctoral programs at UC.

The provisions of the legislation further define the underlying philosophy and design of the program. The degree is “to 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.”

The legislation also speaks to the target population: “This degree shall enable professionals to earn the degree while working full time.” Further, the evaluation of the programs is to address “the extent to which the programs...are fulfilling

identified state needs for training in educational leadership” (Section 66040.7 (b)) and to address statewide supply and demand data. These provisions established the expectation that the CSU Ed.D. will serve public school and community college leaders across the state.

Finally, the legislation establishes a program design that is focused on achieving reforms and improving K-12 and community college student outcomes. The evaluation of the program is to include “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” (Section 66040.7a(d)).

The CSU systemwide framework creates an innovative Ed.D. model that connects program philosophy, pedagogy, and target populations through a design that:

- Is focused on practice and applies research tools to the challenges administrators face in real-world contexts in advancing important reforms and improving student achievement
- Prepares Pre-K-12 and community college leaders within a framework of both (a) common and (b) distinctive issues affecting education in the two different sectors
- Involves faculty with varied disciplinary perspectives in coursework examining theory, research, and significant field-based problems
- Includes outstanding professional leaders in instructional and mentoring roles, and in curricular and programmatic dialogue and decision-making
- Applies a range of research methods to major problems of educational practice relevant to diverse educational settings, using a framework of data-driven decision-making.

The systemwide Ed.D. program framework was developed around core educational leadership concepts derived from major sources of expertise in the field that are responsive to the provisions of Senate Bill 724. The core concepts were drawn from the Report of the CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs, the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders,¹ designs of community college leadership programs from across the nation that reflect the American Association of Community Colleges Competences for Community College Leaders,² and exemplary current doctoral programs in educational leadership. The core concepts are presented below.

| Core Educational Leadership Program Concepts | |
|---|---|
| Concept | Description |
| Leadership Foundations | |
| Systemic Educational Reform | Achieving reform and improvement within California's pre-K-higher education institutions. |
| Visionary Educational Leadership | Leadership based on a shared vision of learning grounded in moral principles and ethical decision making. |

¹ Association of California School Administrators, http://www.acsa.org/hot_topics/hot_topic_detail.cfm?id=13.

² American Association of Community Colleges, http://www.ccleadership.org/resosource_center/competencies.htm.

| | |
|--|---|
| Complexity and Organizations | Modern theories of management of complex organizations and applications to education. |
| Collaborative Management | Fostering distributive leadership, facilitating collaborative change. |
| Diversity and Equity | Addressing issues of diversity, equity and opportunity, including attention to special populations. |
| Educational Policy Environments | Political, fiscal, environmental contexts affecting local, state, and federal educational decision-making. |
| Educational Accountability | Internal and external accountability processes and their use in data-driven planning. |
| Leadership Specialization: Pre-K and Community College Leadership | |
| School and Campus Cultures | Creating shared aspirations and expectations that result in supportive environments and student excellence. |
| Effective Instructional Strategies | Cognition, curriculum, instruction, staff development, and educational equity. |
| Human Resource Development | Human resource management and development; learning organizations; professional communities. |
| Student Learning Supports | Developing classroom, school, and community-based student services and support. |
| School-Community Relations | Working with families, communities, businesses, local and state governmental entities. |
| Resources and Fiscal Planning | Financing public education, and resource allocation to achieve student outcomes. |
| Research Methodology | |
| Assessment and Evaluation | Assessing learning outcomes; using data for student interventions and local decision-making and improvement. |
| Applied Quantitative Inquiry | Formulating researchable questions; design and statistical analysis of surveys; quantitative data collection. |
| Applied Qualitative Inquiry | Qualitative methods of data collection and interpretation; action research; narrative and discourse analysis. |
| Field-Based Research | Research applied to relevant field settings, including collection, analysis, and use of local data. |
| Data-Driven Decision-Making | Intensive case study of data-driven decision-making to improve educational outcomes. |

- ii. 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 type of culminating experience (full dissertation or a culminating project).

The Ed.D. program design establishes a doctoral level culture in virtually every feature. Admissions criteria include a master’s degree, demonstrated academic excellence, evidence of advanced scholarship potential, and an employer’s statement of support for doctoral program participation or a plan by the candidate for meeting doctoral demands and professional responsibilities.

Doctoral level course requirements are fostered through the embedding of preparation for the applied scholarly dissertation throughout the program. This preparation is aimed at equipping candidates to identify significant research problems and questions, to state major theoretical perspectives, to explain the

importance of research investigations, to relate them to the relevant scholarly and professional literature, to identify appropriate sources for and methods of gathering and analyzing research data, and to offer conclusions or recommendations from applied research.

Academic advising supports the doctoral level culture and is defined as including:

- Scholarly discussion that fosters embedding of dissertation research within each component of the curriculum, and
- Expert supervision of Ed.D. candidates in the conduct of rigorous dissertation research.

Each candidate is required to master core concepts in four types of methodologies that apply doctoral level research to problems of practice:

- Assessment and Evaluation
- Applied Quantitative Inquiry
- Applied Qualitative Inquiry
- Data-Driven Decision-Making

The legislative objectives and partnership provisions for SB 724 define the research environment of the Ed.D. The focus of the Ed.D. research is fundamentally on educational reform and on improving student achievement in Pre-K through 12 schools and community colleges. As a consequence, the dissertation and the preparatory coursework are designed to apply research to practice. The dissertation is defined in the systemwide regulations (Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, Sections 40050.1 through 40512, which are included in Appendix 7) as follows:

“The dissertation shall be the written product of systematic, rigorous research on a significant professional issue. The dissertation is expected to contribute to an improvement in professional practices or policy. It shall evidence originality, critical and independent thinking, appropriate form and organization, and a rationale....It shall include a written abstract that summarizes the significance of the work, objectives, methodology, and a conclusion or recommendation.”

The systemwide guidelines establish that in the conduct of the dissertation—i.e., in planning it, in conducting the literature review and problem statement, and in writing the final dissertation, as well as in the antecedent course work—candidates will be expected to engage in rigorous scholarship. The requirements speak to relating the research to *relevant scholarly and professional literature*. They pertain to use of primary works, including academic texts, journals, and scholarly reports. The requirements also speak to *setting forth appropriate sources for and methods of gathering and analyzing research data*. These relate to use and documentation of research methods conforming to established standards of rigor for qualitative and quantitative inquiry.

A central mechanism for establishing a doctoral level culture will be in the appointment of appropriately qualified core and affiliated faculty members. Systemwide program requirements include criteria for the core doctoral faculty, which are as follow:

- Having specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to issues of educational policy or practice) in the areas of study addressed by the doctoral program in educational leadership
- Exhibiting a strong professional record of published scholarship pertinent to educational leadership or the theoretical or methodological underpinnings of study related to the field
- Possessing a doctoral degree in the appropriate discipline
- Being tenured or having a tenure-track appointment
- Being involved in teaching at the graduate level
- Having demonstrated ability directing research activities similar to dissertations.

These criteria apply to core faculty members—those who will be responsible for primary instruction and advising in the program, who will serve as Chairs and members of dissertation committees, and who will serve as members of Ed.D. program governance groups.

[Campuses may wish to add additional local information. For example,]

[At CSU, _____ each candidate in the program will be required to demonstrate the scholarly integration of theory, research, and practice at the doctoral level through three mechanisms. First, each candidate will be required to successfully complete a minimum of __ research methods courses focused on the study of educational practice. Second, many courses in the program will include a required inquiry-oriented field study. Candidates will be expected to undertake field-based, analytic projects that are consistent with the objectives of the particular course. Third, candidates in the program will typically select a practice-based research topic for their dissertation. Faculty will assist candidates in developing dissertations that are scholarly works, which have the potential to bring about important educational reforms. Doctoral courses and dissertation seminars in which students and faculty explore development of research questions and applications of research methodologies will support the doctoral-level culture.]

iii. Student learning outcomes for the proposed program.

The student learning outcomes for the program conform with the systemwide core educational leadership program concepts (Appendix 5). The core curriculum is required to provide professional preparation for leadership, including but not limited to theory and research methods, the structure and culture of educational institutions, and leadership in curriculum and instruction, equity and assessment (Title 5 of California Code of Regulations, Section 40512).

[Campuses will add student learning outcomes. A CSU Fullerton sample is below.]

| Student Learning Objectives |
|---|
| Graduates of the Program will be: Experts in Educational Leadership |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who possess a deep understanding of the complex nature of learning and teaching so that they are able to guide and assist instructional practice. • Who understand the needs of adult learners and can apply the theories found in the androgogy³ literature to the process of educational reform. • Who are skilled users of techniques for forecasting, planning, and management of change processes in education including use of technology as a resource. • Who are aware of cutting-edge technologies and how they can be used to enhance teaching, learning, and leadership of the educational enterprise. |
| Professionals Whose Practice is Informed by Scholarly Literature |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will critique informal ideas about best practice on the basis of the literature. • Who will have a sense of the limits of the literature, as to its applicability to the work of educational professionals, its fundamental validity and reliability, and as to questions of which groups are empowered or marginalized by what is implied in the literature. • Who will foster and encourage best practices within their organizations, based on critical analysis of scholarly literature. • Who can develop with their colleagues and subordinates the ability to participate in communities of learning based on reflective practice and critique of the scholarly literature. • Who can define, contrast, and evaluate the multiple perspectives presented in the scholarly literature regarding education. • Who can critique proposals for research and/or program implementation. • Who can broker consultants and researchers in pursuit of organizational goals, independently assessing organizational needs and matching consultant / researcher skills and proposals to those needs. |
| Reflective Practitioners |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose professional experience is systematically engaged, compared, and critiqued in classroom and other learning experiences. • Whose professional experience will be brought to bear on the areas of their study, finding relevance and application for principles derived from the literature. |
| Critical Thinkers |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose thinking is probabilistic, recognizing the indeterminacy of educational and social contexts. • Whose professional thinking is marked by hypothetical reasoning, meaning that conclusions are remorselessly yet robustly tentative, open to falsification on the basis of new valid and reliable data. • Who exhibit a bias for evidence in decision-making, preferring strongly evidence that is systematic and gathered from multiple sources and via sound means of collection, which are tested against the scholarly literature, and the realities of changing circumstances. |
| Change Agents |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose knowledge of research enables them to interpret findings, make judicious applications of research, and advise others in policy positions. • Who are able to undertake first-hand investigations of local problems using applied research and appropriate methods for generating valid and reliable results. • Who are able to select applied research that addresses significant questions and ground it within the general framework of the scholarly literature. • Who use research results and a sophisticated understanding of organizational structures, cultures, and |

³ As distinguished from *pedagogy*, the Greek root [ped] makes reference to children, *androgogy* references the art and science of teaching adults.

| |
|---|
| institutional networks to foster positive reform efforts within their organizations and across educational institutions. |
| Self-Aware and Ethical Professionals |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who will seek contexts and means for professional-life-long learning and connections with scholarly literature. • Who will demand sophisticated feedback on their own performance and that of others, informed by scholarly understandings. • Who understand that education is embedded in a network of social and political structures that can be influenced and also will exert powerful influences on the educational process at all levels. • Who understand and support the ethical expectations of the education profession and strive to make their professional practice serve the needs of students and the community. |
| Professionals Who Value Diversity |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who understand how their life histories shapes their views about the literature, organizations, and groups and who understand how to create collaborative environments that welcome and serve diverse members— cultural/linguistic diversity, gender, special needs, and age-span differences. • Who work to shape learning communities at their sites that are more humane and responsive to all students and are open to the wider community. |

- iv. Curricular map articulating the alignment between program learning out comes and course learning outcomes.
- v. Listing of courses, identifying which are required.

[Campuses will provide curricular map and listing of courses. A sample from CSU Fullerton follows.]

| Alignment of Student Learning Objectives with Core Concepts | | |
|---|---|---|
| Student Learning Objectives | Student Indicators | Examples of Core Concepts ⁴ that Align with Student Indicators LS: Specialization; LF: Foundation; RM: Research |
| Experts in Educational Leadership | Deep understanding of complex nature of learning and teaching so that they are able to guide and assist instructional practice | LS: Student Learning Supports |
| | Understand the needs of adult learners and can apply the theories found in the literature to the process of educational reform | LS: Effective Instructional Strategies |
| | Skilled users of techniques for forecasting, planning, and management of change | LS: Resources and Fiscal Planning LF: Complexity and Organizations |
| | Aware of cutting-edge technologies and how they can enhance teaching, learning, and leadership | LS: Human Resource Development LF: Systemic Educational Reform |
| Professionals Whose Practice is Informed by Scholarly Literature | Able to critique best practice based on the literature | LF: Collaborative Management |
| | Understand limits of the received literature | LF: Complexity and Organizations |
| | Critical analysis of the literature | LF: Educational Policy Environments |
| | Use the literature in communities of learning | LF: Systemic Educational Reform |
| | Define, contrast and evaluate multiple perspectives | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making |
| | Critiques proposals and programs | RM: Assessment and Evaluation |
| Reflective Practitioners | Assess consultant or researchers work | RM: Assessment and Evaluation |
| | Experience from professional settings is systematically engaged, compared and critiqued | LF: Educational Accountability |
| | Application of principles derived from the literature in professional practice | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership |
| Critical Thinkers | Thinking is probabilistic, recognizing the indeterminacy of educational and social contexts | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making |
| | Hypothetical reasoning—willingness to test conclusions | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making |
| | Bias for evidence in decision-making | RM: Field-Based Research |
| Change Agents | Make judicious applications of research | RM: Assessment and Evaluation |
| | Able to undertake first-hand investigations of local problems | RM: Applied Quantitative Inquiry RM: Applied Qualitative Inquiry |
| | Able to ground applied research projects within the framework of the scholarly literature | RM: Applied Quantitative Inquiry RM: Applied Qualitative Inquiry |
| | Use research results and understanding of organizational structures, etc. to foster positive reform efforts | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making |
| Self-Aware and Ethical Professionals | Seek professional-life-long learning and connections with scholarly literature | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership |
| | Demand for sophisticated feedback on their own performance and that of others informed by scholarship | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership |

⁴ Core concepts are drawn from SB 724, the CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs, the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, community college leadership competencies, and exemplary Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. Core concepts are broad and encompass many of the student outcomes. This matrix provides examples of how the core concepts relate to student outcomes, but is not meant to be an exhaustive comparison.

| Alignment of Student Learning Objectives with Core Concepts | | |
|---|---|---|
| Student Learning Objectives | Student Indicators | Examples of Core Concepts ⁴ that Align with Student Indicators LS: Specialization; LF: Foundation; RM: Research |
| | Understanding of the social and political networks in which education is embedded | LS: School-Community Relations |
| | Support of ethical expectations and need to serve the students and the community | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership |
| Professionals Who Value Diversity | Understanding how their life history shapes their views | LF: Educational Policy Environments |
| | Understand how to create collaborative environments that welcome and serve diverse members | LF: Diversity and Equity LS: School and Campus Cultures |
| | Work to shape learning communities that are more humane and responsive to all students and open to the wider community | LS: Effective Instructional Strategies |

Comparison of Program Courses and Core Curricular Elements for Ed.D. Educational Leadership - PreK-12 Specialization

| Core Concepts | CSUF Leadership Foundation 12 units | | | | CSUF Research 12 units | | | | PreK-12 Specialization 15 units | | | | | Research Support Seminars 12 units | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | 627 Structure of Education | 600 Organizational Theory | 620 Ethical and Legal Dimensions | EDD 604 Forecasting and Planning | EDD 601 Quantitatively-Based Methods | EDD 602 Qualitatively-Based Methods | EDD 603A/B Specialization in Methods | EDD 689 Dissertation Research | EDD 621A Curricular and Instructional Practices | EDD 622A Educational Change and Reform | EDD 624A Politics, Policy, Governance | EDD 605 Collection /Analysis of Assessment | EDD 626A Resource Optimization | EDD 670A Linking Research to Practice | EDD 670B Connecting Research Questions | EDD 670C Refining Research Questions | EDD 670D Scholarly Defense | EDD 670E Qualifying Examination | EDD 670F IRB and Proposal Defense |
| Leadership Foundations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systemic Educational Reform | I | R | | R | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Visionary Leadership | I | R | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Complexity and Organizations | | I | R | | | | | | | A | A | | A | | | | | | |
| Collaborative Management | I | I | R | | | | | | R | R | | | R | | | | | | |
| Diversity and Equity | I | | R | R | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Educational Policy | I | | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Educational Accountability | I | | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | | | | | | | |
| Leadership Specialization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School and Campus Cultures | | I | | | | | | | A | A | | | | | | | | | |
| Effective Instruction | I | | | | | | | | A | A | R | A | R | | | | | | |
| Human Resource Development | | I | R | R | | | | | | A | | | A | | | | | | |
| Student Learning Supports | I | | | R | | | | | A | A | | A | R | | | | | | |
| School-Community Relations | I | I | | | | | | | | | A | R | R | | | | | | |
| Resources and Fiscal Planning | | I | | R | | | | | | | | A | | | | | | | |
| Research Methodology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment and Evaluation | | | | | I | I | A | R | | | | I | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Applied Quantitative Inquiry | | | | | I | | A | R | | | | R | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Applied Qualitative Inquiry | | | | | | I | A | R | | | | R | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Data-Driven Decision-Making | | | | I | R | R | A | R | | | | I | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Note: I=Where a concept is either introduced R=Where a concept is reinforced A=Element is addressed at an advanced level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Comparison of CSUF Program Courses and Core Educational Leadership Concepts – Community College Specialization

| | CSUF Leadership Foundation 12 units | | | | CSUF Research 12 units | | | | Community College Specialization 15 units | | | | | Research Support Seminars 12 units | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Core Concepts | 627 Structure of Education | 600 Organizational Theory | 620 Ethical and Legal Dimensions | EDD 604 Forecasting and Planning | EDD 601 Quantitatively-Based Methods | EDD 602 Qualitatively-Based Methods | EDD 603A/B Specialization in Methods | EDD 689 Dissertation Research | EDD 621B Community College | EDD 622B Instruction & Support Services | EDD 624B Law, Finance, & Staffing | EDD 630 Resource & Enrollment Mgmt | EDD 626A Community College Student | EDD 670A Linking Research to Practice | EDD 670B Connecting Research Questions | EDD 670C Refining Research Questions | EDD 670D Scholarly Defense | EDD 670E Qualifying Examination | EDD 670F IRB and Proposal Defense |
| Leadership Foundations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Systemic Educational Reform | I | R | | R | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Visionary Leadership | I | R | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Complexity and Organizations | | I | R | | | | | | A | A | A | | A | | | | | | |
| Collaborative Management | I | I | R | | | | | | R | R | A | A | R | | | | | | |
| Diversity and Equity | I | | R | R | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Educational Policy | I | | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Educational Accountability | I | | R | | | | | | A | A | A | A | A | | | | | | |
| Leadership Specialization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| School and Campus Cultures | | I | | | | | | | R | A | | | A | | | | | | |
| Effective Instruction | I | | | | | | | | A | A | | A | R | | | | | | |
| Human Resource Development | | I | R | R | | | | | | A | A | A | | | | | | | |
| Student Learning Supports | I | | | R | | | | | A | A | | A | R | | | | | | |
| School-Community Relations | I | I | | | | | | | | A | R | R | A | | | | | | |
| Resources and Fiscal Planning | | I | | R | | | | | | | A | A | | | | | | | |
| Research Methodology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessment and Evaluation | | | | | I | I | A | R | | I | | A | A | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Applied Quantitative Inquiry | | | | | I | | A | R | | | | R | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Applied Qualitative Inquiry | | | | | | I | A | R | | | | R | | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Data-Driven Decision-Making | | | | I | R | R | A | R | | I | | R | R | R | R | R | R | R | R |
| Note: I=Where a concept is either introduced R=Where a concept is reinforced A=Element is addressed at an advanced level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

- vi. Process by which syllabi are reviewed and approved to ensure (1) course learning outcomes are described and are linked to the program learning outcomes, (2) materials are current, (3) pedagogy is appropriate for the modality of the course.

A multi-level process occurs within the CSU for review of course outlines comparable to syllabi. After being developed by faculty with expertise related to the proposed course, graduate course outlines are reviewed and approved at several campus levels, typically including the Department and College Curriculum Committee, the Graduate Education Committee, and the Academic Senate.

[Campuses will provide additional local detail such as: “The required New Course Proposal Form (Appendix 8) addresses (a) course learning outcomes and the link to program learning outcomes, (b) learning materials, and (c) course pedagogy. The Form accompanies the syllabus in the review process, which includes...”]

- vii. Sample syllabi from first three courses and the dissertation or culminating experience, which include specific learning objectives and learning outcomes of the course and are adapted to the modality of the course. Syllabi should demonstrate that extensive library usage is required including use and research of primary and secondary level resources.

[Campuses will respond with a statement such as: “Appendix 9 contains syllabi for the first three courses and for courses related to the dissertation, which demonstrate use of primary and secondary sources.”]

- viii. Internships requirements and monitoring procedures, if required.

Not applicable.

- ix. Special requirements for graduation.

Not applicable.

B. Schedule/format requirements:

- i. Length of the program for the typical student to complete all requirements for the program.

The program is designed so that it may be completed in three years. This requires three academic years and two to three summers of study. This allows for all course work, advancement to candidacy, and completing the dissertation. Students are expected to be concurrently holding full-time positions as educators. This provides important opportunities to apply theoretical and empirical material covered in courses to actual practice. Classes are to be held in the late afternoons and evenings, in summers, and occasionally on weekends, to accommodate the schedules of working professionals.

The program of study distributed over twelve months facilitates (a) integration of graduate studies and practice, (b) periods of intensive study among candidates, and (c) opportunities to work in depth with faculty. Program regulations establish that:

- The program is designed for completion of the degree requirements within three calendar years.
 - Completion of the degree requirements between three years and four to five calendar years is normally acceptable.
 - Total registered time will not normally exceed five years, and extension beyond this period requires approval by the appropriate campus authority.
 - Extension for degree completion beyond five years may not exceed a two-year period, except under unusual circumstances and with special campus approval.
- ii. Description of the cohort or open registration model being used – Minimum attendance/participation requirements and the provisions made for students to make-up assignments or for students who have to drop out of the cohort for a short period of time.

The CSU Ed.D. program is organized as a cohort-based program. Groups of students admitted each year will take courses together. This allows for several distinct advantages of group membership in graduate study, which are intentionally fostered in the program:

- Cohorts offer support to candidates and provide opportunities for members to learn from one another.
- Cohorts establish professional ties that often last beyond the doctoral program itself; such networks are valuable in terms of continued professional support and growth.
- Fostering and monitoring candidates' progress is enhanced in cohorts. The group carries with it the expectation that all but the occasional candidate will complete the program successfully, including such standard benchmarks as the qualifying examination, advancement to candidacy, and completion of the dissertation.
- Scheduling an outstanding program of doctoral study can be accomplished more readily for cohorts that have courses in common. Enrollments are predictable, and a course of study can be planned in advance in relation to the availability of highly qualified faculty.

Each Ed.D. student is expected to make satisfactory progress in accordance with the Ed.D. cohort structure and program of study through the time of Advancement to Candidacy. The normal expectation is that students will attend and participate in all required program components. Students who need to make-up assignment assignments are normally given the opportunity to do so.

In the event that a student's lack of attendance/participation would cause them to fail to maintain a grade point average of 3.0, the student would be notified and

counseled regarding requirements for satisfactory progress toward the degree. Systemwide criteria of satisfactory academic progress are provided in Appendix 10.

[Campuses will provide local information. An example is below.]

[Students who need to stop-out are typically provided two options. One is to take extra coursework to make up courses missed and return to their original cohort. The second is to join a later cohort that, at the time they return, is taking the classes that they missed. Provisions regarding time limits for matriculation and progress toward the degree are included in Appendix 10.]

- iii. Description of how timely and appropriate interactions between students and faculty, and among students will be assured. This is especially relevant for online programs.

[Campuses will typically provide local information. An example is below.]

[Faculty members hold regular office hours that are posted, and most identify periods when they are available before and after class in person and by individual appointment. Virtually all are also available on workdays by e-mail and voice mail.

Timely and appropriate interactions between faculty and students and among students are fostered through course and program electronic support. E-mail is frequently used to allow for continuous communications, and many courses include supplementary Web-based tools to facilitate continuous exchange with faculty and among students (e.g., online discussion rooms, forums, bulletin boards, etc.).]

- iv. Timeframe of courses, i.e. accelerated, weekend, traditional, etc.

The courses in CSU Ed.D. programs will typically be delivered on a semester or quarter basis. While they will often be scheduled after 4:00 P.M. on weekdays, in summers, or on weekends to accommodate the work schedule of students, they will nevertheless typically be the length of a normal academic year or summer term.

- v. Sample schedule of courses for a full cycle of the program

[Campuses will prepare schedule of courses. The sample below is from CSU Fullerton.]

| Course Sequence | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| First Fall Following Admission | |
| Leadership | EDD 627 Epistemology, History, and Structure of Contemporary Education |
| Specialization | EDD 605 Application of Research: Collection and Analysis of Assessment Data <i>OR</i> EDD 621B The Community College: Mission, History, Structure and Governance |
| Research Support | EDD 670A Linking Research to Problems of Practice |
| First Spring | |
| Leadership | EDD 600 Organizational Theory & Challenges for Instructional Leadership |
| Research | EDD 601 Methods of Research: Quantitatively-Based Tools |
| Research Support | EDD 670B Connecting Research Questions to Scholarship in the Discipline |
| First Summer | |
| Specialization | EDD 621A Leadership of Curricular and Instructional Practices: PreK-12 <i>OR</i> EDD 630 The Community College Student |
| Research | EDD 602 Methods of Research: Qualitatively-Based Tools |
| Research Support | EDD 670C Written Qualifying Examination Qualifying Examination |
| Second Fall | |
| Specialization | EDD 624A Social Contexts of Educational Politics, Policy and Governance in Pre-K Education <i>OR</i> EDD 624B Issues in Community College Leadership: Law, Finance, and Staffing |
| Research | EDD 603A Specialization in Qualitatively-Based Tools <i>OR</i> EDD 603B Specialization in Quantitatively-Based Tools |
| Research Support | EDD 670D Refining Research Questions |
| Second Spring | |
| Specialization | EDD 622A Human Dimensions of Educational Change and Reform: PreK-12 <i>OR</i> EDD 622B Instructional and Support Services in Community Colleges |
| Leadership | EDD 620 Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Instructional Leadership |
| Research Support | EDD 670E Scholarly Defense of a Proposition |
| Second Summer | |
| Leadership | EDD 604 Applications of Research: Forecasting and Planning for Emerging Instructional Needs |
| Specialization | EDD 626A Transforming Teaching and Schools through Resource Optimization <i>OR</i> EDD 626B Transforming Community Colleges through Resource Optimization and Enrollment Management |
| Research Support | EDD 670F IRB Approval and Proposal Defense |
| Third Fall | |
| Research Support | Dissertation work |
| Third Spring | |
| Research Support | Dissertation work |

C. Admissions Requirements:

i. Admissions requirements

The Ed.D. programs are designed to admit candidates who meet the academic requirements for rigorous doctoral study and who possess personal qualities and professional experiences that suggest a strong potential for success both as doctoral students 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 Ed.D. program requires the following of all applicants for admission to the doctoral program:

- a. The applicant holds an acceptable baccalaureate degree and master's degree earned at regionally accredited institutions of higher education, or the applicant has completed equivalent academic preparation as determined by the appropriate campus authority;
- b. The applicant has attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.0 in upper division and graduate study combined;
- c. The applicant was in good standing at the last institution of higher education attended.
- d. The applicant has demonstrated sufficient preparation for, experiences in, and potential for educational leadership to benefit from the program, including: successful experience in school, postsecondary, community, and/or policy leadership; academic excellence, problem-solving ability, technology proficiency; interest in critically assessing and in improving current educational policies and practices. Evidence considered in the admission process shall include but not be limited to:
 - Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores on the three sections of the GRE General Test; scores from the previous five years are acceptable as valid;
 - three confidential letters of recommendation attesting to the leadership ability and scholarship of the candidate;
 - a written statement of purpose reflecting understanding of the challenges facing the public schools or community colleges in California;
 - a personal interview; and
 - either a statement of support from the applicant's employer, indicating support for the candidate's doctoral studies or a statement from the applicant, describing the applicant's plan for meeting professional responsibilities and the demands of the program.

A limited number of students (not to exceed 15 percent) may be admitted in any one year on an exception basis if they demonstrate unique leadership strengths.

- ii. Identification of the type of student targeted and qualifications required for the program.

The CSU Ed.D. program is designed to prepare outstanding individuals for leadership positions in public schools and districts and community colleges. It is expected that those admitted will be mid-career educational professionals who are preparing to take on leadership roles in these education sectors. To meet the admission requirements, they need a master's degree in education or a closely related field. Particular attention will be given to recruiting a diverse group of candidates reflecting the population of California's public schools and community colleges.

- iii. Credit policies including the number of credits that students may transfer to the program.

The CSU Ed.D. requires 60 semester units of doctoral level work including 12 units of dissertation work. At least 42 semester units are normally to be completed in residence at the campus awarding the degree.

Candidates can request limited transfer credit for units. Such requests will require approval of the designated campus authority and will normally be subject to the conditions that no more than 12 semester units may be transferred into the program.

[If campuses have additional local requirements they should be included. The following example is from CSU Fullerton.

- The courses must have been taken for doctoral credit.
- The courses must have been taken in the past 5 years.
- The courses must be assessed by the appropriate campus authority as containing the same content as coursework in the campus Ed.D. program.
- The courses must appear on an official transcript from an accredited institution of higher education with a grade of B or better.]

- iv. Residency requirements, if applicable.

All candidates are normally required to be enrolled at CSU, _____ for a minimum of 42 semester units.

- v. Sample brochure or admissions material

[See Appendix 13 for sample brochure and admissions material.]

- vi. If a joint doctoral degree will be offered simultaneously with an independent doctorate, describe the admissions criteria used to differentiate admission to each program, and the difference in target population.

[Not applicable.]

Section VIII: Faculty

- A. Number and type (full-time, part-time, tenured, non-tenured) 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.

Routine doctoral faculty qualifications have been established systemwide for the Ed.D. program. These qualifications, like the other systemwide provisions, were the product of a CSU Academic Senate committee experienced in CSU doctoral programs in education. The faculty qualifications are included in Appendix 13.

Core doctoral faculty are those faculty members who have disciplinary expertise and a scholarly record relevant to leadership in Pre-K–12 or community college leadership and study of the field. They serve in all of the primary roles within the Ed.D. program: instruction, academic advising, Chairing and being a member of Dissertation Committees, program evaluation, governance, and admissions. They are ordinarily full-time and are tenured or have a tenure-track appointment.

Affiliated doctoral faculty are additional participating faculty who have disciplinary expertise or significant experience related to educational leadership. Affiliated faculty include (a) tenured or tenure track-faculty on the campus (normally full-time), and (b) adjunct faculty with special expertise pertinent to educational leadership, including individuals who are currently or recently employed in a leadership positions through a Pre-K–12 or community partner in the program.

Three other types of faculty may also participate in the program: (a) tenured or tenure-track faculty from the campus who are not formally on the Ed.D. Faculty; (b) comparably qualified faculty from other CSU campuses, or from other research universities, and (b) additional highly qualified educational researchers from the campus or other institutions (e.g., research Centers or Institutes).

[Campuses will provide details on number and type of faculty. Tables might be included, like the hypothetical one below, with projected faculty (number of faculty members rather than FTEF) participating in the program from 2007-08 to 2009-10.]

Number of Tenured and Tenure Track Full-Time Faculty
Supporting Ed.D. Program (2007-08 to 2009-10)

| Departments | Curriculum Development | Instruction | Dissertation Supervision | Evaluating Effectiveness | Faculty Support 2007-08 | Faculty Support 2008-09 | Faculty Support 2009-10 |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Educational Leadership | X | X | X | X | 2.00 | 4.00 | 6.00 |
| Elementary Education | | X | X | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Secondary Education | | X | X | | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Educational Research | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2.00 |
| Political Science | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Urban Studies | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Sociology | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Psychology | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Information Systems | X | X | X | X | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

- B. Analysis of the impact that the proposed program or change will have on overall faculty workload, including teaching, research, and scholarship. How will courses no longer being taught by doctorate faculty be taught? How will units be assigned for dissertation work (how many for serving as the chair vs. serving on the committee) and what will be the maximum number of students that one faculty member can advise?

[Campuses will provide response on impact of the Ed.D. program. New positions and faculty searches should be described. Replacement plans for Ed.D. faculty should be specified. A statement might be included about the reduction in workload associated with discontinuing the joint Ed.D. program. Dissertation workload (for Chair and committee members if relevant) and maximum dissertation advising should be designated.]

- C. Support/resources for faculty to develop a doctoral level culture, engage in research, and receive an orientation in order to chair dissertation committees.

[Campuses will develop local responses. Information like that below might be included.]

[CSU, _____ has developed support and resources consistent with a doctoral level culture and facilitating faculty engagement in research. Faculty tenure and promotion criteria include clear expectations regarding faculty research and scholarly publications, and these are consistent with those of tier-one research institutions. A wide array of research activities in education have been in place on the CSU, _____ campus for many years because of its institutional commitment to improving public schools. State, federal, and foundation projects are ongoing that provide major opportunities for research. The campus provides assistance in grant writing, support for faculty delivery of papers at conferences, computer software for quantitative and qualitative data analysis, and access to a wide range of electronic databases. The Faculty Development Center is

available to assist faculty individually and departments collectively in further developing research activities and funding.

Preparation to chair dissertation committees derives from several factors. In order to be appointed to the core faculty, individuals much have demonstrated ability in directing comparable research activities. Most faculty have been involved in dissertation supervision as part of a joint Ed.D. program or a Ph.D. program. In addition, all faculty have extensive experience chairing master's theses. Orientation to chairing Ed.D. dissertation committees will (a) utilize Faculty Handbook and Student Handbook sections addressing dissertation requirements and (b) be supplemented by routine use of carefully chosen texts available for guiding social and behavioral science research dissertations.]

- D. Information about the balance of full and part time faculty members involved, and how that balance will ensure quality and consistency.

Courses in CSU Ed.D. programs will normally be taught by full-time tenure track faculty. The systemwide faculty requirements are that instruction is to be delivered primarily by core doctoral faculty, who are full-time tenured faculty or tenure-track faculty. These systemwide provisions enable affiliated faculty who hold adjunct appointments to serve as co-instructors, providing a mechanism for enriching courses through involvement of PreK-12 and community college partners. It is possible that a part-time faculty member would be assigned to teach a course because of their unique skills, but they would need to be appointed to the affiliated doctoral faculty. This requires a review of their doctoral instruction qualifications and election by the Ed.D. Program Faculty. Such instructional roles would not be a routine practice. Delivery of primary instruction by core and affiliated Ed.D. Program Faculty will ensure quality and consistency.

[Campuses may wish to elaborate on this section with local information.]

- E. Faculty background and experience to engage in doctoral-level instruction—Include an abbreviated vitae to include an overview of the key credentials, publications, and prior experience supervising dissertation work for primary faculty responsible for the program—Full vitae not required.

[Campuses will provide response. A listing of faculty would typically be included, with abbreviated vitae in Appendix 15.]

Section IX: Student Support Services

- A. Support services available for doctoral level students, such as financial aid, placement and research funding.

The CSU Ed.D. program provides financial aid for all eligible students based on federal guidelines. Students are able to receive fee-offsets if they qualify for aid based on federal guidelines. In addition, all students are able to receive federal and other loans that are available for graduate study.

The Ed.D. fee policy sets aside 10% of student fees in the program for financial aid. It makes this amount available first for need-based aid and then for other program purposes. The total is approximately \$1,000 per student. The balance of the financial aid set-aside can be used for other types of student support such as research assistantships, dissertation fellowships, student grants for purchase of texts and scholarly materials, and off-setting of research expenses (e.g., data collection, transcription, etc.). It can also be used to support student participation in conferences and meetings of professional associations that enhance student networking and placement opportunities.

The CSU Ed.D. includes a mentoring component that is designed to provide an array of professional development opportunities. It involves students in networks that support their development within and beyond their institutions, and it is intended to provide professional support. Mentors assist the candidate in identifying fieldwork opportunities, professional development experiences, and professional groups and associations relevant to student success in the program and to facilitating career advancement.

[Campuses will describe local financial aid and financial aid advising, career placement services and assistance, and funding that is available to students for research.]

B. Ongoing advising and academic support.

A distinguishing feature of the CSU Ed.D. program is each student's having both a faculty academic advisor and a professional mentor. The role of academic advisors is directed toward creating a doctoral level culture, performing graduate advising functions, serving as the Dissertation Committee Chair, providing the primary supervision of the candidate's dissertation research, and sponsoring the candidate's submission to the campus Institutional Review Board for approval of Human subjects Research. The role of mentors is focused on providing guidance, modeling, and support for professional experiences that foster leadership effectiveness and opportunities,

Purposes of Faculty Academic Advisement include providing academic discussion and dialogue that support embedding of dissertation research within each component of the curriculum. Purposes of Faculty Mentoring include providing informal assessment and feedback to enhance candidate reflection on educational leadership and reform. The Ed.D. Doctoral Advisement and Mentoring components of the CSU Ed.D. programs are described in Appendices 11 and 12.

Faculty academic advisors are responsible for: (a) helping candidates plan an efficient Ed.D. course of study that can be completed within three years by working professionals; (b) engaging candidates in academic discussion and dialogue that assists them to prepare for dissertation research throughout each component of the curriculum; (c) providing expert supervision to Ed.D. candidates in the conduct of rigorous dissertation research; and (d) advocating on behalf of the candidates and their needs.

The initial Faculty Advisor is appointed at the time the candidate is admitted to the program. At the time the candidate begins planning the dissertation, he/she identifies a faculty member well suited to serve as Dissertation Chair. If this individual is available to serve in this role and agrees to do so, they become the Faculty Academic Advisor and primary supervisor of the student's dissertation research.

The student handbook for the Ed.D. program is intended to ensure ongoing support for students. It is to include a thorough description of program policies, requirements, and procedures. It will be accessible online in order to be readily available to the working professionals who will be enrolled in the Ed.D. program.

[Campuses will describe other specific local advising and academic support.]

Section X: Information Literacy and Resources

- A. Description of the information literacy competencies expected of students at entrance to the program and at graduation and how they will be evaluated

Information literacy competencies are expected of students from the point of admission to the program and are expected to develop throughout the programs of study. Technology proficiency is included among admission requirements and includes information literacy competency.

[Individual campuses will augment this description, specifying how they plan to assess information literacy competency at the entrance to the program and at graduation. This can, if a campus chooses to do so, include reference to the Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy Assessment and/or Multimedia Educational Resources for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT).

[CSU has collaborated with ETS in the national Higher Education ICT Initiative, through which ETS developed the ICT Literacy Assessment. ICT literacy proficiency as measured by the assessment is the ability to use digital technology, communication tools, and electronic networks appropriately to solve information problems. This includes the ability to use technology as a tool to research, organize, evaluate, and communicate information, and the possession of a fundamental understanding of the ethical and legal issues surrounding the access and use of information.

The ICT Literacy Assessment is available for use in the Ed.D. program, utilizing the *Advanced Assessment*. It is a scenario- and web-based assessment of students' skills in information and communication technology (ICT) literacy. It contains interactive simulations of information resources and applications such as Web-based documents, journal article databases, and spread-sheets. It evaluates how students solve problems that entail information technologies. It encompasses technical skills and cognitive information competence abilities needed to effectively access, evaluate and use information from a wide range of sources. For students who do not demonstrate ICT literacy competence, CSU's comprehensive systemwide digital library, Multimedia

Educational Resources for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT), has a range of tools that can be used to assist them in developing needed proficiencies.

- B. Description of what staffing and instructional services have been put in place and what library and information resources are available to students and faculty in support of the new degree

[Campuses will provide local information for Sections X. B – X. F. An example from CSU Fullerton is at the end of this section. Systemwide information is provided immediately below that is relevant to Sections X. C.]

- C. Access to library systems (local, national, or global), electronic services, Internet, information utilities, service providers, and document delivery services for both faculty and students

CSU's Systemwide Electronic Information Resources (SEIR) implements cooperative buying aimed at ensuring access to electronic services for all CSU campuses. The Electronic Core Collection it maintains is designed to meet needs of core programs within the CSU, and SEIR has worked to address the needs of the Ed.D. program in making current purchase decisions. Information about the subscriptions presently available to CSU campuses is available at: <http://seir/calstate.edu/protected/subscribers/index.shtml>.

[Campuses will augment with local information.]

- D. Staff and services available to students and faculty for instruction on how to use information resources, both onsite and remotely
- E. Availability of library staff to answer research questions
- F. Impact on the maintenance of the home institution's library in terms of library and research support appropriate for doctoral-level research

[An example from CSU Fullerton pertaining to Section X. B. through X. F. follows.

- B. Description of what staffing and instructional services have been put in place and what library and information resources are available to students and faculty in support of the new degree

The Pollak Library at CSUF holds over a million books and bound periodicals. The library also has over 3,000 print subscriptions and over 26,000 electronic books. Over 30,000 inter-library loan requests from CSUF faculty and students are completed each year. The library staff makes over 700 instructional presentations yearly. Over \$700,000 is spent annually on purchase of current serials such as journals, and over \$300,000 is spent on electronic serial subscriptions. Over six million dollars are spent each year on expenditures for information resources.

The current list of electronic databases that specifically support education follows:]

http://p8331-metaib.calstate.edu.lib-proxy.fullerton.edu/V/UQ1MEJTXPYGNQ1I23YRK8YCTGVNK8BBUAE2A8T392L6CISLDK5-05

| Database Name | Resource Type | Actions |
|--|---------------|---------|
| ERIC (EBSCO) | Articles | |
| ERIC FirstSearch (OCLC) | Articles | |
| Education Full-Text (Wilson) | Articles | |
| Education: A Sage Full-Text Collection (CSA) | Articles | |
| Academic Search Elite (EBSCO) | Articles | |
| Teacher Reference Center (EBSCO) New | Articles | |
| Wiley InterScience | Articles | |
| Factiva (Dow Jones) | Articles | |
| Project MUSE Premium | Articles | |
| JSTOR | Articles | |
| PsycINFO (EBSCO) | Articles | |
| PsycArticles (EBSCO) New | Articles | |
| Mental Measurements Yearbook (EBSCO) | Reference | |
| SPORTDiscus (EBSCO) | Articles | |
| Web of Science | Articles | |
| Children's Literature Comprehensive Database | Articles | |
| Kraus Curriculum Development Library | Reference | |
| RAND California | Statistics | |

Inte

- C. Access to library systems (local, national, or global), electronic services, Internet, information utilities, service providers, and document delivery services for both faculty and students.

Pollak Library has access to a wide variety of library systems through both full text services and inter-library loan programs.

Address <http://www.library.fullerton.edu/ASP/LibTemplate.asp?version=1&showoption=findbooksandmore&showoptionpush=240&cont> Go Links »

California State University Fullerton Pollak Library

Research

Library Navigation
 Library Home Page
 Research
 Services
 Information
Research Links
 Find Books
 Find Articles
 Find Journals By Title
 Research Guides
 Web Resources
 Ask A Librarian
 Citing Sources
 How Do I?

Pollak Library General Content Information Print Info

Other Library Catalogs

Links to catalogs or libraries outside of CSUF, to search for materials.

- [WorldCat Subscription Resource](#)
- [LINK+](#) This search is best used through the [Pollak Library Catalog](#). Search for title, then click on the gray 'Try LINK+' button, upper right. The search will continue in LINK+.
- [CSU libraries](#) (individual)
- [CSU libraries](#) (union)
- [Melvyl \(UC System\)](#)
- Southern California libraries - *no longer active as of 06/22/06*
- [Greater LA/OC libraries](#)
- [Library of Congress Catalog](#)
- [National Library catalogs](#)

D. Staff and services available to students and faculty for instruction on how to use, access, and support information resources, both onsite and remotely.

Pollak Library employs over 27 librarians and other professional staff. A bibliographer is specifically assigned to support the field of education. In addition, other librarians with expertise in areas such as legal research also support education students and faculty. Faculty are able to arrange for instructional sessions on library resources to be held during courses or to seek support for specific research projects.

Address <http://www.library.fullerton.edu/ASP/LibTemplate.asp?version=2&showoption=referenceandinstruction&showoptionpush=300&cont> Go Links »

California State University Fullerton Pollak Library

Services

Library Navigation
 Library Home Page
 Research
 Services
 Information
Service Links
 Borrowing and Reserves
 Reference and Instruction
 Study Spaces and Computers
 Service Desks
 Online Services
 How Do I?
Library Workshops & Instruction Sessions
 Library Drop-in Workshops
 Library Survival Skills
 Workshops
 Citation Workshops
 Simmons Study of Media & Markets Workshops

REFERENCE AND INSTRUCTION

Drop-In Workshops

- Library Survival Skills Workshops
- Citation Workshops

Faculty-Requested Library Instruction

- Faculty-Requested Library Instruction Form

Reference Online Services

- 24/7 Chat Reference
- Email Reference

Reference Person to Person

- Telephone Research Assistance
- Walk-In Reference
- Research Consultations

E. Availability of library staff to support research activity

The reference desk of the library is always staffed when the library is open. Students and faculty have access to email reference assistance as well as an online chat room for reference assistance. Library staff will also make individual reference consultation appointments with students and faculty. Approximately 2,000 reference support transactions are completed in a typical week.

F. Impact on the maintenance of the home institution's library in terms of library and research support appropriate for doctoral-level research

The library has been supporting the current joint Ed.D. program and its students. The number of students will increase from the current 5 per cohort to 20 per cohort in the independent degree program. However, the nature of the demands on the library is not expected to be different in major ways. The substantial number of dissertations may require a higher than normal level of Interlibrary Loan activity, and this can be accommodated. Library instruction, reference, and individual research consultations will require preparation and expertise. However, three years of experience with the joint Ed.D. has demonstrated that needed information and resources are readily available.]

G. Need for additional cooperative agreements with other institutions to supplement resources for doctoral work – Copies of the agreements should be included as an appendix to the proposal

CSU libraries generally have agreements that provide rights for print materials (books and articles) for faculty and students with institutions that offer such agreements. Interlibrary Loan is available between CSU campuses, with UC libraries, and with the other state and national libraries that contain collections relevant to the study of education, educational leadership, and reform at the pre-K-grade 12 and community college levels.

Section XI: Technology

A. Description of the institution's technological capacity to support teaching and learning in the proposed program.

The CSU has established an integrated electronic environment that enables all CSU students, faculty, and staff to communicate with one another and to interact with information resources anytime and from any place. Faculty members and students have email and web access from on-campus and off-campus locations.

CSU's Multimedia Educational Resources for Online Teaching and Learning (MERLOT) has extensive digital resources will be available to faculty and students in the Ed.D. program. Ed.D. faculty may establish an online Teaching Commons on Merlot and may add Educational Leadership resources to the MERLOT collection. This is an open access, continually growing web-based compendia of resources.

[Campuses will add local response. An example adapted from CSU Fullerton is below.]

[Almost all faculty members and students have access to an up-to-date, university provided workstation, with computer hardware and software. These enable them to easily use the Learning Management System resources (e.g., Blackboard, WebCT, etc.) available on campuses that facilitate integration of technology throughout instruction.

CSU _____ faculty make extensive use of electronic information resources in their instruction. Faculty and students have access to digital core collections and digital library resources that enable them to access in excess of 200,000 titles.]

- B. Required technology skills—What level of technology proficiency is expected of students? Will students receive training on how to access required technology used in the program?

A criterion for admission to the program is proficiency with technology. Each candidate is required to provide evidence of technology skills that equip them for doctoral study, and letters of recommendation specifically address technology proficiency.

[Campuses will provide additional information about the level of proficiency expected and training provided on accessing technology used in the program.]

XII. Section XII: Physical Resources

- A. Description of the physical resources provided to support the proposed program(s) and the impact of the proposed change on the physical resource capacity and structure of the classrooms, study spaces and student support areas.

[Campuses will provide local responses. An example from CSU Fullerton is below.]

[The Ed.D. program will be relatively small, even when fully enrolled, and its physical resource needs can be accommodated within existing facilities of the College of Education. Current faculty members already have offices and computers. New faculty are provided these resources as a matter of course by the campus. The Ed.D. program currently uses a conference area in the Department of Educational Leadership for instruction. This space is equipped with “smart classroom” technology (LCD mounted projector, computer, DVD, screen) and can seat 20 students. Space for new faculty offices will be needed and has been allocated. Additional, instructional space is located in a room contiguous to the Department office. This space seats 25 students.]

Section XIII: Financial Resources

- A. Assessment of the financial viability and sustainability of the program including:

- i. Total cost of the program for students, including tuition and any special fees – How are students expected to finance their tuition?

The authorizing legislation designated the fee structure for the CSU independent Ed.D. program. The CSU Board of Trustees subsequently approved a CSU Education Doctorate State University Fee that conforms with the legislative provisions. The fee is the same as that for students in state-supported UC doctoral programs in education and in joint Ed.D. programs. The projected fees during the period from 2007-08 through 2009-10 are indicated below. The fee rate for 2007-08 is based on the budget compact between the Governor and higher education. The annual increase in fees is projected at a rate of 10%, also reflecting the budget compact between the Governor and higher education.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| CSU Education Doctorate Fee | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
| Academic Year Fee | \$7,587.00 | \$8,346.00 | \$9,181.00 |
| Summer Fee | \$3,793.50 | \$4,173.00 | \$4,590.50 |
| 12-Month Study Fees | \$11,380.50 | \$12,519.00 | \$13,771.50 |

The CSU Education Doctorate Fee represents the total cost of the program paid by students. The fee includes the normal cost of enrollment during the academic year and the additional summer fee to allow for 12-month study. The student fees for the summer term are half the academic year fees.

The CSU Education Doctorate Fee for 12-month study will be \$11,380.50 during 2007-08 and is projected to increase to \$13,771.50 by 2009-10. This is significantly lower than the student cost at private universities offering the doctorate in California, at which student costs typically are more than \$18,000 annually for academic year and summer study.

Students may finance program costs independently or may qualify for financial aid in the form of grants or loans. Education Doctorate student fees include a 10 percent financial aid set-aside. These funds are available to provide financial assistance to students who qualify for need-based aid. They are projected to be sufficient to cover any eligible students.

- ii. Narrative describing all start-up costs for the institution and how the costs will be covered.

[Individual campuses will provide information. The material might include a discussion like that below.]

[Start-up costs have included: (a) faculty release time associated with program and course development (\$___); (b) ___ percent salary of the program director for proposal development and approval activities (\$___); (c) administrative support to assist in proposal development and approval (\$___); (d) publications and promotional materials (\$___); and (e) office furniture, equipment and supplies (\$___). The campus allocated start-up funding to cover these costs. Total start-up funding for 2005-2007

was \$_____, which was sufficient to cover all start-up costs. Additional campus support of \$____ has been committed for 2007-08 and will enable all aspects of the program to be fully operational during the initial year.]

- iii. Financial impact of the change on the institution including evidence of the capacity of the institution to absorb start-up costs. If the institution has incurred a deficit in the past three years, then supplemental information describing the financial capacity of the institution to start and sustain the new program(s) is required.

[Individual campuses will provide information. The response might include a discussion like that below.]

[CSU, _____ is a large, comprehensive state-supported institution with an annual budget of \$_____. Initiating new degree programs occurs on a continuing basis, and the campus has resources for this purpose. The Ed.D. is a relatively small program, and the financial impact on the institution will be minimal, including start-up costs.]

- iv. Statement of the minimum number of students necessary to make the program financially viable—the budget should reflect anticipated attrition.

[Individual campuses will provide information. The response might include a discussion like that below.]

[The program will be financially viable with annual cohorts of 18-24. It is projected that 24 new students will be admitted annually, and the budget projections reflect this. The assumption is that most of these students (18 at a minimum) will continue in the program. If enrollments are somewhat lower and within normal attrition, the budget model is still sufficient to make the program financially viable. However, the option also exists for more courses taken in the two concentrations (Pre-K-12 and community college) to be taught together, resulting in classes that facilitate collaboration between the two groups of students and generate faculty savings.]

- v. Budget projection, for at least the first three years of the proposed program, based on the enrollment data in the market analysis and including projected revenues and costs—The budget should include all budgetary assumptions and may be included in the Appendices.

The projected Ed.D. revenues and budget for the first three years are shown below.

Projected Revenues: CSU Independent Ed.D. Program, 2007-08 to 2009-10

| Revenue Component | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| CSU Marginal Cost Rate | \$7,428.00 | \$7,651.00 | \$7,880.00 |
| CSU Ed Doctorate Fee | \$7,587.00 | \$8,346.00 | \$9,181.00 |
| CSU Summer School Fee | \$3,793.50 | \$4,173.00 | \$4,590.50 |
| Total Revenue | \$18,808.50 | \$20,170.00 | \$21,651.50 |

The revenue projections reflect the three basic sources of income: (1) the CSU marginal cost rate – the funding per student for instruction in the state budget; (2) the CSU Education Doctorate Fee – which is set at the rate of the UC doctorate fee in education in accordance with the enabling legislation (SB 724), and (3) summer school fees based on the Education Doctorate Fee – reflecting the fact that the program anticipates 12 months of study.

[Campus funding should be added as appropriate. If, for example, the campus is providing additional funding that will continue during any part of the 3-year period, it should be included.

Campuses will provide local budget information. This should include a detailed line item budget that covers the first three years and a narrative summary of projected revenues and expenditures. An example is given below; the accompanying budgetary assumptions are included in the Appendix at the end of this document. The normal expectation is that revenues will cover—i.e., will be at the level of or will exceed program costs by a slight amount. In addressing this issue, it is typical to provide projected revenues and costs on a per student basis, dividing program costs by projected enrollment.

[The table on page 40 shows the projected budget for the three-year period. As can be seen, the revenue per student for 2007-08 is projected at approximately \$18,808 and the expenditure per student is projected at \$_____. The projected revenue in 2008-09 is approximately \$20,170 and the projected expenditure per student is \$_____. In 2009-2010, the projected revenue is approximately \$21,651, and the projected expenditure per student is \$_____.

The largest item in the three-year budget is faculty salaries. Faculty salaries are calculated using a combination of release time and full salaries and benefits to reflect the mix of the faculty teaching in the program during its first three years.

The increased revenues that occur with expanded enrollments are assigned to faculty and student research support and faculty professional development in year three and thereafter. This support is intended primarily for faculty who serve as dissertation chairpersons. The funds are intended to be used for a range of faculty research and development activities that contribute to the program's research culture and quality dissertation advisement.

Additional budgetary detail is provided in Appendix 16.]

- B. If the institution continues to offer a joint doctoral program(s), describe the availability of resources for all such programs, and the basis for allocation of resources to support both the joint and the independent programs.

["Not Applicable."]

Projected Budget: CSU, _____ Independent Ed.D. Program, 2007-08 to 2009-10
[Sample Format--Each Campus Will Use Its Own Budget Categories and Amounts]

| Budget Item | 2007-08 | 2008-09 | 2009-10 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| Salaries | | | |
| 1. Director | | | |
| 2. Student Services Specialist | | | |
| 3. Administrative Analyst | | | |
| 4. Faculty--Instruction | | | |
| 5. Faculty—Course and Program Development | | | |
| 6. Undergraduate and Graduate Student Assistant(s) | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Salaries</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Benefits | | | |
| 1. Director | | | |
| 2. Student Services Specialist | | | |
| 3. Administrative Analyst | | | |
| 4. Faculty--Instruction | | | |
| 5. Faculty--Course and Program Development | | | |
| 6. Undergraduate and Graduate Student Assistants | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Benefits</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Supplies and Expenses | | | |
| 1. Supplies and Services | | | |
| 2. Postage | | | |
| 3. Phones | | | |
| 4. Photocopying and Printing | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Supplies and Expenses</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Equipment and Technology Support | | | |
| Computers/Video/Lab/Software/Distance Learning Equipment | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Equipment and Technology Support</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Research Support | | | |
| 1. Library and Information Resources, Research Tools | | | |
| 2. Faculty and Student Research Support | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Research Support</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Meetings | | | |
| Symposium, Colloquia, Retreats | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Meetings</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Travel | | | |
| Director, Faculty and Staff Travel | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <i>Sub-Total Travel</i> | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Total budget | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Number of students | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Expenditure per student | | | |

Section XIV: Plan for Evaluating Educational Effectiveness

- A. Description of what assessment tools (student work samples, evaluations, placement rates, etc.) will be used to measure the student learning outcomes for the program as described in Section VII.A.iii, including meta-reviews of dissertations or other work products or processes to assure consistency of effectiveness over time.

[Individual campuses will provide responses. A matrix that links Ed.D. student learning objectives with courses and assessment strategies will typically be included. A sample from CSU Fullerton follows.]

Table 29: Alignment of Student Outcomes with Core Concepts, Courses, and Assessment Strategies

| Program graduates will be: | | Examples of Core Concepts ⁵ that Align with Student Indicators | Courses that Align with Student Outcomes ⁶ | Assessment Strategies |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| Student Learning Objectives | Student Indicators | | | |
| Experts in Educational Leadership | Deep understanding of complex nature of learning and teaching so that they are able to guide and assist instructional practice | LS: Student Learning Supports | EDD 627 Epistemology, History, and Structure of Contemporary Education EDD 600 Organizational Theory and Challenges for Instructional Leadership EDD 620 Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Educational Leadership EDD 604 Applications of Research: Forecasting and Planning EDD 626A Transforming Teaching and Schools through Resource Optimization in PreK-12 Education EDD626B Transforming Community Colleges through Resource Optimization and Enrollment Management | Course Assignments Seminar Discussions Applied Research Projects |
| | Understand the needs of adult learners and can apply the theories found in the literature to the process of educational reform | LS: Effective Instructional Strategies | | |
| | Skilled users of techniques for forecasting, planning, and management of change | LS: Resources and Fiscal Planning LF: Complexity and Organizations | | |
| | Aware of cutting-edge technologies and how they can enhance teaching, learning, and leadership | LS: Human Resource Development LF: Systemic Educational Reform | | |
| Professionals whose practice is informed by scholarly literature | Able to critique best practice based on the literature | LF: Collaborative Management | EDD 600 Organizational Theory and Challenges for Instructional Leadership EDD 627 Epistemology, History, and Structure of Contemporary Education EDD 689 Dissertation Research EDD 621A Leadership of Curricular and Instructional Practices in PreK-12 Education EDD 621B The Community College: Mission, History, Structure, and Governance EDD 670C Research Support Seminar: Refining Research Questions EDD 670D Research Support Seminar: Scholarly Defense of a Proposition EDD 670E Research Support Seminar: Qualifying Examination | Course Assignments Seminar Discussions Dissertation Qualifying Examination Applied Research Projects |
| | Understand limits of the received literature | LF: Complexity and Organizations | | |
| | Critical analysis of the literature | LF: Educational Policy Environments | | |
| | Use the literature in communities of learning | LF: Systemic Educational Reform | | |
| | Define, contrast and evaluate multiple perspectives | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making | | |
| | Critiques proposals and programs | RM: Assessment and Evaluation | | |
| Assess consultant or researchers work | RM: Assessment and Evaluation | | | |

⁵ Core concepts are drawn from SB 724, the CSU Presidents Task Force on Education Leadership Programs, and the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, and existing Ed.D. programs in Educational Leadership. Core concepts are broad and are encompass many of the student outcomes. This matrix provides some examples of how the core concepts relate to our student outcomes, but is not meant to be an exhaustive comparison.

⁶ This matrix provides examples of how courses are aligned with student outcomes and core concepts, but is not meant to be an exhaustive comparison. No single course covers a single concept—or visa versa.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Reflective Practitioners | Experience from professional settings is systematically engaged, compared and critiqued | LF: Educational Accountability | EDD 604 Applications of Research: Forecasting and Planning EDD 620 Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Educational Leadership | Course Assignments Seminar |
| | Application of principles derived from the literature in professional practice | RF: Visionary Educational Leadership | | |
| Critical Thinkers | Thinking is probabilistic, recognizing the indeterminacy of educational and social contexts | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making | EDD 605 Applications of Research: Collection and Analysis of Assessment Data in PreK-12 Education EDD630 The Community College Student EDD 670B Research Support Seminar: Connecting Research Questions to Scholarship in the Discipline EDD 670F Research Support Seminar: IRB Approval and Proposal Defense | Discussions Dissertation Applied Research Projects |
| | Hypothetical reasoning—willingness to test conclusions | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making | | |
| | Bias for evidence in decision-making | RM: Field-Based Research | | |
| Change Agents | Make judicious applications of research | RM: Assessment and Evaluation | EDD 601 Methods of Research: Quantitatively-Based Methods EDD 602 Methods of Research: Qualitatively-Based Methods EDD 603A Specialization in Qualitatively-Based Tools EDD 603B Specialization in Quantitatively-Based Tools EDD 689 Dissertation Research EDD 670A Research Support Seminar: Linking Research to Problems of Practice | Course Assignments Seminar Discussions Applied Research Projects |
| | Able to undertake first-hand investigations of local problems | RM: Applied Quantitative Inquiry RM: Applied Qualitative Inquiry | | |
| | Able to ground applied research projects within the framework of the scholarly literature | RM: Applied Quantitative Inquiry RM: Applied Qualitative Inquiry | | |
| | Use research results and understanding of organizational structures, etc. to foster positive reform efforts | RM: Data-Driven Decision-Making | | |
| Self-Aware and Ethical Professionals | Seek professional-life-long learning and connections with scholarly literature | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership | EDD 622A Human Dimensions of Educational Change and Reform in PreK-12 Education EDD 622B Instructional and Support Services in Community Colleges | Post-Doctoral Professional Development Plan Dissertation Progress Reports Seminar Discussions Course Assignments Applied Research Projects |
| | Demand for sophisticated feedback on their own performance and that of others informed by scholarship | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership | | |
| | Understanding of the social and political networks in which education is embedded | LS: School-Community Relations | | |
| | Support of ethical expectations and need to serve the students and the community | LF: Visionary Educational Leadership | | |
| Professionals Who Value Diversity | Understanding how their life history shapes their views | LF: Educational Policy Environments | EDD 624A Social Contexts of Educational Politics, Policy and Governance in PreK-12 Education EDD 621B The Community College: Mission, History, Structure, and Governance EDD624B Issues in Community College Leadership: Law, Finance, and Staffing EDD 621A Leadership of Curricular and Instructional Practices in PreK-12 Education | Seminar Discussions Course Assignments Dissertation Progress Reports Applied Research Projects |
| | Understand how to create collaborative environments that welcome and serve diverse members | LF: Diversity and Equity LS: School and Campus Cultures | | |
| | Work to shape learning communities that are more humane and responsive to all students and open to the wider community | LS: Effective Instructional Strategies | | |

B. Description of the process and timing to be used to assess the effectiveness of the program after start-up and then as part of the school's or institution's broader assessment process

Senate Bill 724 required three types of program effectiveness data to be provided in a report to the Governor and Legislature in 2011. The data are to be collected annually and will be among the measures used for assessing program effectiveness. The data will contribute to campus annual evaluations, continuous program improvement, and assessment of Ed.D. program effectiveness as part of the campus' institutional assessment processes. The data elements are listed in the table below.

| SB 724 Program Evaluation Elements For Assessing Program Effectiveness | |
|--|--|
| Degree Production | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Students Enrolled • Number of Degree Recipients • Time to Degree • Attrition Rate | |
| Employment Data | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job placement of graduates: institutions • Job placement of graduates: positions • Job placement of graduates: changes from initial employment | |
| Effects of Program Graduates | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effects on reform efforts: P-12 education • Effects on reform efforts: community college • Effects on student achievement: P-12 • Effects on student achievement: community college | |

The data elements provide annual informant regarding : (a) enrollments and degree production, (b) employment of graduates, and (c) impacts of graduates on educational reform efforts and on student achievement. The data will be available annually for all CSU campuses having independent Ed.D. programs and will provide a long-term and comparative framework for assessing program effectiveness.

[Individual campuses will provide a detailed response regarding assessment of program effectiveness. Components of the response by CSU Fullerton are included below.]

[Program effectiveness data will be collected and analyzed each semester, year, and at program completion. The Program Director will present the findings at regular meetings of the Faculty Group, the Executive Committee, and the Advisory Board so that program revisions can be considered as appropriate. The Program Director and/or members of the Faculty Group or Executive Committee may suggest curriculum or program changes based on the findings and their relationship to developments in research or professional practice. The process will follow a “continuous improvement” model that will include....

Another element of assessing program effectiveness is the assessment of course effectiveness. At the end of every class, the students complete a Student Rating of Instruction form. These are analyzed statistically and reported to the departments. Faculty address the assessments as part of the retention, tenure and promotion process. The Ed.D. faculty will use these data on an aggregated basis each semester as an indicator of effectiveness of program courses and to identify trends warranting attention.

As part of the campus' broader assessment process, each program in the university is required to submit annual reports which outline measurable progress toward defined goals.....]

Section XV: Plan for Teach-out Provisions

- A. Teach-out plan detailing how students who begin this program will finish if the institution determines that the program is to be closed.

CSU policies for discontinuation of programs require teach out plans that allow a reasonable time for all students enrolled in the program at the time of discontinuation to complete the requirements for the degree. The plans are to include a teach-out schedule that reflects the estimated timeline for graduation of enrolled students.

[Individual campuses will provide a more detailed response. An example provided by CSU Fullerton is below.]

[University Policy Statement 100.610, which is titled Program Discontinuance outlines the procedures that must be followed to close a program at CSU Fullerton. It contains the following language:

A schedule for discontinuance shall be developed by the school dean in consultation with the appropriate program faculty. The schedule must be approved by the VPAA, who shall monitor the implementation of the scheduled discontinuance. Every effort shall be made by the program faculty and the school dean to assist students in completing their studies or in finding alternatives to their studies. (p. 3)

<http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/PDF/100/UPS100-610.pdf>

CSUF will offer all of the courses and support necessary for each student who starts the program and maintains continuous enrollment in good standing to complete the program....]

- B. For joint doctoral programs transition to independent doctoral programs, describe the nature of the teach-out plan between the partnering institutions, including how financial responsibility and expenses will be shared, students, served and dissertations supported. Identify the timelines established for the teach-out and the notice to be given to all students enrolled in the program. Copies of formal agreements for teach out among the partnering institutions and notices provided to students are to be submitted with the proposal. The formal agreement should be signed by all partnering institutions. If the original MOU between the partnering institutions contains a detailed description of the

teach-out responsibilities for each institution, this document may be substitute in lieu of a new formal teach-out agreement.

CSU has established system level procedures for campuses that propose discontinuing a joint Ed.D. program with a UC campus. The campus must submit a comprehensive proposal to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program. Teach out provisions must be included that allow a reasonable time for all students enrolled in the program at the time of discontinuation to compete the requirements for the degree. Formal agreements for teach-out and adherence to the MOU are to be addressed in the proposal.

[Individual campuses will provide additional local information. A sample is below.]

[CSU _____ will discontinue its role in the Joint Ed.D. program with UC _____ and the partner CSU institutions. It has been agreed to by all parties that CSU, _____ will continue to participate in the activities of the partnership as long as it has students enrolled in the Joint program. CSU _____ will operate under the current guidelines and understandings of that program while its students are enrolled.

In fall 2007, when independent Ed.D. classes begin, ___ of the ___ CSU _____ students in the Joint Ed.D. will have completed their coursework and will be working on their dissertations. The remaining ___ will have completed their coursework in Spring _____. Most are expected to have completed their dissertations by summer 2009. This is when the students in the first cohort in the independent Ed.D. will be focusing significantly on their dissertations.

CSU _____ will work with all ___ students enrolled in the Joint Ed.D. through the completion of the dissertation. Dissertation Chairs will be provided workload credit for this role, ensuring continuity in dissertation advisement. CSU _____ Joint Ed.D. Faculty will also continue to participate as members of the Dissertation Committees for the students in the program and to contribute to other Committees established under by bylaws of the program.

The Discontinuation Proposal submitted to the CSU Chancellor's Office and approved by all parties is included in Appendix 17. Also included is the MOU between the partnering CSU institutions and UC. Its provisions regarding discontinuation are being followed in the discontinuation process. UC _____ and the CSU campuses that plan to remain in the joint Ed.D. with UC _____ will submit a report to the Substantive Change Committee regarding plans for the program.]

Appendix 16

Budgetary Assumptions: Revenues

The projections reflect the three basic sources of revenues: (1) the CSU marginal cost rate—the funding per student for instruction in the state budget; (2) the CSU Education Doctorate Fee—which is set at the rate of the UC doctoral fee in education in accordance with the enabling legislation, and (3) summer school fees based on the Education Doctorate Fee rate—reflecting the fact that the programs anticipate 12 months of study.

[Additional campus support or other revenue should be included as appropriate.]

An annual 3% increase is used for the projection of the CSU marginal cost rate. This is consistent with the long-term budget compact between the Governor and higher education.

A 10% annual increase in doctoral fees is used. The compact between the Governor and higher education also establishes this student fee increase.

Student financial aid support (10% of student fees) is included in the revenue total. It is included to reflect the financial aid available expressly for the program. Typically, few students in these programs qualify for need-based financial aid. After need-based aid has been provided, the remaining financial aid funds are to be available for program operations and support.

The budget is based on admitting annual cohorts of 18-24 students. It is assumed that in year one, 24 students will be enrolled. In year two, 18-20 of the students from the first cohort will be fully enrolled and an additional 18-24 students will be admitted, resulting in a minimum enrollment of 42. In year three, most of the year one and two students will continue and 18-24 new students will be admitted, resulting in a minimum enrollment of 56 students across the three cohorts.

Budgetary Assumptions: Costs

[Individual campuses will provide local budgetary assumptions. An example is provided below.]

[In the three-year budget, assumptions include the following: (1) the program has a full-time director who also serves as an Ed.D. faculty member; (2) the program has a dedicated student services counselor and administrative analyst, (3) the annual cost of living adjustment is 4%; and (4) all primary instructional, student support, and operating expenses are included.

The largest item in the three-year budget is faculty salaries. In year one, faculty salaries reflect a dual specialization program, in which half of the courses in the two concentrations (P-12 and community college) are taken together and half are taken separately. During year one, faculty salaries are based on replacement rates.

The workload associated with teaching a doctoral course is calculated at ___% the normal instructional load. For example, three-unit courses are associated with ___ units of workload.

In the second year, there is a substantial increase in the faculty salary item. This reflects two factors. The first is the doubling of the number of courses as a result of the second year curriculum. The second factor is a change in the mix of instructional faculty. It is assumed that by the second year of the program, two to three faculty members at the Associate or Full Professor level will be associated with the Ed.D. program for a majority of their time. The budget reflects a combined funding model, where other faculty are paid at replacement rate, but these full-time faculty who, in addition to the Director, have primary roles in the program, are paid based on actual salary and benefits.

In the third year, there is again a sizable increase in the faculty salary item. This reflects the additional third year workload associated with dissertations. It is assumed that 20 of the 24 students who initially enrolled will be involved in their dissertation research. Each will have a faculty dissertation advisor, who is Chair of the Dissertation Committee. Each faculty advisor will receive a total of ___ units of workload credit for serving as the Dissertation Chair and primary advisor. Some research development and support funds are included in the budget, primarily for faculty involved in dissertation advisement. The purpose is to enable them to engage in research and professional development that contribute to the programs' research culture and to quality dissertations.

Class size has a significant impact on costs. The assumption is made that average class sizes will range between 12 and 24. This includes foundational courses, specialization courses, and research methodology courses.

Other budgetary assumptions reflect normal CSU and campus budgeting practices. These pertain to costs associated with employee benefits, supplies and expenses, equipment, meetings, and travel.]