

**ACADEMIC SENATE
OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

AS-2748-06/AA/TEKR
May 4-5, 2006

**Affirming Core Principles and Key Characteristics of Policy for
Independent EdD Programs in the CSU System**

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of the California State University (CSU) support the development, review and approval of independent EdD programs in the CSU system in keeping with the core principles and key characteristics of policy specified in the *Report of the Academic Senate CSU Ed.D. Policy Work Group*; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU, affirm the following core principles for planning and offering independent doctoral programs in the CSU system:

- high levels of quality and traditional doctoral program expectations;
- appropriate flexibility in adoption of implementation details at the campus level;
- distinctions between roles/qualifications of core doctoral faculty and affiliated faculty;
- ASCSU-appointed faculty review at the systemwide level; and
- support for partnerships with P-12 Schools and Community Colleges; and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU, recognize the attached elements of policy for independent doctoral programs and encourages campuses to build upon the system guidelines to develop campus specific additions in the following areas: core education leadership concepts; examinations and dissertations; candidate admission criteria; candidate time limits; faculty qualifications; candidate advising; governance structure; and a CSU faculty consultation group, and be it further

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate CSU, urge all deliberate speed in moving these core principles and key characteristics of policy forward so that independent doctoral programs in the CSU system may commence in fall 2007; and be it further

RESOLVED: That copies of this resolution be distributed to the CSU Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; local campus Presidents, Provosts, Deans of Education and Graduate Studies, and Senates.

RATIONALE: The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) (2000 Report) and California legislators (SB 713 and SB 724) have cited a need for educating school administrators and Community College teachers and administrators at the level of the doctorate of education. As the system of public

higher education with a highly qualified faculty that educates and certifies most of California's teachers, the California State University (CSU), with its 23 campuses across the State, is well positioned to provide Ed.D. programs of high quality and at a reasonable cost to students. The structure and content of such programs must be determined and approved by CSU faculty. The degree programs must have sufficient flexibility to ensure the scholarly development of a broad range of educational leaders.

In September 2001, the Academic Senate CSU endorsed "The California State University at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Meeting the Needs of the People of California." This report supported a set of recommendations on graduate education in the CSU; the intention of the recommendations was, in part, to set minimal standards for programs and, in part, to seek additional funding to permit upgrading of programs.

In September 2004, the Academic Senate CSU endorsed the report of the Task Force on Graduate and Postbaccalaureate Education in the CSU entitled "Rethinking Graduate Education in the CSU: Meeting the Needs of the People of California for Graduate Education for the 21st Century." Included in the report's recommendations regarding Doctoral Education were several germane to this resolution. The report affirmed support for the CSU seeking legislative authorization to offer doctoral programs in "applied fields and the education of advanced-level practitioners," independent of other universities, when 1) "the need for publicly supported doctoral programs in one of more selected fields is well established," 2) the UC does not respond by developing programs to match the need, 3) "the faculty at one or more CSU campuses has the expertise to offer the programs," and, 4) adequate funding is made available.

Approved – May 4-5, 2006

**REPORT OF THE ASCSU ED.D POLICY WORK GROUP
April 30, 2006**

SENATE REPRESENTATIVES:

**NANCY HUNT
CRISTY JENSEN, CHAIR
CHERYL MASON
DAVID MC NEIL
MARK O'SHEA
DARLENE YEE**

CORE PRINCIPLES FOLLOWED

- A. Guidelines emphasizing quality standards and traditional doctoral program expectations from statewide level
- B. Flexibility in adoption of implementation details at campus level
- C. Key distinctions between role and qualification of core doctoral faculty and affiliated faculty
- D. Opportunity for "piloting" a statewide faculty oversight role
- E. Genuine partnerships with P-12 and Community Colleges reflecting commitment to meaningful and relevant educational experience

I. CORE EDUCATION LEADERSHIP CONCEPTS

Key Characteristics of Policy

- i. Curriculum framed in terms of concepts drawn from previous CSU studies, including Welty Report on Education Leadership Needs
- ii. Campuses given flexibility in formulation of actual coursework
- iii. Strong methodology component to fit with dissertation expectations
- iv. Curriculum divided between Leadership Foundations and Leadership Specialization permitting development of tracks in P-12 and Community College Leadership
- v. Permits and encourages multidisciplinary perspectives

II. EXAMINATIONS AND DISSERTATIONS

Key Characteristics of Policy

- i. Three major examinations, passage of which are required (written qualifying examination, dissertation proposal examination, and oral defense of dissertation as final examination)
- ii. Chair and majority membership of qualifying exam and dissertation committee must come from tenured faculty of CSU campus offering degree
- iii. Only one opportunity to retake qualifying exams
- iv. Dissertation required

III. CANDIDATE ADMISSION CRITERIA

Key Characteristics of Policy

- i. Ed.D faculty will oversee specific admissions processes, review applications and make admissions decisions
- ii. Standard admissions criteria (3.0 GPA in upper division and grad work, GRE scores, demonstrated practitioner potential or established skills
- iii. 15% exceptional admissions for particular admissions decisions as desired by faculty

IV. CANDIDATE TIME LIMITS

Key characteristics of policy

- i. total registered time not expected to exceed five years; extension requires approval of faculty; demonstration of currency required for extension of time more than two years
- ii. satisfactory academic process requires cumulative 3.0 and two semester 3.0 minimum; strict guidelines for disqualification and readmission

V. FACULTY QUALIFICATIONS

Key Characteristics of policy

- i. Strong distinctions between qualifications and role of *core doctoral faculty* and *affiliated doctoral faculty*; campuses may further define qualifications, roles, terms of appointment in by-laws adopted by core faculty
- ii. Core doctoral faculty are primary doctoral instructors, members of qual and dissertation comm., advisors, chairs, and members of governance committees; *must* have specific expertise (theoretical, methodological, or related to ed policy or practice), exhibit strong and appropriate published scholarship, possess doctoral degree, tenured or tenure track, involved in grad level teaching, and ability to direct others in research
- iii. Affiliated faculty may instruct in program, serve as committee members and be willing to participate in governance if specified in by laws; are drawn from tenured or tt faculty in other fields or with unique expertise or experienced practitioners; must normally have expertise, possess doctoral degree and appointed based on review of qualifications and election by EdD faculty.
- iv. Provisions for role of other faculty of university, faculty from other CSU campuses, educational researchers and faculty from other institutions, and special circumstances

VI. CANDIDATE ADVISING

Key characteristics of policy

- i. Advising for professional and academic development is a central purpose of program and goal of faculty

- ii. Core faculty members are available to serve as program and academic advisors
- iii. Advisor appointed at time of admission
- iv. At time of initiation of planning dissertation research, candidate identifies chair from among core faculty

VII. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE AND EXAMPLES

Key Characteristics of Policy

- i. Distinguishes between broad program advisory group (includes faculty and practitioners), EdD Faculty group (requires faculty developed by-laws), and Regional Partnership group (includes key practitioners in region)
- ii. Permits large measure of discretion at campus level re: structure

VIII. CSU FACULTY CONSULTATION GROUP

Key Characteristics of Policy

- i. Agreement to pilot a new governance structure and review process to help guide EdD. Program planning and extramural review of program proposals; review after year 1
- ii. Consultation Group plays role in initial review of campus proposals (4-6 faculty selected by Senate) – paralleling review at campus level *and* later in system level review of campus approved proposals (by one of the 4-6 above).

IX. PROCEDURES

- a. IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE (for Year One embedded in proposal review process, c. below)
- b. PROGRAM PROPOSAL (comprehensive proposal format)
- a. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS (attached one page flow chart)