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June 15, 2015

Dr. David Connors
Director of Academic Programs and Accreditation
California State University, Los Angeles
5151 State University Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Dear David:

WASCUC has received the First Doctoral Degree Fifth-Year Review Report submitted on May 18, 2015, by California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA). The first Commission-approved doctoral degree program at an institution is subject to a review the fifth year after implementation of the program. CSULA’s Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership was approved on June 18, 2009. Although the review was originally scheduled for fall 2014, in 2013 CSULA requested and received approval for an extension to spring 2015.

The intent of the fifth-year review is to evaluate the status of the program under the Standards of Accreditation, in particular through an examination of the resources and support for the program and the results of an initial assessment of educational effectiveness. This review was conducted by staff, as described in the “First Doctoral Degree Fifth-Year Review Guidelines.”

CSULA is to be commended for the obvious time and effort devoted to the report: it was well structured, clearly focused, comprehensive, and self-reflective. The report satisfactorily addressed the expected content as articulated in the fifth-year review guidelines.

Overview and Context. The Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership has a clear mission that is aligned with the Charter College of Education’s (CCOE) vision, and has developed student learning outcomes that emphasize social justice and engagement with the public good. The program has made excellent progress in responding to issues raised in past reviews: outcomes for the first group of graduates; financial sustainability of the program; continued development of a doctoral culture; and continued progress in assessment.

Faculty and Program Resources. The program is to be commended for the careful attention paid to developing a doctoral culture. Faculty in the program:

- meet carefully selected qualifications and standards
- maintain active records of scholarship and professional activity
- have their workloads adjusted to take into account the demands of advising, mentoring, and supervising doctoral graduate students
- participate in programs and retreats that focus on the curriculum and student learning
In addition, examples of student participation in a doctoral culture include:

- informal and formal peer review practices where students can give and receive constructive feedback on their work
- Laboratories of Practice, a two-semester sequence that enrolls students at different years in their academic programs and that focuses on the research process, from generating ideas to producing a thesis
- participation in research symposia held on campus and attendance at professional association conferences held nationally (e.g., over 50% of the students have attended an American Educational Research Association national conference)

In terms of financial viability, the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership operates successfully as a self-sustaining program. In addition, two new tenure track faculty members have been appointed to the program, and staffing has been augmented to meet needs in assessment and student services.

Financial support for faculty development is available and students can apply for modest resources for travel to a professional conference and for research stipends.

The report described program and physical resources, library, technology support, student services, and financial aid practices that are all appropriate for a doctoral program and a doctoral culture.

**Program Effectiveness.** Five cohorts have been admitted to the program since it was approved by WSCUC (a total of 80 students). The program’s retention data are generally good, from 73% to 91% depending on cohort and year in program. The overall three-year graduation rate for cohorts 1 and 2 is not as good: 50%, which is a concern for faculty and the College. Steps are underway to strengthen the graduation rate, including improved dissertation supervision practices.

In terms of student learning and achievement, the program has identified key milestones, standards of performance at these milestones, and assessment strategies. The program is to be commended for its external reviews of students’ dissertations (using a faculty developed rubric). The results yield a rich source of information on aspects of the program that could be improved (e.g., greater attention to academic writing). The faculty and leadership are also to be commended on the surveys of students at key points in their academic programs. The findings from the surveys have identified areas that could be strengthened, such as increased attention in the course curriculum to research on leadership practices that facilitate organizational change and reform.

The Ed.D. faculty and leadership are to be praised for their focused attention on student success, their ongoing assessment strategies, and the analysis and use of results to strengthen the doctoral program.

**Findings and Conclusions.** The report ended with a concluding statement that provided evidence of the program’s ongoing self-reflection and culture of continuous improvement.
Strengths were self-identified as diversity; a programmatic focus on social justice; and the commitment, caring and personal attention of faculty to students.

Areas for improvement include:
- retention and graduation rates
- students’ academic writing
- aligning courses so that key topics are more explicitly sequenced (e.g., research design)
- quantitative methods

**Staff Conclusions.** The Ed.D. in Educational Leadership is a program that is self-reflective, informed by evidence, and driven to meet its mission and vision. CSULA is providing adequate resources and support for the program, and the program has done an outstanding job in its initial assessment of educational effectiveness, identifying what is working well and what needs to be improved.

CSULA’s next regularly scheduled interactions with WSCUC include:

- **Offsite Review**    Fall 2018
- **Accreditation Visit**    Spring 2019

I would like to affirm the hard work and important steps that California State University, Los Angeles has taken to successfully implement the Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gross Davis, Ph.D.
Vice President
California State University, Los Angeles
Charter College of Education

Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership
Lois André-Bechely, Director

First Doctoral Degree Fifth-Year Review Report
WASC Substantive Change Committee for Doctoral Programs

May 18, 2015

I. Overview and Context

The University
Located just five miles from a revitalized downtown Los Angeles, Cal State L.A., building on a historic commitment since 1947 to economic and community development, is strengthening this commitment under the leadership of a new President, William A. Covino. Eight colleges offer nationally recognized programs in science, arts, business, criminal justice, engineering, nursing, education and humanities, among others, led by an award-winning faculty of whom 47% are women and 47% are racial/ethnic minorities. A federally designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), Cal State L.A. enrolls over 23,000 students, of whom 58% are women, 57% are Hispanic, 16% Asian American/Pacific Islander, 4% African American, 2% bi- or multi-racial, 9% white, non-Hispanic and 8% are nonresidents. Over 70% of students are from families where another language is spoken in the home.

Recognizing the importance of the University’s role to not only support students’ academic success but also to celebrate their roots in the Los Angeles community, President Covino established the Center for Engagement, Service and the Public Good to focus the campus on increasing its contribution as a powerful engine of social mobility for its students and graduates. This center leads the campus activities in the Greater Outcomes for East Los Angeles (GO ELA) cradle to career project. This aligns well with Cal State L.A.’s recognition by Washington Monthly as one of the top ten master’s universities in the nation for its contribution to the public good. Under the new leadership of President Covino, administrators, faculty and staff are rising to the challenge of providing the very best in a 21st century educational experience for the University’s students to meet 21st century workforce needs.

Since the summer of 2013, the campus has mobilized to convert from the quarter to semester calendar and in doing so, also take the opportunity to transform the educational experience to improve student success for undergraduate and graduate students. New courses and programs have been designed, thousands of courses were modified and updated, general education has been revised to require two courses in civic/service learning, additional academic and social
supports for students, such as the Graduate Resource Center, are being put into place. As current and incoming students will experience, Cal State L.A. is shaping a rich engaged learning experience for all its students, improving their post graduation outcomes and making their communities a better place.

The Ed.D. Program in Context

The same excitement can be experienced in the Charter College of Education (CCOE). The College’s new dean, Dr. Eunsook Hyun, has infused a sense of urgency that the CCOE must make a powerful impact on education in our region and has rallied faculty, staff and students around this mission. She has embraced the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership, takes an active role in its governance, and is one of its staunchest supporters. The more recent activities that are described in this report, reflect both the focus and the vision Dean Hyun contributes to the Ed.D. program.

As discussed in the Second Year Progress Report submitted in December 2011, the Cal State L.A. Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership was launched in Fall 2009 during a time of national and state economic instability. The program’s inaugural year was during a time of budget and enrollment reduction mandates that presented challenges for the University and the CCOE. However, the alternate plans put in place mitigated any negative impacts to the quality of the Ed.D. program in its early years and maintained the support that doctoral faculty needed to deliver high quality learning opportunities and mentor students through completion of the doctorate. Today, the Ed.D. enjoys stable and adequate funding and is able to plan strategically for growth and the continued development of a vibrant doctoral program for its students.

A key feature of the Ed.D. program is its focus on leadership in practice and an expanded understanding of the many contexts in which educational leadership takes place. The program goals and student learning outcomes guide the implementation of a rigorous, social justice oriented curriculum (See Attachment 1). Additionally, the college-wide structure of the doctoral program allows the many educational disciplines represented by Ed.D. faculty to be available in the students’ studies of curriculum, policy and practice, leadership, and systemic change. The Ed.D. program establishes Cal State L.A. as a model for educating diverse doctoral students who are committed to improving the educational opportunities for the historically underserved students in the communities served by the University. As the quotes above reflect, students are selecting the Ed.D. program because it does address diversity and social justice.

“It is new, it is local, and its diversity represents the greater Los Angeles.”
Cohort 3 Student from Entry Survey

“Social justice has been a mantra of all the graduating classes. Change is definitely on the rise and this program prepares us for that. I had an opportunity to go to USC and other places [but] it was this one that gave me the opportunity to be myself and get what I want.”
Focus Group, Cohort 4 Student
As it reaches maturity, the Ed.D. program is well-positioned to substantially contribute to the University’s vision for Engagement, Service and the Public Good. Indeed, the students’ comments from the Graduate Exit Survey illustrate that the Ed.D. program’s doctoral graduates will be instrumental in helping to realize that vision.

Previous Substantive Change Commission Requests

The December 1, 2011, Ed.D. Progress Report addressed issues raised by the WASC Structural Change Panel at the time of the initial approval of the Ed.D. program in June 2009. The panel requested follow up on: “1) the sustainability of financial support in view of the deteriorating economic situation facing the state; 2) the development of a doctoral culture and the attendant policies and practices on workload, scholarship, and professional development; and 3) the assessment of the core values and the integration of findings from assessment into planning and budgeting.” The April 5, 2012 letter from WASC Vice President Barbara Gross Davis states that upon review of the Progress Report, the Substantive Change Doctoral Committee found that Cal State L.A. had addressed the issues requested and commended the program on how it managed the budget realities during challenging and fluid economic times, the scholarly accomplishments of the faculty, and the assessment efforts that supported program improvement. The Committee acknowledged the candor and thoughtfulness of the report. The letter notes that for the Fifth-Year First Doctoral Degree Special Report, the committee will review how the Ed.D. program addresses the following: “outcomes for the first group of graduates; financial sustainability of the program; the continued development of a doctoral culture; and the continued progress in assessing student learning and using the results to inform planning and budgeting.”

Conclusion of Section I: Overview

The Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership at Cal State L.A. is pleased to present the Doctoral Degree Fifth-Year Review Report. The process of preparing this report, collecting and analyzing data, studying program elements and listening to the voices of our students has proved immensely valuable for charting new directions in program curriculum, assessment and innovation. Those who work in the Ed.D. program now know more about the successes and accomplishments as well as the areas in which further improvements are warranted. This report will follow the WASC guidelines provided and respond to the four issues noted in April
2012 and provide programmatic data and examples of the practices, activities and assessment outcomes for the period January 2012 through April 2015 (from the Second Year Progress Report to the present) and conclude with analysis and reflection.

II. Faculty and Program Resources

Faculty Participation in a Doctoral Culture

Doctoral Faculty Qualifications. The California State University (CSU) describes in Executive Order 911, the qualifications for Ed.D. Core and Affiliated faculty and the length of time they can serve as doctoral faculty with each term of appointment. The Cal State L.A. Ed.D. program Bylaws (Attachment 2) adapted the qualifications for doctoral faculty from Executive Order 911. Pursuant to the guidelines established in the Bylaws, in 2014 newly interested college and campus faculty were invited to apply as doctoral faculty and previous core and affiliated doctoral faculty were required to reapply to participate in the Ed.D. program. A leadership team consisting of the Dean of the CCOE, Associate Dean, Ed.D. Director, Ed.D. Associate Director, and the three CCOE Division Chairs reviewed the curriculum vitae of the college faculty whom applied and made recommendations to the Dean for appointment as either core or affiliated faculty.

There are currently 23 CCOE core faculty and 5 CCOE affiliated faculty. CCOE retired faculty and CCOE faculty in the early retirement program (FERP) can continue to participate in the doctoral program. Additionally, there are eight affiliated Cal State L.A. faculty from other colleges on campus. There are six affiliated community members (four are Ed.D. graduates) who are active in the Ed.D. program as mentors, dissertation committee members, and guest lecturers. Attachment 3 lists all Ed.D. faculty. CV’s of CCOE core and affiliated faculty, campus affiliated faculty and community members are included as Attachment 4 in the Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ed.D. Faculty</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Professor (Retired/FERP)</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Community Members &amp; Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCOE Core</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCOE Affiliated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Affiliated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty teaching in the doctoral program continue to maintain an active record of scholarship and professional activity. Collectively, from 2011 to the present time, the core faculty in the Ed.D. program have produced over 70 journal articles, chapters, books and other quality
publications as well as 12 institutional and/or evaluation reports. The Ed.D. faculty delivered over 120 presentations at prestigious professional conferences or as invited speakers in scholarly venues or at educational organizations including ten presentations with Ed.D. students. Attachment 5 shows the quality and breadth of CCOE Ed.D. faculty publications and presentations from 2011 to the present.

**Faculty Teaching.** Tenured/tenure-track faculty at Cal State L.A. have a 36 quarter units per year instructional workload requirement (12 units per quarter). Ed.D. courses are taught only by tenured/tenure track CCOE core and affiliated faculty, with the exception of the dissertation proposal writing course taught by a tenured professor from the English department (an affiliated Ed.D. faculty member) and two courses taught or co-taught by adjunct faculty on three occasions. The Ed.D. program since its inception has operated on a semester schedule whereas the university operates on the quarter system. Therefore, the faculty workload calculations follow a set unit conversion formula. With the University changing to a semester schedule, the workload calculations will change. The table below shows the current method of calculating workload for the three types of doctoral courses and the workload calculations that will go into effect in fall 2016. The University’s move to a semester schedule will not affect the implementation of the required doctoral differential to reduce doctoral faculty teaching loads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Semester Units</th>
<th>Quarter Units (sem units x 1.5)</th>
<th>Quarter Units with Doctoral Differential (qtr units x 1.33)</th>
<th>Additional Quarter Units Earned for Release Time - Workload Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 - Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core or Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning in 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core or Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*units are rounded up to the next full unit

Ed.D. faculty are not assigned to the Ed.D. program as their “home” program: they are assigned to programs in one of the three CCOE divisions. Their teaching load varies depending on their instructional responsibilities in their home divisions. Teaching in the Ed.D. program typically lessens a core faculty member’s teaching load in the following ways. For example, a faculty
member could earn two workload unit credits teaching an elective course in fall semester and earn another two workload unit credits teaching a Laboratory of Practice (Lab) course in both fall and spring semesters (one workload credit per semester). The four workload credits provide the faculty member with units for one course release per year. Or, another example, the faculty member may teach just one elective course per year and carry over the two units into the next year, combining those units with the two units earned in the current year and take a course release. The program’s practice ensuring that faculty members can take their course release in the same year or carry over the course release to the next academic year, provides the necessary flexibility for faculty to use their release time when it best meets their scholarship and research plans and in consideration of their home program and division responsibilities.

**Advising and Mentoring.** The Director and Associate Director of the Ed.D. program are active advisors throughout students’ enrollment in the doctoral program and meet (in person and online) with students to discuss elective course options, dissertation chair selection, graduation requirements, and any other issues that arise. Lab faculty also advise and mentor students assigned to their Lab courses. However, advising students in the doctoral program is considered a responsibility of all teaching faculty and those faculty supervising dissertations and serving on committees. The Ed.D. program holds monthly faculty meetings to provide the opportunity for all doctoral faculty to collectively determine program practices and remain up to date on program information, course schedules, timelines/calendars, dissertation guidelines, and so forth.

Doctoral faculty who chair dissertations and/or serve as a member of a dissertation committee receive workload compensation on a per student basis. Since the design of the degree program requires students to complete the dissertation in one year, dissertation chairs must work intensely with their doctoral students from the second semester of the second year of the program through the summer of the third year. Therefore, dissertation chairs earn units for one full course release for each dissertation they supervise. Dissertation chairs receive two quarter units once their assigned student successfully defends the dissertation proposal and another two quarter units once their student’s dissertation is approved and filed. Faculty serving as members of dissertation committees earn a half quarter unit or $500 in professional development funds when the dissertation is approved and filed.

Core faculty who teach doctoral courses have been able to apply units earned as a result of the doctoral differential toward their workload requirement and if they participate on dissertation committees, they can combine credited workload units earned from teaching and dissertation supervision on any given year or bank units earned to use in a subsequent year. As a result, most core doctoral faculty receive at least one course release per academic year to use for their own scholarship and research. Attachment 6 lists the faculty who teach in the Ed.D. program, serve as dissertation chairs and on dissertation committees.

**College-Wide Doctoral Faculty Participation in Program Development.** Engaging in continuous improvement that supports program implementation and enrollment growth, and that complements university and college change initiatives requires a sustained, inclusive college-
wide approach to doctoral program leadership and faculty development. Since 2011, the Ed.D. program has held monthly doctoral faculty meetings, attended by faculty from across the college, that have addressed items such as university semester conversion and curriculum revision and additions, analysis of data from mid-program review of student portfolios and ongoing evaluation of students’ academic writing proficiencies. The Ed.D. program will be adding a postsecondary specialization beginning in fall 2016 and the development of the postsecondary curriculum has been an ongoing discussion item at the 2014-2105 Ed.D. faculty meetings. (See Attachment 7 for sample agendas of monthly meetings)

Supplementing the monthly meetings, the Ed.D. program held a fall 2014 Ed.D. Faculty Retreat for new and returning core and affiliated faculty. Data from student surveys (Entry, End of Year One, End of Year Two, and Exit surveys) were presented to faculty for analysis and reflection on findings and trends. Based on the discussion of the data, faculty then developed questions to ask students during focus group sessions. An additional session at the Retreat was focused on “lessons learned” in chairing Ed.D. dissertations so that new faculty could learn from those faculty who have successfully supervised students to degree completion. (Attachment 8, Dissertation Presentation). During discussion at the Ed.D. Faculty Retreat, faculty realized that few had seen one another’s syllabi, knew what various texts and readings were assigned across Ed.D. courses, or what assignments students were completing. With the goal of working toward a more cohesive and coordinated curriculum to which all faculty could align their courses, the program held an Ed.D. Program Design Day in winter 2015 that allowed faculty to review syllabi, texts, student samples of all Ed.D. courses in order to identify curricular and instructional strengths, content gaps, and areas in which to target improvement of the doctoral program coursework scope and sequence. (See Attachment 9 for Ed.D. Retreat and Design Day agendas.) One suggestion raised at Design Day was to fund a course release for a curriculum coordinator for the program who would be tasked with maintaining a database of faculty’s instructional materials and activities and how they are sequenced throughout the program course of study. Selected information in the database could be made available to students so that they could better plan for course expectations and assignments. The suggestion will be presented to the Dean at a future budget planning meeting. In February 2016, the Ed.D. program will combine the Faculty Retreat and Design Day into one meeting with subsequent Retreat/Design Days held annually. (Students attend courses in summer semester and surveys are done in August. A February retreat provides more time to collect data and prepare it for presentation.)

**Student Participation in a Doctoral Culture**
Two program design elements have proven to be instrumental in the development of the rich doctoral culture of the Ed.D. program: the cohort model in conjunction with the program’s Laboratory of Practice (Lab) courses: EDFN 605 series. The cohort model allows faculty to engage students in instructional practices consistent with doctoral level pedagogy and peer support and review practices that are modeled after faculty peer support networks. From the
very first semester, students engage in peer review practices that assist them in developing ways to receive and give constructive critiques of their work (See sample course syllabus: Attachment 10). The quotes below from students at the end of their two years of coursework capture the benefits of strong peer support in a well-implemented cohort model.

“I honestly didn’t think I was going to be in such a supportive atmosphere. I expected to run into competition from my cohort - but as it turns out - I have created a collaborative bond with every single member in our group that will surely last into our professional development. I can count on these guys - they are truly an exceptional group.”

End of Second Year Survey, Cohort 3 Student

“The cohort experiences, both the good and difficult experiences, they have allowed me to grow more as a student, writer, and scholar. Those experiences with the cohort members have provided the opportunity to refine my ability to speak on my topic with individuals that do not have any direct knowledge of it as well as those who do.”

End of Second Year Survey, Cohort 2 Student

**Laboratories of Practice.** The Lab courses were designed as two semester unit courses in which 8-10 students at different years of study in the doctoral program meet together with the same core doctoral faculty member throughout the year and across years so as to create stable faculty and peer mentoring relationships. It was not until spring 2013, when the program had three full cohorts, that faculty were able to experience the power of the Labs as a way to build a robust doctoral culture among students at different levels of doctoral study. Since 2013, each Lab section enrolls a mix of students that are in Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 or more and every effort is made such that students stay with the same faculty Lab instructor and student peers until graduation. All Lab faculty coordinate coursework and use a collaboratively developed syllabus to ensure that students have a common yet also different experience (depending on the faculty member’s individual planning). One of the most important learning outcomes of the Labs has been removing the mystery of what is involved in doing research and completing a doctorate. Year 1 students are able to learn from students in Year 2 who are finalizing research questions and preparing their dissertation proposals at the same time they learn from students in Year 3 who are Advanced to Candidacy and conducting their dissertation research and writing up their findings. It is in these Lab courses where the Ed.D. students see themselves as developing scholars and peer researchers. Attachment 11 is a sample Lab syllabus and Attachment 12 illustrates the Lab series learning sequence.

“If I went to an institution that didn’t have the same nurturing characteristics like this program has, I probably wouldn’t finish the program. If it were elitist and wasn’t grounded in public education values and really didn’t have this mission and vision of social justice then I probably wouldn’t be earning an Ed.D. at the end of this year.”

Focus Group, Cohort 3 Student

**Ed.D. Research Symposia.** An important part of engaging Ed.D. students in the practices of a doctoral culture is to involve them as participants in research symposia and at research
conferences. The Ed.D. program is committed to doing both. In the Second Year Progress Report we noted that in June 2011, the Ed.D. program sponsored a lecture and workshop for the Ed.D. students by Dr. Gary Anderson from New York University and Dr. Kathryn Herr from Montclair State, both of whom are prominent scholars in the area of practitioner research. Beginning in 2012, the Ed.D. program now sponsors annual research symposiums for doctoral students and other interested students and faculty in the CCOE, thus creating a venue for Ed.D. students to present on their completed research and works in progress and hear keynote talks from established scholars in the field. The first Ed.D. Research Symposium held on May 19, 2012, brought to campus Dr. James Spillane of Northwestern University, an expert in distributed leadership for the keynote lecture. On May 4, 2013, the Ed.D. program invited well known research methods scholar, Dr. Kathleen Collins from the University of Arkansas to do both a workshop on Mixed Methods Research in the evening before the research symposium and a keynote address at the second annual Research Symposium.

Responding to an initiative among Ed.D. directors in the CSU System for a regional Ed.D. Research Symposium, Cal State L.A. hosted the first Southern California CSU Ed.D. Research Symposium on May 31, 2014. The regional research symposium brought together 140 doctoral students and faculty from seven southern California CSU campuses. Fourteen Cal State L.A. faculty served as session facilitators and fourteen Ed.D. students presented on their research with over 80% of the Cal State L.A. Ed.D. students in attendance. On May 2, 2015, the Ed.D. program sponsored its fourth research symposium with keynote speaker, Dr. Gerardo Lopez, noted scholar of PreK-20 education policy from Loyola University, New Orleans. (Attachment 13, Copies of Symposium Flyers and Agendas). The May 2015 Research Symposium was organized online and utilized many Google.com features including online evaluation of the symposium. Results from the online evaluation indicated that approximately 80% of the respondents rated the morning presentations and afternoon roundtable sessions as “extremely useful” or “useful.” Samples of respondents’ comments to open-ended questions: “I felt like a scholar and I was able to make meaningful comments when I participated at the round table. I had a great experience talking to Dr. Lopez during lunch,” “The Dedoose workshop has a direct impact on my ability to do qualitative research effectively,” and “For future symposiums, if time permits, a panel of guest speakers who are researchers would add to the expertise of the conference,” are representative of students opinions of the value of the research symposium and provide guidance for planning the 2016 symposium. The online evaluation will be a continuing practice for future research symposia and allow the program to quickly collect and analyze data on students’ satisfaction with and applications of what was learned at the symposium in regards to their doctoral research and individual scholarship.

Social Issues Forum. The Ed.D. program received a small award of funds from the university to organize a Social Issues and Education Forum that broadens students’ understanding of the many social issues that impact families, school-age children and youth, and community college and university students. Aligned with the

“They should’ve focused more on social theories. I’d like to see more of a focus on the urban environment. If you want to become a well-rounded educator, you need to walk in other people’s shoes and I don’t think we got that experience.”

Focus Group Cohort 3 Student
university’s goals to increase civic learning that fosters students’ engagement in their communities, on May 1, 2015, the Ed.D. program held a forum on Social Issues and Education: Gentrification and Affordable Housing. Students in each of the five Lab courses conducted inquiries into gentrification and affordable housing as related to education. A panel of community leaders including a council member from the City of Pasadena, a member of the School Board for Los Angeles Unified School District, a representative from the Los Angeles County Housing Authority, and a director of a community advocacy organization, participated in discussion with an invited education policy scholar and a Q and A with the audience. (Agenda for the Forum, Attachment 14). All currently enrolled doctoral students, three graduates, three recently admitted doctoral students for the fall 2016 cohort, and several community members and other guests – a total of 79 people – attended the forum. The sample comments from the online evaluation capture students’ response to the Social Issues and Education Forum: “I will look at school data critically and understand at the intersection of social issues that impact schools, families and children. This project allowed me to look at my own school data to understand the population that I serve and move forward in supporting agencies that have a vested interest in the lives of the families I serve,” and “I learned about the effects it can have on a community not just on individual families.” Most importantly the impact it can have in schools, challenging educational leaders.” Additionally, the evaluation data showed that 85% of respondents rated the forum as “excellent” or “very good” and 85% recommend that the Ed.D. program continue to hold a Social Issues and Education Forum each year. The student focus group comment in the side box above, “. . . need to walk in other people’s shoes,” presents a challenge for the Ed.D. program in that there is a great deal of content that must be covered in the two years of doctoral coursework and yet understanding the urban environment beyond the school house, so to speak, is critical for educational leaders. Institutionalizing the Social Issues Forum as an annual event sponsored by the Ed.D. program and varying the social issue topic each year may be one way to raise greater awareness of pressing social concerns with the doctoral students.

Research Conference Attendance. One of the ways in which doctoral students at research universities learn to see themselves as emerging scholars is when they attend major national and regional research conferences in their discipline. Recognizing that the Ed.D. students, as working professionals, are less accustomed to attending a major research conference, assimilating them into new roles as researchers is an important part of their scholarly development. The Ed.D. faculty discuss with students the learning that takes place at research conferences and actively encourage students to attend the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting each year. Faculty assist students in submitting proposals to present their research at the conference, attend sessions and SIG meetings with students, and make themselves available throughout the conference to talk with students about their experiences at AERA. CCOE Dean Hyun has hosted receptions at AERA for CCOE faculty and students in 2014 and 2015. As a result of the concerted effort of the doctoral faculty to bring Cal State L.A. doctoral students to the largest and most respected national/international educational research conference, over 50% of students from Cohorts 1 – 5 have attended AERA at least once, several have attended each year while enrolled in the doctoral program and four returned to present their research as graduates.
In addition to the activities described above, the doctoral faculty encourage students to participate in as many other scholarly activities that they can manage as working professionals with family and other obligations. With the thoughtful guidance of the doctoral faculty, the Ed.D. students have an impressive record of academic accomplishments that include presentations, publications, graduate assistantships, adjunct teaching and lectures, and service on committees as student representatives. *Attachment 15* lists students’ involvements in activities related to the doctoral culture of Cal State L.A.’s Ed.D. program.

**Resources to Support a Doctoral Culture**

*Financial Resources and Sustainability.* The legislation authorizing the Ed.D. degree, SB 724\(^1\), states in Section 66040.5 that in regards to funding the degree programs, “funding provided from the state for each FTES shall be at the agreed-upon marginal cost calculation that the California State University receives.” The marginal cost revenue combined with student tuition allows the Ed.D. program to operate successfully as a self-sustaining program. The annual budget for the Ed.D. program has grown from $269,750 in 2009-2010, its first year, to $1,218,691 in 2014-2015. The budget constraints the program experienced in its early years are no longer an issue. The full funding the Ed.D. program receives, as stipulated in SB724, provides substantial financial resources allocated directly to the Ed.D. program for its continued development as an effective, sustainable and strong doctoral program. Details about the operating expenses and revenue of the doctoral program are provided in *Attachment 16*.

The following expenditures illustrate the ways in which the Ed.D. budget supports a doctoral culture and appropriate and customary doctoral program practices.

**New Faculty and Staff.** Among the expenditures that have had a positive impact on the growth, development, and operations of the Ed.D. program are new faculty and staff hires. In the past two years, two additional faculty were hired: an assistant professor of K-12 education and an assistant professor of higher education.

- Dr. Allison Mattheis (Ph.D., University of Minnesota, Twin Cities) joined the CCOE faculty in 2013, and teaches in the Ed.D program, the M.A. in Educational Foundations, and B.A. in Urban Learning degree programs. She is a former secondary school science teacher and holds a K-12 Principal’s License (administrative credential) from the state of Minnesota. Her research interests include sociocultural analysis of policy and the exploration of educational cultures and climates using ethnographic qualitative approaches as well as interdisciplinary mixed methods. Dr. Mattheis’ publications cover topics in school choice policy and equity issues related to gender and sexuality.

- Dr. Daisy D. Alfaro (Ph.D., University of Washington) joined the Ed.D. program in 2014 and brings research expertise in the contexts that promote equity, access, and success of underrepresented students in higher education. Her research has focused largely on

identifying the protective factors that influenced the P-20 trajectories of low-income, first-generation college, urban, Latino students to the top law schools in the country. Dr. Alfaro has a background in educational leadership and policy studies and previously served as a researcher for the Washington State Commission on Hispanic Affairs, providing policy analyses to legislators in the state on the effectiveness and appropriateness of programs that target Latino students.

The Ed.D. program has specific needs for staff assistance both in terms of assessment support and administrative support. To meet these needs the Ed.D. program added two new staff members.

- Mr. Jacob Garrison was hired to serve as the Data Analyst for both the Ed.D. program and the other programs in the CCOE. He helps develop assessment instruments, collects data and does independent analysis of data. Mr. Garrison has a background as Manager of Marketing Research and Strategy at Paramount Pictures. He holds a Master of Arts degree in Social Sciences from the University of Chicago.

- Ms. Cathy Morales worked as an Administrative Assistant in the CCOE for Cal State L.A.’s Writing Project for over 12 years before being recruited as the Administrative Support Coordinator for the Ed.D. program. Her responsibilities range from assisting the Director of the program, to providing support for Ed.D. student support services, to Webmaster of the program’s webpage. She has a Master of Arts degree in Education in Instructional Technology New Media Design and Production from Cal State LA, and has earned two clear teaching credentials: Elementary Multiple Subjects and Secondary Art and Computer Concepts.

**Ed.D. Financial Support for Faculty Development.** In 2013-2014, the Ed.D. program was invited to join the Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate (CPED). CPED was founded in 2007 with a grant from the Carnegie Foundation with the goal of redesigning the Ed.D. and doctoral preparation of professional practitioners. CPED has become a consortium of over 80 colleges and schools of education committed to the critical examination of the doctorate in education and sharing successful program practices that make the degree relevant and meaningful to the work of education professionals. As a member of CPED, program directors, faculty and education deans attend convenings twice a year. Faculty attending CPED meetings bring back to the Ed.D. program new ideas on topics such as doctoral level pedagogy, research methodologies for practitioner research, building and sustaining community partnerships, and more. In June 2015, seven Ed.D. faculty will be attending the CPED convening at Cal State Fullerton.

**Travel.** In addition to the $1500 per year in professional development funds the university provides to faculty, the Ed.D. program also supports faculty travel related to and in support of the doctoral program. To date, the Ed.D. program has provided more than $42,000 for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Travel Reimbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$773.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$3,665.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$17,215.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>$8,503.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$42,157.69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
doctoral faculty travel to conferences and CPED convenings.

*Financial Resources for Students.* The Chancellor’s Office of the CSU requires that ten percent of tuition collected from Ed.D. students be set-aside for need-based financial aid. Each semester the University’s Division of Administration & Finance designates these funds for Ed. D. students that are distributed by the Office of Financial Aid to doctoral students who qualify for financial assistance. (The University is not authorized to collect or award set-aside funds in the summer term.) The table below shows that for each fiscal year, the expenditure of funds has increased while the number of students receiving awards has remained fairly constant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Fiscal Year Expenditure</th>
<th># Students Receiving Awards</th>
<th>Average Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$33,600</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$4,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$97,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$5,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 (fall semester)</td>
<td>$21,250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students who require financial assistance to pay tuition and fees, are eligible for student loans. For Ed.D. graduates that assumed loans while enrolled in the program, student indebtedness ranges from approximately $20,000 to $120,000. The University Cashiers Office created a payment plan system for Ed.D. students to pay tuition in three equal installments each semester. These arrangements allow doctoral students to tailor payment of tuition and fees with loans only, loans and cash, or cash installments.

*Ed.D. Financial Support for Student Professional Development.* As described above, the Ed.D. program encourages students to attend national research conferences and AERA, in particular. Students are reimbursed $500 each year for their conference travel expenses. To date, the Ed.D. program has reimbursed students for travel at a cost of over $41,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Travel Reimbursements</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$10,194.98</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$9,950.00</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>$5,500.00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015</td>
<td>$12,100.00</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,244.98</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ed.D. program also provides students who have Advanced to Candidacy, a $500 research stipend to help defray expenses for data collection. Seventeen students in Cohort 1 received stipends as did five students in Cohort 2 for a total expenditure of $11,000. Eight eligible
students in Cohort 3 are completing data collection at the time this report is being prepared and will receive research stipends upon submission of receipts, bringing the total expenditure for support of students’ research to $15,000 in three years.

Students also apply for various fellowships and scholarships awarded by the CCOE, Cal State L.A., and outside organizations. Attachment 15 lists scholarships students have received.

**Physical Facilities.** Doctoral classrooms are located in Martin Luther King, Jr. Hall, home of the CCOE faculty and administrative offices; all are smart classrooms with full access to WiFi. There is a designated Doctoral Programs office staffed by the Ed.D. Administrative Support Coordinator, Cathy Morales and the program assistant for the CSULA/UCLA Joint Ph.D. in Special Education. Within the office suite is a Doctoral Study Lounge equipped with a computer, printer, white board and bulletin boards for announcements and cohort graduation photographs.

**Library.** Since the initial implementation of the doctoral program, the University Library has been an integral partner providing the Ed.D. program with a variety of research and instructional support services. The Ed.D. Librarian delivers information literacy instruction and offers in-depth research consultations for students throughout their studies. Ed.D. students also have access to a virtual librarian 24/7 through QuestionPoint—Ask a Librarian service. The Librarian hosts Ed.D. Saturday workshops that include basics such as registering for interlibrary loan and registering for and learning to use RefWorks, an online citation management tool.

The Ed.D. Librarian works closely with faculty to identify, select, and acquire materials to support the research needs and interests of the Ed.D. students and their faculty. The University Library provides access to more than two hundred databases and has more than one million print volumes. As part of the CSU System library consortium and through the use of interlibrary loan the Ed.D. students have access to both print and electronic resources available in all of the CSU libraries and other libraries throughout the United States and beyond.

**Technology.** The Ed.D. program enjoys excellent technology support from the CCOE Information Technology staff. College and university provided hardware and software supports the integration of technology into instruction, for research, and other related program activities. The program website, [www.calstatela.edu/edd](http://www.calstatela.edu/edd), is unique to the University. Campus IT staff assisted the Ed.D. program in developing a pilot website that has an external and internal site (for students and faculty) on the myCSULA portal. The Ed.D. funded a graduate assistant to write the operational manual for future development of program websites and Ed.D. Administrative Support Coordinator, Cathy Morales is webmaster for the Ed.D. site. Cathy Morales also oversees the Ed.D. Program’s social media sites:  
facebook: [https://www.facebook.com/groups/620747808056653/](https://www.facebook.com/groups/620747808056653/)  
Twitter: [https://twitter.com/csula_edd](https://twitter.com/csula_edd)

**Student Services.** The Director of the CCOE Office of Student Services, Mr. Agustin Cervantes, assists the Ed.D. Program with recruitment and enrollment management services. He attends
doctrinal program leadership meetings and maintains an active relationship with the program. The University’s Office of Graduate Studies offers numerous resources for doctoral students. Students can apply for additional conference travel funding and reimbursement of research expenses. Dissertation workshops and dissertation review and submission information and processing are done through the Office of Graduate Studies. The new Graduate Resource Center provides academic workshops, professional development and networking and other general resources for graduate students from across the university.

**Conclusion to Section II: Faculty and Program Resources**

From the initial implementation of Cal State L.A.’s Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, the program has demonstrated evidence-based planning and resource allocation to ensure a vital doctoral culture for faculty and students. Data from focus group sessions conducted with students from Cohorts 1 – 4 by CCOE data analyst, Jacob Garrison verify much of what is discussed above on how faculty and program resources support the development of a doctoral culture. Garrison summarizes in his report (See Attachment 17, Garrison Data Report) that “from the students’ perspective, the emergence of the doctoral culture at the Charter College of Education followed this path:

- Students built supportive relationships with faculty members.
- The culture of support established by faculty members led into relationships between students creating a network of support from the top-down and the bottom up.
- Finally, there were ample resources (e.g. trips to AERA - American Educational Research Association, library) to enable students to succeed in a doctoral program.”

The program activities and resources described in Section II above illustrate the comprehensive and strategic approach to allocating financial resources and utilizing other resources such that the Ed.D. program can continue to build and sustain a viable and engaging doctoral culture. The variety of data collected from students and information learned from best practices led to the plans and activities that have been enacted. Sound data-informed decision-making, especially critical for a self-sustaining program, has been part of the program’s budget planning and subsequent expenditures since its inception and will continue to be so, whether funding research symposia, student travel to AERA or new doctoral faculty positions. This attention to resource allocation during the difficult economic times of the past or times of sufficient funding like that which the program experiences today, is foundational to the success of the Ed.D. program, its faculty and its students.

“*What I am confident in is that the program continues to strive to improve and address both the needs of its students and the betterment and quality of the program. I appreciate the support we received, I loved the other enrichment activities including the Town Hall, AERA Conference, the Research Symposium, and a number of the assignments that allowed us to do practical pilot research projects.*“

End of Second Year Survey, Cohort 2 Student
III. Program Effectiveness

The students in the Ed.D. program are exceptionally diverse by race/ethnicity, languages spoken, gender and age. They are teachers, adjunct faculty, K-12 administrators, community college and university support personnel, school psychologists, K-16 counselors, special educators and others working in education-related fields and community organizations. Thus their research interests vary widely. For example, a special education teacher studies the impact of her arts curriculum on high school students with Autism or a university athletic director studies the experiences of undocumented Latina/Latino college students or a high school counselor studies the advocacy roles of same-sex parents with school age children. These student research topics and others are listed in Attachment 18.

Each cohort brings with it a diversity that is at the same time instructionally invigorating and also instructionally demanding. Embracing this dynamic as a unique feature of the doctoral program, Ed.D. core faculty rely on different data sources that encourage reflection on pedagogical practices and guide curricular and instructional improvement to best meet the needs of students. The Ed.D. cohorts have provided faculty with rich information to assess the program; student voices are captured throughout this report. Data collected from student surveys, focus groups, program assessments and outside review of completed dissertations are presented in this section as evidence of the continuous evaluation the program undertakes to ensure the delivery of an effective doctoral program and high quality student outcomes.

Cohorts. Cal State L.A. has admitted 5 cohorts into the Ed.D. program. Students in Cohort 1 (admitted fall 2009) and Cohort 2 (admitted fall 2011; no students were admitted in 2010-2011) are the only students completing the program at the time of this report. Students in Cohort 3 are in the third year of the Ed.D. course of study. Cohort 4 is approaching the end of the second year and preparing dissertation proposals. Cohort 5 is in their first year of study. The enrollment of each cohort has varied and the size and stability of Cohorts 4 and 5 suggests renewed enrollment growth. The table below shows enrollment, retention, persistence to
degree and graduation information by cohort. (See Attachment 19 for the complete table with individual student information.)

### Ed.D. Cohorts’ Retention, Persistence and Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cohort 1 Entered 2009</th>
<th>No Cohort 2010</th>
<th>Cohort 2 Entered 2011</th>
<th>Cohort 3 Entered 2012</th>
<th>Cohort 4 Entered 2013</th>
<th>Cohort 5 Entered 2014</th>
<th>Total All Cohorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Students Enrolled in Fall Semester Year 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students Enrolled End of Year 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate End of 2nd Year</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>expected 93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Rate End of Year 3 for Cohorts 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>expected 91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students Withdrew/Dropped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students Persisting Toward Degree After Completion of Coursework</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>expected 91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Students Advanced to Candidacy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Students Advanced to Candidacy in Cohorts 1 &amp; 2 Graduated</td>
<td>85% (17)</td>
<td>67% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Students in Cohorts 1 &amp; 2 Graduating in 3 Years</td>
<td>50% (10)</td>
<td>50% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table shows, retention rates during the two years of coursework are strong for each cohort. Persistence toward degree completion once students finish the two years of coursework is also strong; students who encounter challenges while developing the dissertation proposal or completing data collection, continue to persist in their efforts to earn a doctorate. The three years to graduation data for cohorts 1 & 2 – only 50% of students completing the program on time in three years – is a concern for Ed.D. faculty and for dissertation chairs, in particular. Improved dissertation supervision practices such as more frequent monitoring of student data collection and drafts of findings and analyses, were put in place to not only assist students in cohorts 1 and 2 still completing their dissertations, but to also establish clearer expectations and guidelines for students in cohorts 3, 4 and 5 for staying on track to complete the degree program in three years. These improvements are expected to show an increased percentage of students in Cohort 3 graduating in three years, and will continue to be evaluated.
and adjusted as Cohort 4 enters the dissertation phase of their doctoral studies beginning in summer 2015.

**Student Learning and Achievement**

*Targeted Assessment.* There are four degree milestones in the Ed.D. program that allow for assessment of student learning and achievement as illustrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Milestones</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses &amp; Labs</td>
<td>Mid Program Review e-Portfolio</td>
<td>Review of Grades and Course Completions</td>
<td>Dissertation Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Year 1</td>
<td>End of Year 2</td>
<td>End of Year 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students take two years of coursework that includes core leadership courses and research methods courses along with the Lab courses described in Section II (See *Attachment 20* for the three year coursework schedule). At the end of the first year of coursework, students are required to submit a Mid Program Review e-Portfolio as the first assessment milestone. Analysis of the e-Portfolios provides Ed.D. faculty with information that not only demonstrates candidates’ knowledge and skills at the end of the first year in the program, but also provides information regarding program implementation and specific student needs. The e-Portfolio assesses students’ academic progress by reviewing each student’s personal research interest statement and the themes the student describes emerging from literature reviews on the student’s research topic, three student-selected course papers including one paper from a research methods course, and the student’s reflective essay on her or his learning and growth as evidenced by the three representative course papers. Overall, faculty reviewers’ scores indicate that upon completion of their first year in the program, most students fall between “developing” and “acceptable” on the review criteria (see rubric in *Attachment 21*) and students demonstrate growth across semesters in their first year. Ratings and student reflections indicate that students are making adequate progress yet still need instructional support, and in particular, writing support to be prepared for the dissertation phase of the program. For a full discussion on the Mid Program Review e-Portfolio see the report by Dr. Sharon Ulanoff, *Attachment 21*. Sample student submissions for the Mid Program Review e-Portfolio are provided as *Attachment 22*.

In the summer semester of students’ second year of coursework, students write their dissertation proposals and prepare an oral defense of their proposals for their dissertation committees. Before students can proceed to the proposal defense, all course grades are reviewed to ensure that students are in good academic standing – the second assessment milestone. The dissertation proposal and oral defense constitute the qualifying exam and is the third assessment milestone for Ed.D. students. At the dissertation proposal defense,
committees must agree that students have met the requirements for a proposal that is doctoral level quality as well as doable in three years in order for students to successfully pass the qualifying exam and be advanced to candidacy. See samples of student dissertation proposals in Attachment 23.

The dissertation defense is the final assessment milestone for students. The dissertation report and the oral defense of the dissertation must demonstrate that the student has successfully fulfilled the requirement of completing an independent research project. The quality of students’ dissertations is also a key outcome measure for assessing program effectiveness. The Ed.D. program is designed for students to be able to complete the degree in three years with the final year dedicated to the dissertation. However, for Cohorts 1 and 2, the only cohorts to progress through three years of study to date, approximately 50% were able to complete their dissertations in three years. The remainder of students advanced to candidacy needed one additional semester or more in order to produce a quality dissertation and finish degree requirements. As noted in the discussion above on cohorts, Ed.D. faculty and dissertation chairs used this information to determine ways that additional coordination of coursework related to developing research questions, literature reviews, appropriate research methodology and data analysis as well as academic writing support throughout the program can facilitate more students completing the degree program in three years. See Attachment 24 for two sample dissertations.

Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning
Student work from the four assessment benchmarks or milestones produces ample data to evaluate student learning and inform program improvement. In addition to the Mid Program Review e-Portfolio, other assessment and evaluation measures are integral to the program assessment plan.

Multiple Data Sources to Assess Writing Supports. Assisting doctoral students to advance to the level of analysis and writing that is critically important to produce a quality dissertation and future scholarly work surfaced early on in the implementation of the doctoral program as a key area in which faculty need to focus. This has not changed. Faculty observations of students’ written work in their courses, Mid Program e-Portfolio essays, dissertation proposal drafts and dissertation drafts confirm that doctoral faculty must continually seek ways to support students’ development as academic writers throughout the Ed.D. course of study. The attached report by Dr. Joan Fingon (Attachment 25) describes the many ways the program has incorporated information from baseline data on students’ writing upon entering the program, student end of year surveys, feedback on writing workshops, student self-efficacy surveys and informal observations of students’ writing when targeting resources to properly prepare students for the difficult task of writing a dissertation.

Independent Evaluation of Dissertations. To date, twenty-three students have graduated from the Ed.D. program. To assess the major program outcome – the dissertation – all completed dissertations were sent to outside reviewers to evaluate selected components of the dissertation and an overall rating of quality. Ten reviewers consisting of university
administrators, an administrator from the Los Angeles County Office of Education, a classroom teacher and retired CCOE faculty, all with no affiliation with the Ed.D. program, completed independent reviews of the twenty-three dissertations using the rubric included as Attachment 26. The table below shows the results from the dissertation evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounding in the Literature</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions**</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings and Analysis</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Conventions</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding
**One reviewer did not include a rating for this component

Overall, the ratings were very encouraging with the first four components of students’ dissertations (Introduction, Literature Review, Research Questions and Methodology) receiving high ratings of excellent or outstanding. The later components (Findings, Analysis, Conclusions and Writing Conventions) ratings reveal where more support and assistance for students is needed. Ed.D. faculty reviewing the data noted that these last sections of the dissertation were written when students in Cohorts 1 and 2 were trying to complete their degree before the end of the semester to avoid paying additional tuition and fees. Students pay full tuition each semester ($5990) until graduation regardless of number of units enrolled or only a short amount of time needed for final revisions and edits to the dissertation. Students defend their dissertations at the end of the summer and often when busy working at their school/college/university sites preparing for a new school year. This places added time constraints and stress on students trying to graduate. Currently, the program is working with the Interim Dean of Graduate Studies to allow a fee to maintain continuing student status and a positive resolution will be in place in fall 2015. Students are using few university resources and require limited supervision from their chairs at that point and reducing tuition and fees to the minimum required would provide students with the additional time they need. In addition, dissertation chairs have modified due dates and timelines when supervising doctoral candidates’ dissertation work to allow more time at the end of the process. At the time of this writing, 80% of Cohort 3 students have completed data collection and are on schedule with writing up their findings and analyses (See Attachment 19) with time for revising and editing such that their dissertations should show improvement in ratings on Findings, Analysis, Conclusions and Writing Conventions when submitted for outside review.
Independent Review of Survey Data. The Ed.D. program asks students to complete anonymous online surveys at four specific times during the doctoral course of study: 1) the Pre-Entry Survey administered to admitted students prior to orientation and the start of the first semester of coursework; 2) the End of the First Year Survey; 3) the End of the Second Year Survey; and 4) the Graduate Exit Survey. The survey questions were developed by Ed.D. faculty and have remained constant for the cohorts in the past three years enabling comparisons across cohorts and identification of trends over subsequent years. Jacob Garrison, Ed.D. and CCOE Data Analyst, examined all survey results and presented an analysis of findings to faculty at the Ed.D. Retreat (see Retreat Agenda, Attachment 9). Faculty discussion of survey data generated questions that were included when conducting focus groups with students from cohorts 1, 2, 3, and 4. An attached report (see Garrison Data Report, Attachment 17) compiles survey and focus group data. Examples of findings from his report that inform areas for improvement in program effectiveness include:

- Matching the observations of faculty regarding the need to improve the manner in which academic writing is taught and how the teaching of writing for the dissertation, in particular, is sequenced throughout the Ed.D. program coursework, graduates reported ratings on “instruction in academic writing” ranged from “fair” at 36% to “excellent” at only 18%.

- At the end of their second year, Ed.D students had participated in a variety of activities related to the Ed.D. Program Goals. Importantly, 75% of Ed.D students had participated in activities related to social justice and inclusion based issues—a keystone of the program. On the one hand, students expressed an understanding of how social inequity affected the urban learning environment and the role that leadership can play in creating change. On the other hand, under 50% of students have participated in organizational or technology reform efforts.

- Students indicated in the End of Second Year Survey that they were engaging in learning that corresponds to the program’s Student Learning Outcomes (Table 10 in the Ed.D. Data Report, Attachment 17). While only 6% of students disagreed/strongly disagreed with the statements that the program helped them to develop “Recognition of ways the global community affects all levels of education” and “Skills for planning, leading, and implementing organizational change and education reform efforts,” only 39% and 38% respectively strongly agreed that the program was effective in those areas.

That only 50% of students report participating in organizational reform efforts and just over one third strongly agree that the program helped them develop skills to participate in organizational change and reform, uncovers areas in which the Ed.D. program can focus improvement, such as increased attention in course curriculum to research on leadership practices that help facilitate organizational change and reform. Similarly, students’ lower ratings on technology and global community issues must be addressed as these topics are highly relevant for the Los Angeles region as a global city with increasing employment growth in technology fields. Students clearly want more opportunity to study technology and its impact on education. The Ed.D. coursework includes an elective course whereby students in the cohort can “vote” for their choice of an elective. Prior to sharing with students elective course options for a given semester, doctoral faculty are contacted as to their availability to teach an elective in their field of
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expertise. Those faculty who agree to offer a course, submit a short description of the course. A list of the possible elective courses with descriptions are then presented to students with the request that students rank their top three preferences. For the fall 2016 elective courses for Cohort 5, two Instruction Technology faculty were asked to offer courses, and their technology courses (one on educational leadership and technology and the other on technology, media and social justice) received the highest rankings and both will be offered. Students who will be ABD in fall also have the option of taking an extra elective and to date, four have signed up for the technology courses. It is in this way that the program can use the survey data to better meet the needs and interests of students.

The opportunity to examine student survey responses beginning with Cohort 1 and continuing with each cohort provides important data on the areas in which to target improvement and subsequently monitor the effectiveness of those efforts. The Ed.D. data report has additional information on program effectiveness and areas on which to target improvements.

Other Student Accomplishments. As already mentioned, all but a very few of the Ed.D. students are working full time as professionals in educational organizations. With support and guidance of faculty advisors and mentors, many doctoral students participate in activities such as conference presentations, publishing, adjunct teaching and lectures, graduate assistantships, and university and state-level service. The students’ accomplishments can be directly linked to the doctoral culture that has been developed not only within the Ed.D. program but in the CCOE and the University as well. See Attachment 15 for list of Student Activities.

Certainly, a major indicator of program effectiveness is the graduate student outcomes. The graduates’ dissertation topics bring to light the many problems of practice and educational issues that doctoral students with on-the-ground experience and local insight can uncover and research in pursuit of their Ed.D. degrees. The twenty-three graduates from Cohorts 1 and 2 now have impressive credentials as practitioner-scholars. To appreciate their contributions to new knowledge across many fields of educational practice and the work in which they are currently engaged, see Attachment 27, Graduates’ Short Biographies and Dissertation Abstracts. With a growing number of graduates, the program is now positioned to conduct post-graduate tracking surveys at three and five year intervals, and focus groups with each graduating cohort. These data can help inform program changes and improvements that will ensure that the Ed.D. is a relevant and meaningful degree for future cohorts.

Conclusion of Section III: Program Effectiveness
The above examples of program assessment practices capture the ways in which Ed.D. program leadership and faculty are regularly engaged in reflection, planning and action to address the areas of the doctoral program that need modification or improvement. The analysis of benchmark assessments, surveys, and focus group results, provides evidence from students that the Ed.D. program has made excellent progress in delivering a relevant course of study closely linked to the program goals and student learning outcomes. Direct and indirect measures of student learning, and various other methods of assessment and evaluation highlight the strengths of the program as well as identify new areas in which to focus attention.
for continuous improvement. Importantly, student data makes clear that program resources and faculty support are key factors that help students complete quality dissertations – the culmination of their doctoral degree experience. This section has demonstrated that the effectiveness of the Ed.D. program is directly related to the way in which the college, program and Ed.D. faculty welcome ongoing and authentic assessment and evaluation and apply what is learned through these processes when pursuing program improvement and change.

IV. Findings and Reflections

"There are MANY strengths! Among the greatest are (1) the connection to K-12 education systems in the local area, (2) the emphasis placed on social justice is TRULY embedded throughout the program and is evident in the actions and language of the faculty, (3) the amount and type of support provided by the structure of the program as well as the faculty themselves is immensely helpful to maintaining focus and striving for success through all the challenges of completing a doctorate while working full time (as most students did), and (4) the knowledge, thinking processes and ideals that we walked away with are directly applicable to all levels of work in the K-12 system and prepared us for becoming stronger and more efficient school leaders!"

Graduate Exit Survey

Program Strengths
The Cal State L.A. Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership is unique among the professional doctorates in educational leadership in the Los Angeles region. Its uniqueness draws upon not only the faculty and student diversity of the University but also from the diversity of the Ed.D. students in terms of their racial/ethnic backgrounds, primary/heritage languages, age, job titles, years of experience working in educational settings, and research interests. That each cohort reflects this diversity and together, the students examine educational policies and practices, school, college and university structures and cultures, and educational access and social justice in underserved urban communities – all from a broad PreK-12 perspective – illustrate what makes the Cal State L.A. Ed.D. program a special environment for doctoral study. However, diversity among the doctoral student population does not, on its own, facilitate the deep understanding of social justice that is fundamental for addressing access to equal and equitable educational opportunities. The ways in which social justice issues are integrated into student learning is key. Program data indicate that the Ed.D. does this well. For example, the findings from student survey data show that it is in the areas of social justice, and access and inclusion, where most Ed.D. students (76%) are applying what they learn when engaging in educational change and reform efforts. Students’ comments such as the quote above and the testament below are evidence of the program’s grounding in social justice values and how that contributes to the achievement of students historically underrepresented among people with doctorates.
In part, the strengths of the Cal State L.A. Ed.D. can be attributed to the core group of faculty who have been involved with the implementation of the degree program from the beginning. Of the twenty-three current CCOE doctoral faculty, nineteen have been with the Ed.D. program since 2009. These faculty know the program well, are committed to its success, help orient new doctoral faculty to program practices and processes, and work collaboratively on new ideas and program innovations. Additionally, Ed.D. faculty who regularly teach courses in the program and serve on and chair dissertation committees, start building relationships of trust and support with the doctoral students from the first year. Students clearly appreciate a committed and caring faculty. Data from the End of Second Year Survey and Graduate Exit Survey indicate that students are very satisfied (85% and 91% respectively) with the guidance provided by dissertation chairs. Given that students are attempting to complete the dissertation in one year and must rely on their chairs to work intensely with them during summer break, the high ratings provide further evidence that the Ed.D. faculty and the relationships they develop with students are a major strength of the doctoral program. Student comments below affirm the importance of the relationships that develop between doctoral faculty and students.

“The EdD program was incredibly supportive of students. Having a strong cohort and faculty that truly believed in, supported and encouraged us along the way really made it easier to maintain focus and push through all the hard work.”

Graduate Exit Survey

“I truly appreciate the commitment that the EdD faculty models for the EdD students. The level of collaboration exemplify the expectations that were set for us as students.”

End of Second Year Survey Cohort 3 Student

“The EdD program was incredibly supportive of students. Having a strong cohort and faculty that truly believed in, supported and encouraged us along the way really made it easier to maintain focus and push through all the hard work.”

Graduate Exit Survey

“I truly appreciate the commitment that the EdD faculty models for the EdD students. The level of collaboration exemplify the expectations that were set for us as students.”

End of Second Year Survey Cohort 3 Student

“Very, very, caring and authentic advisors who have your back, but who also “tell it as it is” so that we students can complete the program with quality work . . . Our cohort year (students and faculty alike) felt like a big family =).”

Graduate Exit Survey

End of Second Year Survey Cohort 3 Student
Areas for Continuous Improvement

The data discussed throughout this report and presented in more detail in the appendices, identify areas that can be targeted for improvement. The retention, persistence and graduation data, while strong in some ways, is not as good as it should be. The CSU offers the professional doctorate in educational leadership as a degree program that can be completed in three years. It is incumbent on the individual campus programs to make it possible for students to do just that. Only Cohorts 1 and 2 are included in the graduation data but the 50% on-time completion rate for both cohorts signals that the program must improve the ways in which it prepares and supports students for degree completion. As discussed previously in the report, actions are already underway to address this issue. Additional improvement in the following areas would further support students’ completion of the degree in three years.

- Data from the End of Second Year Survey and the Graduate Exit Survey indicate that generally, students do not believe that the program prepares them well for the difficult tasks associated with writing the dissertation. The independent review of the graduates’ dissertations also suggests that some students need more help with academic writing conventions. While the faculty continue to focus on developing students’ academic writing, and more recent cohorts are showing stronger academic writing skills, there still needs to be a concerted effort to support students who are experiencing difficulty at the various stages of the dissertation process. Available funds in the Ed.D. budget could support a writing tutor and editor to provide individual help for struggling students.

- In addition to academic writing, instruction related to the different elements of the dissertation – literature reviews, research design, data collection and data analysis – must be more explicitly taught and sequenced throughout students’ course of study in the first two years. Faculty will need to coordinate their instruction across courses to accomplish this. The Ed.D. Faculty Retreat and the Ed.D. Design Day initiated discussions around the difficult topic of program cohesion versus academic freedom in teaching. More time to continue faculty discussion on curriculum coordination is needed. Faculty professional development funding from the Ed.D. budget could support two Retreat/Design Days which would help accelerate doctoral faculty collaboration and cooperation around what is taught, in which courses, and when during the two-year course sequence.

- The survey data vary on students’ perspectives on the effectiveness of instruction on research methodology, qualitative and quantitative. However, the data show that students are less sure if they have sufficiently acquired the knowledge and skills needed to conduct quantitative research. The End of the First Year Survey for Cohort 4, issued after students had completed both the quantitative and qualitative methods courses, found that only 38% strongly agreed that they could analyze and interpret quantitative data, 31% strongly agreed they had the knowledge and skills to use different methods of quantitative research, and 23% strongly agreed they had developed skills in using and

“There were a lot of things that could’ve been integrated better like for example, teaching a lit review. If you’re going to teach a lit review in one class, I’m not sure if you need to teach it differently in a 2nd or 3rd class.”

Focus Group, Student Cohort 3
interpreting advanced statistics for research. Cohort 4 has already begun designing their dissertation research project and without confidence that they can successfully conduct a quantitative study, they are more likely to select qualitative methodology (as have most Ed.D. graduates and ABD students; see Attachment 18). Qualitative methodologies can take longer to complete and for students who want more assurance that they can finish the degree program in three years, a quantitative study may be more easily completed in the one year devoted to dissertation research. There have been measures taken to address methodological preparation and quantitative methods, specifically. The series of three research methods courses was expanded from three semester units each to four semester units each in 2012 to give faculty more time to cover all the concepts and skills needed for conducting dissertation research. A half-semester course on statistics for those students who have not had or have not recently used their previous training in statistics was added to the program, and is taken prior to the advanced statistics course so that all students are current in their knowledge of basic statistical analysis. Two Ed.D. faculty who specialize in quantitative methods are now team teaching the advanced statistics course in order to provide students with more individual guidance in class and throughout the semester. Yet, as the data from Cohort 4 indicate, this is still an area in need of improvement and may require additional resources to ensure that students can confidently select quantitative methodology for their dissertation research.

The three targeted areas above would do much to improve the opportunity for students to complete the doctorate in three years. Continued assessment and evaluation of the effectiveness of the ongoing and proposed changes discussed above will guide future planning and action and should help the program make strides over the next three years in raising the on-time graduation rate to at least 75% of a cohort and a final cohort graduation rate of retained and persisting students to 100%.

Other areas that can affect positive student outcomes and related to program improvement include: program growth and diversification, building faculty capacity, establishing authentic community partnerships, and addressing emerging administrative challenges. In fall 2016, the Ed.D. program will launch a postsecondary specialization. In small numbers, postsecondary students have been a part of the program since the first cohort and all have been successful. The new and more specialized curriculum for postsecondary students and a planned recruitment effort is expected to expand the program in fall 2017 to two concurrently enrolled cohorts per year, PreK-12 and Postsecondary. There will be further diversification of Ed.D. students’ experiences in educational settings and research interests and this will create additional challenges for the Ed.D. faculty who teach core courses and methods courses and those who supervise dissertations. With a limited number of courses that can be offered during the two years of course work, faculty will be under more pressure to coordinate and collaborate across specializations in terms of course content and assignments so that students in both specializations have similar learning experiences in preparation for the dissertation.
To accommodate the growth and diversification, the program will need to build faculty capacity with new faculty positions and invitations to existing CCOE and campus faculty to join the Ed.D program as core and affiliated faculty. This will necessitate orienting new faculty to the structure of an Ed.D. program, how Ed.D. students as full-time working professionals are different from Ph.D. students (which most faculty were), the caring and attentive advising and mentoring the students need to support them in degree completion, and the importance of following the program’s curricular scope and sequence and adjusting course content to best meet students’ instructional needs given the limited amount of time for course work in a three year doctoral degree program. Moreover, as part of building faculty capacity, the program must seek a more racially/ethnically diverse doctoral faculty. Although the data from the student surveys and the focus groups indicate that students are highly appreciative of the Ed.D. faculty, students also make clear that they would like a more diverse faculty.

| “I didn’t feel there was enough diversity in the faculty.” | Graduate Exit Survey |
| “Including instructors from various ethnic backgrounds could serve to enhance discussions and broaden perspectives related to educational issues.” | Graduate Exit Survey |
| “There needs to be greater diversity among the faculty!” | Graduate Exit Survey |
| “Should the program have been more representative of its student population with a more diverse faculty? I would have liked to have seen that”. | End of Second Year Survey, Cohort 2 Student |
| “I would hope that more ethnicity is represented on the faculty. There is an obvious absence of Blacks and Hispanics.” | End of Second Year Survey, Cohort 2 Student |

All public education institutions in California experienced the difficult economic times of the recent past and are just now rebounding. One of the lessons learned from the days of budget reductions and reduced resources is that community partnerships and collaborations allow organizations and agencies to work together to best meet the needs of students, families, and school communities. The Ed.D. program is still in the process of developing authentic and sustainable community partnerships/collaborations beyond the organizational connections that the Ed.D. students bring with them as education professionals. From the perspective of the Ed.D. program, established partnerships with one school district, one community college, and one community organization would be enough to provide students with access to organizational leaders, staff, teachers/faculty and students and families who could identify the pressing issues that would benefit from new knowledge that students’ research could provide. The program must progress from talking about partnerships and collaborations to establishing real commitments and genuine, doable activities that are beneficial for students and educational and community-based organizations. Making this happen would better realize the Ed.D. program goals and reflect the vision of the university.
Over the past six years, the Ed.D. program has developed into a successful and viable doctoral program. The program relies on state funding and student tuition and fees. Other revenue sources will be examined in the coming years, such as gifts and grants. Relatedly, as the program grows and enrolls a diverse PreK-16 student population with a wide range of research interests, there will necessarily be more curricular diversity required. The Ed.D. budget can provide for more electives to address students interests, however, in doing so must maintain equity in workload among the teaching faculty in the doctoral program. The Ed.D. program has now reached a point in its development where emerging and complex issues can be seen on the horizon. Administrative flexibility and nuanced resolutions to budgeting and staffing issues will be important if the program’s success and uniqueness continues well into the future.

The nature of a review process and the program information that is generated is expected to uncover areas for improvement. The review process can also bring to light program accomplishments that serve to encourage and motivate all those associated with the degree program to continue the excellent work they do. That is the case here. The review has shown that the program’s strengths are many, illustrated throughout the sections of this report. The CCOE leadership, Ed.D. faculty and staff are committed to building upon those strengths and the program’s best practices. In concluding the review process, Cal State L.A., the Charter College of Education and the Ed.D. program faculty appreciated the opportunity to study the doctoral degree program and present the many ways the Ed.D. program utilizes sound and appropriate assessment and evaluation strategies to ensure that the doctoral program remains effective, sustainable and stable, and that it continues to produce high quality student outcomes that enrich the professional growth of its students and graduates.

Closing
The Doctoral Degree Fifth Year Report is submitted to the WASC staff and members of the Doctoral Committee of the Substantive Change Panel. As requested in the April 2012 letter from WASC approving the Second Year Progress Report, this report links assessment to planning and budgeting to developing a healthy doctoral culture and to student success and graduate outcomes. It is laced with comments from student data – student voices – in an effort to bring the Ed.D. students and graduates into the discussion on the program’s strengths and areas for improvement. The report includes examples and supporting data and appendices to capture the delivery of the program from January 2012 through April 2015.
Mission, Vision, and Core Values of the Charter College of Education

The vision of the Charter College provides direction for its programs and the leadership of its community. The vision states:

The Charter College of Education (C COE) is a learning community of faculty, administrators, staff, C COE students, and community members that work collaboratively to ensure that all C COE students receive a high-quality education, honor the diversity of all learners, advocate for educational and community reforms, develop reflective practices that promote equity, and facilitate the maximum learning and achievement potential of all children and adults.

All programs in the C COE are guided by the mission:

The C COE mission is to develop in C COE students the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote the academic, social, and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools and related agencies. C COE graduates become teachers, special educators, school administrators, educational technologists, researchers, program evaluators, school psychologists, counselors, rehabilitation professionals, higher education faculty, and other educational specialists. Within an environment of shared governance, C COE professional preparation programs utilize data-driven decision-making, technology-integrated instruction, meaningful curricula, and outcome-based assessments to ensure high-quality educational opportunities for all C COE students.

The core values of the C COE define the deep commitments of the faculty, administrators, and staff to the students and learning community. The core values are:

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY. We believe in creating inclusive learning environments with equitable educational opportunities for all learners, including those with disabilities and those from diverse cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds. We believe everyone can learn if given the opportunity and support. We honor the dignity of every individual and hold high academic expectations for all learners. We value diversity because it enriches the quality of everyone’s learning.

PROFESSIONALISM. We believe professionalism is mastery of the body of knowledge for one’s discipline and the demonstration of cultural, technological, ethical, and professional competencies. C COE courses and professional preparation programs are designed to teach professional dispositions, skills, and/or knowledge.

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE. We believe all C COE students should develop reflective practices, including self-assessment strategies to foster professional growth. We promote the deliberate application of knowledge to practice and the constant reflective analysis of one’s practice in relation to school and/or community needs.

COLLABORATION. We believe that collaborations and partnerships among C COE faculty and staff, C COE students, schools, families, and community organizations enhance educational excellence, urban school and related agency transformations, and educational access and equity for all learners. Meaningful and lasting educational collaborations and partnerships are grounded in understanding the complexity of all stakeholders’ needs and their interdependence, and we advocate that all C COE professional preparation programs build collaborations and partnerships.
# Program Goals and SLOs

## PreK-16 Program Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal #1: Educational Leadership in the Service of Justice, Access, and Social Change</th>
<th>Program Goal #2: Leadership Grounded in Knowledge and Expertise in Teaching, Learning, and Organizational Change</th>
<th>Program Goal #3: Critical Reflection and Inquiry Embedded in Leadership Practice</th>
<th>Program Goal #4: Leadership that Engages with the Broader Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical and Theoretical</strong></td>
<td>1.1 Analyze historical experiences of and theoretical perspectives on inequality and inequity in education in the U.S.</td>
<td>2.1 Apply advanced knowledge of the research literature related to past and present understandings of the professional practice of teachers, college faculty, counselors, administrators and other educational personnel in educational organizations.</td>
<td>3.1 Critically reflect on the history of major educational reform movements, their related educational paradigms, and analyze their impact on the structuring and organization of curriculum and instruction and student outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political and Contemporary</strong></td>
<td>1.2 Explore the extent to which education has reproduced patterns of cultural dominance and oppression over time and analyze this dynamic in contemporary educational contexts.</td>
<td>2.2 Creatively apply and integrate knowledge of the political, economic, and organizational challenges of public education in order to lead, plan and implement change that sustains improvement of urban educational settings and environments.</td>
<td>3.2 Analyze the interrelated effects of educational policies and practices on agencies, organizations, business and community groups external to educational organizations, and the effects of those groups’ policies and practices on educational environments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Education Challenges</strong></td>
<td>1.3 Interpret the development of educational policy related to legislation and litigation from the perspective of race, class, language, gender, disability, and immigration status.</td>
<td>2.3 Synthesize knowledge and understanding of the complex nature of teaching and learning, cognition and development, in order to best implement, guide, assist and evaluate effective instructional practice in urban educational settings and environments.</td>
<td>3.3 Incorporate a deep understanding of the knowledge of and experience with reform shared by historically excluded members of educational communities in planning for and implementing new reforms and systemic change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EdD Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EdD. Core and Affiliated Faculty, Charter College of Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daisy Alfaro, Asst. Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lois Andre-Bechley, Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Martin Brodwin, Professor, Special Education &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pearl Chen, Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mary Salvey, Professor, Special Education &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joan Singon, Professor, Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mitch Grigory, Asst. Professor, Special Education &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anne Zafner, Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anthony Hernandez, Assoc. Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sunsook Buyn, Dean, Charter College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Manisha Saveri, Dean, Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Gilbert Jones, Assoc. Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christina Imm, Professor, Special Education &amp; Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. A. Lisa Matheis, Asst. Professor, Applied &amp; Advanced Studies in Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliated Faculty, Cal State LA Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Allison Bulign, Asst. Professor, Dept. of Child &amp; Family Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Christopher Harris, Assoc. Professor, Dept. of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anne Larson, Professor, School of Kinesiology &amp; Nutritional Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rita Edesma, Professor, Dept. of Child &amp; Family Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliated Faculty, Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David Black, Professional Rehabilitation Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vince Carbino, Principal, City of Angeles School, LAUSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Kelly Kolowski, Lead (Visual Arts) Teacher, Help Group West School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected Doctoral Faculty Presentations


annual meeting, Philadelphia, April 7-10, 2014.


Brodwin, M. G. (2014). Cultural awareness and diversity in rehabilitation education. Presented as part of the Addressing Diversity Workshop for the California State Department of Rehabilitation, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2014). Students with disabilities and the CSULA rehabilitation services program: Opportunities in the profession. Presented as part of the New Students’ Orientation for the Office of Students with Disabilities, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2014). Academic advisement within the CSULA undergraduate rehabilitation services program. Presented to the Educational Opportunity Program, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2013). Counseling skills in academic advisement. Presented to the university academic advisors, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2013). The counseling program, option in rehabilitation counseling. Presented to Psy Chi, the student psychology organization, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2012). The rehabilitation counseling program at Cal State, Los Angeles. Presented to the undergraduate urban learning students in the Charter College of Education, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2011). The rehabilitation services and rehabilitation counseling programs at Cal State, Los Angeles. Presented to the outreach and recruitment counselors, California State University, Los Angeles.

Brodwin, M. G. (2011). Academic opportunities for college students: The rehabilitation services major and minor programs, the rehabilitation counseling program, and the Career Counseling Certificate at Cal State, Los Angeles. Presented to the Educational Opportunity Program transfer students, California State University, Los Angeles.


Chen, P. (2013). Learning and training in complex enculturating environments. Presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT), Anaheim, CA.


presented at the 2011 TERA International Conference on Education (TICE 2011),
Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

Computer Using Educators (CUE) conference.


the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology
(AECT), Anaheim, CA.

Learners: What Strategies Do Teachers Use?,” Paper accepted at the Annual Meeting
American Education and Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Ulanoff, S.H., Fingon, J.C., & Quirocho, A. (2013, June). I do what I do because it is the right thing to do... A
narrative inquiry into three Latina educators’ trajectories of identity development. Paper
presented at 2013 Ethnographic Qualitative Research Conference, Cedarville, OH.

Ulanoff, S.H. & Fingon, J.C. (2013, April/May). Reading specialists’ stories about teaching reading in
diverse, urban settings. Paper presented at Annual Meeting American Education and
Research Association, San Francisco, CA.


Ulanoff, S.H., Fingon, J.C., & Quirocho, A. (2012, April). I do what I do because it is the right thing to do: A
narrative inquiry into three Latina educational trajectories of professional identity development.
Paper presented at Annual Meeting American Education and Research Association, Vancouver,
B.C. Canada.

National Science Teachers Association, Regional Conference, Hartford, CT.

Ulanoff, S. H. & Fingon, J.C. (2011, April). Reading Specialists Stories’ About Teaching Reading in
Diverse, Urban Settings Annual Meeting American Education and Research Association, New
Orleans.

principals in traditional and residency programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
University Council for Educational Administration, Washington, DC.

in high school mathematics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American
Educational Research Association, Philadelphia PA.

apprentice principals in traditional and residency programs. Paper presented at the annual


Harris, C. When Effective Practices Become Risky Business. Accepted for the Conference on College Composition and Communication at Tampa, FL on March 20, 2015.

Harris, C. Expanding Traditional Views of Assessment and Revision Through Research. Computers and Writing. Frostburg, MD. 8 June 2013.


Harris, C. Panel chair for New Inquiries into Writing Research Traditions. At the 63rd Annual Conference on College Composition and Communication. St. Louis, MO. 24 March 2012.


M. Javeri. Synergistic Integration of Educational Technology, Peace and Environmental Studies for


Busan, Korea, Sept. 23-24, 2011

Tejeda, Carlos (2014). The Battle for Transformative Pedagogies: Decolonial Perspectives on the Embattled State of California’s Higher Education.” National Association for Multicultural Education – California Chapter 3rd Annual Conference Fullerton, California,


Ulanoff, S. H. & Thorsos, N. (2012, April). Knowing the “Other” Latino Student is not Enough: Teaching the US Born English Language Learner in California. Paper presented in the symposium “To Know English Learners is not Enough: A Call to Include Other English Learners” at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Vancouver, BC.


Uy, Fredrick. The Influence of Language in the Learning of Mathematics (June 2014)


Uy, Fredrick. (February 2014). Parental and Family Involvement – A Key Partner to Successful ELL Students.

Uy, Frederick. (September 2013). Transformations, Geometry, and Common Core Standards in Today’s Classrooms.

Uy, Frederick. (July 2013). Teaching Mathematics to English Learners, Secondary School Teachers. CA Mathematics Network
Uy, Frederick. (June 2013). CA Mathematics Network: Teaching Mathematics to English Learners, Elementary School Teachers.

Uy, Frederick. (November 2012). CSU, CSULA, and LAUSD: Strengthening Mathematics Instruction.

Uy, Frederick. (July 2012). Department of Mathematics, Ateneo de Manila High School, Quezon City: Mathematics Teaching and Learning as Seen through a Critical Perspective.


Uy, Frederick. (February 2012). Region 11 Algebra Forum, LACOE: Teaching Mathematics to English Learners, Elementary School Teachers


Weinberg, L. A. (February, 2011). From Legal violations to substantial compliance: Special education in Los Angeles county’s juvenile halls. USC’s University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD), Los Angeles, CA.


Selected Doctoral Faculty Publications


pilot study of faculty instructional methods and attitudes on students with disabilities in higher education. *Exceptionality Education International, 24*(1), 48–64.


Fingon, J.C. (in press) Capitalizing on Young Adolescent, Struggling, Wimpy (or Otherwise) Readers’ Interests in Diary Book Series and Non---traditional Texts, *Voices From the Middle*.


Harris, C. “From the CMS Sepulcher, the Phoenix, Moodle Rises.” In Computers and Composition
Online Special Issue on Open Source and Free Software. Fall 2010—Spring 2011. (Blind reviewed). http://www.bgsu.edu/departments/english/cconline/MoodleW/1Abstract.html


Mattheis, A. & Yoder, J.B. (2014). Queer in STEM: National study overview and implications for higher


Selected Doctoral Faculty Reports


Student Scholarly Activities

Attachment 15

**Ed.D. Student and Graduate Professional Activities and Scholarships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Student/Graduate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaliene Wright</td>
<td>AERA: Wright, S. (2013). Oral Histories of Four Urban Youth Affected by Disproportionality In Special Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Martínez</td>
<td>CSU EdD Regional Symposium: Martínez, E. Latino Parents and Teachers: Key Players Building Neighborhood Social Capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eun Sun Park</td>
<td>CSU EdD Regional Symposium: Park, E. S. (2014). How Do Korean Immigrant Parents View Their Children's Heritage Language Proficiency?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Student/Graduate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickson Perey</td>
<td>AERA: 2015 Division A Dialogic Forum, Doctoral Student Special Mentoring Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KiMI Wilson</td>
<td>AERA: 2015 Asa G. Hillard III and Barbara A. Sizemore Research Institute on African Americans and Education, Doctoral Students Special Mentoring Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Student/Graduate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>R. David Black</td>
<td>2012 California State University, Los Angeles, Alumni Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Dale M. Schoettler Scholarship for Visually Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Rudolph Billman Memorial Scholarship, American Federation for the Blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010 William Randolph Hearst/CSU Trustees’ Award for Outstanding Achievement - Ali C. Razi Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010 American Council for the Blind, Qualis Scholarship Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercedes Perez</td>
<td>2015 Carol Smallenburg Fellowship, Charter College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iralz Carson</td>
<td>2015 Lena and Dominic Longo Scholarship, Charter College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hassan Dornayi</td>
<td>2015 Lena and Dominic Longo Scholarship, Charter College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Ramser</td>
<td>2015 Lena and Dominic Longo Scholarship, Charter College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eun Sun Tark</td>
<td>2015 Charter College of Education Endowed Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nilo Far Ghasami</td>
<td>2014 California School Employees Association Career Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Wolf</td>
<td>2015 Linked Learning Fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIMI Wilson</td>
<td>2014 Congressional Black Caucus Spouses Education Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Mike Sheu</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for EDFN 452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching/Lecturing</td>
<td>Rudy Washington</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for URN 451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Rios-</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for COUN 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambrano</td>
<td>Linda Lee</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for EDAD 601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smbat Avetyan</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for EDFN 452; PHYS 211; PHYS 212; Astronomy 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Ramser</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for ENGL 102 and ENGL 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socorro Orozco</td>
<td>Adjunct Faculty Member for EDFN 413 and URN 464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linda Lee</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer for EDCI 641C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preciosa Cordeno</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer for EDCI 641C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evita Guanlao</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer for EDCI 641C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crystal Perez</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer for EDSP 403, 407, 413, 587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. David Black</td>
<td>Guest Lecturer for EDIT 510 (quarterly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State L. A.</td>
<td>R. David Black</td>
<td>2009-2012 Intern to the Director, Office Students with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td></td>
<td>2011 Internship with Vice President of Student Affairs, Office of Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/</td>
<td>Eun Sun Tark</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, Department of Modern Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Eun Sun Tark</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, AASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Student/Graduate</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistantships</td>
<td>Cecilia Jimenez</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, AASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecilia Jimenez</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant to Interim Provost, Cheryl Ney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Johnson</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, EdD Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shalene Wright</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, EdD Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kanit Pamanee</td>
<td>Research Assistant, EDSC (Dr. Kimm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Wiebe</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, English Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Woolf</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant, AASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Kotowski</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant, EDFN 641B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Memberships</td>
<td>Eun Sun Tark</td>
<td>Cal State L.A. Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosa Johnson</td>
<td>Cal State L.A. Faculty Policy Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marlo Moya</td>
<td>California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Committee on Credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dickson Perey</td>
<td>AERA Graduate Student Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Ramser</td>
<td>Charter College of Education Faculty and Staff Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EdD Program Curriculum

**Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership Specialization in PreK-12 Leadership**

The doctoral program in Educational Leadership with a Specialization in PreK-12 Education is designed to prepare educators to lead reform efforts in California’s Pre-Kindergarten through 12th grade schools. The degree program is designed specifically for working professionals in the field of education. The Ed.D. in Educational Leadership has three emphases: School and System Redesign, Urban Teaching and Learning, and Students’ Special Needs, Supports and Services. A total of 63 semester units is required, with at least 30 in 600-level courses and including 12 dissertation year units. Students must pass a qualifying examination and complete a dissertation. Only students who have been admitted to the doctoral program may enroll in doctoral courses, with prior approval of the Doctoral Program Director. There is a limit on credit that may be earned in variable-unit courses. See Restrictions on Credit Earned in Variable Unit Courses in the Charter College of Education section in the Academic Programs: College-based and University-wide chapter in the catalog.

### Required Courses (27 semester units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 601</td>
<td>Organizational Theory and Leadership for Change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 605</td>
<td>Advocacy, Community Engagement and Governance: The Social and Political</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contexts of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 660</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning in Diverse Urban Settings: Equity, Access, and</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 641A</td>
<td>Using Quantitative Methods to Analyze Inequitable Schooling Outcomes and</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Target Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 641B</td>
<td>Using Qualitative Research to Explore Teaching and Learning for Diverse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban Settings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 641C</td>
<td>Practitioner Research Embedded in School Communities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 600</td>
<td>Seminar: Understanding and Using Research to Answer Questions about</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse Urban Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 602</td>
<td>Research Methodologies for Urban Educational Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 604</td>
<td>Disability, Race, Language, and Gender: Educational Equity, School Policy,</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Required Emphasis Course (3 semester units)

Select one course in an emphasis area from the emphases and elective courses.

- School and System Redesign (e.g. EDFN 614)
- Urban Teaching and Learning (e.g. EDCI 675 or EDCI 677)
- Students’ Special Needs, Supports and Services (e.g. EDSP 660 OR EDSP 640)

### Required Lab Courses (15 to 27 semester units)

Select from the following based on emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 603</td>
<td>Introduction to Doctoral Research</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 605F</td>
<td>Faculty Research Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Minimum 6 units for credit and must be repeated until degree completion.)</td>
<td>(2, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 605C</td>
<td>Community Research Lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Must be repeated for credit two times.)</td>
<td>(2, 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Emphasis and Elective Courses (6 semester units)

To complete the required 60 semester units, select, with advisor approval, additional classes for a total of 6 units from the courses listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 675</td>
<td>Advanced Pedagogical Strategies for Achieving Equity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDCI 677</td>
<td>Leadership in Curriculum and Assessment for Linguistically and Culturally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse Urban Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDFN 614</td>
<td>Evaluation Methods for Urban Educational Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSP 660</td>
<td>Seminar: Research on Learning Disabilities and Behavior Disorders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 603</td>
<td>Doctoral Seminar: Philosophy and Ethics of Educational Leadership</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 608</td>
<td>Legislative Action and Educational Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDAD 692</td>
<td>Doctoral Seminar: Special Topics in Educational Leadership for PreK-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53
Education  
EDFN 650  Research Seminar: Special Topics on Research Methods for Education  (3)  
EDFN 651  Research Seminar: Special Topics in Educational Disciplines  (2)  
EDSP 600  Seminar: Understanding and Using Research to Answer Questions about Diverse Urban Schools  (3)  
EDSP 615  Research Seminar in Early Childhood Special Education  (3)  
COUN 601  Research Methods in Single Subject Design  (3)  
EDCI 635  Teachers, Leadership, and Power in Urban Schools  (3)  
EDIT 600  Educational Technology Leadership  (3)  
EDSP 640  Research on Exceptional Students from Diverse Cultural and Linguistic Backgrounds  (3)  
TESL 600  Language Planning and Policy  (3)  

Dissertation Courses (12 or more semester units)  
EDAD 626  Designing and Writing the Doctoral Dissertation Proposal  (3)  
EDFN 699  Doctoral Dissertation  (Must be repeated for credit three times.)  (3, 3, 3)  

Additional Course(s) (TBD)  
EDAD 695  Guided Study for the Dissertation  (3)  
EDFN 698  Graduate Directed Study  (1-9)  

Minimum Units  63  

All courses are listed with semester units.

(It is each student’s responsibility to check the Future Course Offerings in the Schedule of Classes for verification of quarter(s) in which courses will be offered.)

Admission Requirements:  

Admission to CSULA.  
An earned baccalaureate degree and master’s degree from accredited institution of higher education with a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 in upper division courses and 3.25 or above in graduate study. Official transcripts are required.  
A professional resume.  
Demonstrated excellence in writing as demonstrated by samples of academic and professional documents. Submission of Graduate Record Examination (GRE) scores on the three sections of the General Test; GRE scores from the previous five (5) years are acceptable.  
Three confidential letters of recommendation attesting to the leadership and scholarship potential of the applicant.  
A written statement of professional purpose that reflects an understanding of the future challenges facing schools and the community they serve.  

For further information, contact the program coordinator at (323) 343-4330 or visit the Division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education in King Hall C2098 or the Ed.D. webpage: www.calstatela.edu/edd.

(rev. 03/2013 - Associate Dean’s Office)
Comparison with Peer Institutions

CSU Fullerton EdD in Educational Leadership K-12
CSU Fullerton’s Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership builds on the campus' two decades of successful experience working with surrounding school districts and community colleges in addressing the major challenges faced by the rapidly changing demographics of North, Central, and Southern Orange County. The program directly responds to the needs of the county K-12, which has become majority minority in the past 20 years.

Semester 1:
- EDD 627 – Epistemology, History, and Structure of Contemporary Education
- EDD 605 – Applications of Research: Collection and Analysis of Assessment Data in P-12 Education
- EDD 670A – Research Support Seminar

Semester 2:
- EDD 600 – Organizational Theory and Challenges for Instructional Leadership
- EDD 601 – Methods of Research: Quantitatively-Based Tools
- EDD 670B – Research Support Seminar

Semester 3:
- EDD 621A – Leadership of Curricular and Instructional Practices
- EDD 602 – Methods of Research: Qualitatively-Based Tools
- EDD 670C – Research Support Seminar

Semester 4:
- EDD 624A – Social Context of Educational Politics, Policy, and Governance
- EDD 603 – Specialization in Qualitatively-Based Tools OR EDD 606 – Specialization in Quantitatively-Based Tools
- EDD 670D – Research Support Seminar

Semester 5:
- EDD 604 – Forecasting and Planning for Emerging Instructional Needs
- EDD 626A – Transforming Teaching and Schools through Resource Optimization
- EDD 670E – Research Support Seminar

Semester 6:
- EDD 622A – Human Dimensions of Education Change
- EDD 620 – Ethical and Legal Dimensions of Instructional Leadership
- EDD 670F – Research Support Seminar

Semester 7:
- EDD 698 – Dissertation Work I

Semester 8:
- EDD 698 – Dissertation Work II

Semester 9 (if needed):
EDD 699 – Independent Study – Dissertation
CSU Long Beach PK-12 Educational Leadership

The Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership at CSU Long Beach builds on the campus' nationally recognized master's degree programs in community college leadership, student development in higher education, and educational administration. The Ed.D. program draws on the campus leadership role in the development of the Long Beach Education Partnership, a national model for seamless educational success from preschool through college.

Professional Seminar
- EDLD 720: Proseminar in Educational Leadership (1)
- EDLD 721A: Advanced Proseminar in Educational Leadership (1)
- EDLD 721B: Advanced Proseminar in Educational Leadership (1)
- EDLD 721C: Advanced Proseminar in Educational Leadership (3)
- EDLD 721D: Advanced Proseminar in Educational Leadership (1)
- EDLD 721E: Advanced Proseminar in Educational Leadership (1)

Core Courses:
- EDLD 722: History and Systems of U.S. Education (3)
- EDLD 723: Legal and Ethical Leadership: Implications for Policy and Practice in P-16 Educational Settings (3)
- EDLD 724: U.S. Education and Diversity (3)
- EDLD 725: Organizational Leadership in Educational Settings (3)
- EDLD 726: Policy, Politics, Power in Educational Settings (3)

Research Courses:
- EDLD 730: Educational Research Epistemologies and Methodologies (3)
- EDLD 731: Qualitative Research Methods for Educational Leadership (3)
- EDLD 732: Inferential Data Analysis in Education (3)
- EDLD 733: Program and Student Assessment (1)
- EDLD 734: Survey Methods in Educational Research (1)
- EDLD 735: Applied Field Research (2)

Pre K - 12 Specialization Courses:
- EDLD 751: Organizational Culture and Community Engagement in Education (3)
- EDLD 752: Financial and Human Resource Development (3)
- EDLD 754: Leadership in P-12 Education (3)
- EDLD 755: Curriculum Theory, Instructional Leadership, and Accountability (3)

Dissertation Courses:
- EDLD 797: Directed Individual Study (3 units)
- EDLD 798: Doctoral Dissertation (3 units)
CSU Northridge PK-12 Educational Leadership

CSU Northridge's Ed.D. program focuses on the knowledge and practical skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in PK-12 and community colleges. The distinguishing feature of the program is the two separate cohorts for individuals preparing for leadership positions in PK-12 schools. This two-strand approach addresses the distinct issues for each level of educational leadership, including the instructional leadership for the elimination of achievement gaps and leadership focused on student learning outcomes. Students are also engaged in field-based inquiry and dissertation research to address school/district issues. An induction plan within the program allows for the completion of the Tier II Professional Administrative Credential for PK-12 candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 700</td>
<td>The Art of Collaborative Leadership (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 705</td>
<td>Organizational Complexity and Change (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 710</td>
<td>Curricular and Instructional Leadership for Systemic Reform (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 715</td>
<td>Leading Change through Cultural Competence (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 725</td>
<td>Instructional Assessment and Program Evaluation (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 730</td>
<td>Public Policy in Education (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 740</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship in Education (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 745</td>
<td>The Science of Administration (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 750</td>
<td>The Ethical Dimensions of Leadership (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 755</td>
<td>Human Relations in Educational Organizations (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 760</td>
<td>Field-based Inquiry I (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 765</td>
<td>Field-based Inquiry II (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 770</td>
<td>Applied Quantitative Inquiry I (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 775</td>
<td>Applied Quantitative Inquiry II* (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 780</td>
<td>Applied Qualitative Inquiry I (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 785</td>
<td>Applied Qualitative Inquiry II* (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELPS 789</td>
<td>Dissertation Seminar (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Choose only one, either ELPS 775 or ELPS 785
Cal Poly Pomona P-12 Leadership

The Cal Poly Pomona program, developed in close collaboration with school, district, and community leaders who reflect the region’s diverse community, is uniquely designed for P-12 leaders who are committed to transforming schools, turning around under-performing schools, and enhancing schools that are already succeeding. Intended for working professionals, the program provides a cohort-based, academically rigorous, and practically relevant curriculum that prepares graduates to make a significant and immediate impact in their organizations. Candidates are guided and supported at each stage of the doctoral program through mentoring, faculty advisement, and interactive seminars that build dissertation research skills for ensuring successful completion of the degree.

Year One Courses

- EDD 700: Understanding Oneself as a Leader
- EDD 760: Research Learning Community Seminar: Introduction to Doctoral Studies and Dissertation Research
- EDD 751: Quantitative Research Methods for School Improvement
- EDD 732: Organizational Transformation in Schools
- EDD 752: Qualitative Research Methods for School Improvement
- EDD 731: Student Achievement through Instructional Leadership
- EDD 701: Ethical Leadership for Effective Schools
- EDD 704: Effective Human Resource Management

Year Two Courses

- EDD 752: Applied Quantitative Research for School Improvement or EDD 754: Applied Qualitative Research for School Improvement
- EDD 730: Leadership for Equity and Advocacy
- EDD 753: Dynamics of Motivation and Change
- EDD 706: Law, Policy and Educational Leadership
- EDD 761: Research Learning Community Seminar: Preparation and Defense of a Dissertation Proposal
- EDD 705: Fiscal Planning, Analysis and Budgeting
- EDD 703: Governmental and Political Relationships
- EDD 702: Global Perspectives in Educational Leadership

Year Three Courses

- EDD 734: Community Relations and Partnerships
- EDD 735/ EDD 735L: Leading and Learning with Technology (Lecture/Lab)
- EDD 762: Research Learning Community Seminar: Post-Proposal Dissertation Development
- EDD 800: Dissertation
- EDD 763: Research Learning Community Seminar: Advanced Dissertation Development
- EDD 800: Dissertation
- EDD 764: Research Learning Community Seminar: Preparation for Dissertation Completion and Defense
- EDD 800: Dissertation
EdD Recruitment Activities and Effectiveness

Recruitment Activities: There are several types of recruitment activities that are used for the EdD in Educational Leadership.

1. EdD webpages and Facebook account: The EdD is advertised on the Charter College of Education webpage ([http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/aase/edd-educational-leadership](http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/aase/edd-educational-leadership)), a dedicated program webpage ([https://my.calstatela.edu/web/edd](https://my.calstatela.edu/web/edd)) and an EdD Program Facebook page. The program is also featured on the CSU EdD programs page.

2. Recruitment sessions—during fall and spring semesters the EdD Director, Associate Director, and additional faculty hold recruitment sessions. These sessions are posted on the CCOE webpage and on the EdD webpage. They are held in the evenings and on Saturdays to be able to reach out to the maximum number of potential students.

3. Community College and other School Visits. Program directors and EdD faculty also visit colleges and schools in the local area to meet with administrators with the goal of recruiting potential students.

4. Classroom visits. EdD faculty visit MA classes to make brief presentations and hand out program flyers (see next page).

5. Current and former EdD students serve as ambassadors and recommend the program to colleagues and friends.

6. In 2014 students created a recruitment video ([https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gga_m0F7X_0&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gga_m0F7X_0&feature=youtu.be)).

Recruitment Effectiveness

1. On campus recruitment efforts account for about 60% of applications to the program. The rest can be attributed to program websites, flyers, and current/former student recommendations.

2. Applications have increased over the past two years; this is consistent for programs at our peer campuses.

3. Future efforts will include an increased focus on the use of social media in recruitment.
Charter College of Education
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Why Not Apply NOW?
Application Deadline is June 1, 2016

Is it your personal goal to get a doctorate?
In Cal State L.A.'s doctoral program in Educational Leadership you can study with a diverse cohort of PreK-16 administrators, teachers, community college faculty and staff, special educators, counselors and other professionals in education-related fields who are committed to social justice and the students in Los Angeles' diverse urban education environment.

How to get started!

- Please go to our website for application information:
  https://my.calstatela.edu/web/edd
- You will need to apply to the university on CSU Mentor and submit all supporting documents
- You will need to apply to the Ed.D. program using the Ed.D. Supplemental Application and submit all supporting documents.

About the Ed.D. at CSULA
- 3 year program
- Cohort Model (one every fall)
- K-12 and Post Secondary
- Research Based
- Rigorous and Inclusive
- Diverse group of students
- Supportive Faculty and Staff
- Requires a MA degree
- Requires GRE scores (within 5 years)

For further information, please contact: Cathy Morales
Ed.D Program Administrative Support Coordinator at cmora90@calstatela.edu
California State University, Los Angeles
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• Post-Secondary
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• Evening Courses
• Cohort Model
• Rigorous and Inclusive
• Research-Based
• Exceptional Student Support

“My overall experience has been positive and has motivated me to continue in the pursuit of social justice for our students, families, and communities.”

Dr. Elizabeth Martinez, graduate Cohort 1

Apply now to Cal State L.A.’s doctoral program in Educational Leadership and study in a diverse cohort of PreK – 16 administrators, teachers, community college faculty and staff, special educators, counselors and other professionals in education-related fields who are committed to social justice and the students in Los Angeles' diverse urban educational environment.
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General Overview of Program

The Educational Leadership Doctorate at California State University, Los Angeles began in Fall 2009, building, in part, on the joint-doctoral program between several CSUs and UC Irvine. The program considers leadership from wide view, meaning that they are preparing leaders to serve in a variety of educational contexts in diverse positions within educational institutions. The curriculum is oriented toward social justice and enrolls students who represent the significant diversity of Los Angeles County.

The doctoral program is located within the division of Applied and Advanced Studies in Education, but draws its faculty from across the Charter College of Education. The program is led by a program director and supported by an associate director for the recently launched post-secondary education specialization. The current director also serves as the associate director for the K-12 specialization. This governance structure works. A collaborative spirit prevails among the leadership in the college regarding the doctoral program, with the Division chair showing strong support, as well as the newly-appointed dean. In our interview with the Division chairs, we found consensus that the doctoral program is in the right division and that they work across division lines without issue.

The program is self-supporting, reliant on program enrollment. Although the program began at the height of the budget cuts of the 2009, it has recovered from early years of budget constraints. All constituents interviewed were in agreement that the budget was sufficient for program operations and personnel. Students are supported academically through several measures to support their dissertation work that require significant investment in resources (e.g. laboratories of practice, writing support) and are well-supported to present their work at
professional conferences. CSULA annually sends a large delegation of students and faculty to
the American Educational Research Association, a significant marker of a doctoral culture.

The external review was conducted over two days. Interviews were conducted with:
dean, associate dean, and dean of graduate studies; college leadership team; division chairs; 2
with program faculty; program director; student interview and class visit; exit interview with
dean, dean of graduate studies, and division chair. We had access to the program self-study and
appendices (June, 2016) and other program documents. We also chose a random sample of
completed dissertations (10) to review independently.

Evaluation of Program Quality

History

The EdD program in Educational Leadership is housed in the Charter College of
Education, one of eight colleges within the context of CSULA. The university operates as a
federally designated Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) that has been named among the top ten
master’s universities in the nation for its contribution to the public good. The relatively recent
conversion of the campus from quarters to semesters offered opportunity and challenges,
which will be addressed later in this report, relative to the EdD program in Educational
Leadership. The EdD Progress Report issued in December of 2011 addressed issues raised by
the WASC Structural Change Panel at the time of the initial approval. In a follow-up letter from
WASC Vice President Barbara Gross Davis, issued in April, 2012, the program was commended
for its management of the budget, as well as for the scholarship of program faculty, and the
improvements made based on program assessments. The fifth-year study conducted in 2015
focused on student outcomes, financial sustainability, the continued development of the
doctoral culture, and continued program improvement through targeted assessment.
Mission, Goals, and Objectives

All programs in the CCOE adhere to its mission:

...to develop in CCOE students the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote the academic, social, and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools and related agencies....Within an environment of shared governance, CCOE professional preparation programs utilize data-driven decision-making, technology-integrated instruction, meaningful curricula, and outcome-based assessments to ensure high-quality educational opportunities for all CCOE students.

The core values that comprise the mission are: Educational equity, professionalism, reflective practice, and collaboration. An added key feature specific to the EdD program is a “focus on leadership in practice and an expanded understanding of the many contexts in which educational leadership takes place.”

Our review of the self-study provided and conversations with department administration, faculty, and students suggested to us that this community of scholars and students are highly engaged in practices that relate to the mission of the CCOE, as well as the additional features of the EdD program. We noted evidence of the leadership theory being taken into practice through a social justice curriculum. The faculty are collaborative, exhibit and encourage reflective practice, and they engage in corrective action in relation to improving student outcomes.

Program Data: Enrollment Data & Impact of Enrollment Trends

As of the date of the self-study (June 2015), the EdD program at CSULA has admitted 5 cohorts (the cohort entering in 2016 was not reported in the self-study). No students were admitted in 2010-11, due to budget constraints. Enrollment has ranged from 11-22 students,
with only the K-12 specialization included in these years. The 3-year graduation rate for Cohorts 1 and 2 was 50%. Cohort 1 is planning to graduate 87% of those who started the program and Cohort 2 is planning to graduate 64%. Subsequent cohorts have much stronger retention rates, losing only 1 student in each cohort. A total of 80 students were enrolled in these 5 cohorts, with an overall retention rate of 89%. They have instituted several supports to decrease time to degree. Most notable of these are the laboratories of practice where students work in small, mixed cohort groups to develop their research topic throughout the program, rather than focusing on that activity in the later semesters of the program.

The director reports that the program is encouraged to enroll 20 students per cohort. With the addition of the post-secondary education cohort (16 students in Fall 2016), they have exceeded that goal, doubling the size of their entering cohort. They are also considering off-campus, district-based cohorts, recognizing that recruitment is on-going and necessary for the enrollment health of the program.

Curriculum and Instruction

The curriculum for the doctoral program in Educational Leadership with specialization in PK-12 education is designed to prepare educators to lead reform efforts in California schools. Required credits total 63, and include a qualifying exam and dissertation (12 dissertation credits). The courses align with content befitting urban leadership to include required courses totaling 27 units related to leadership content and research design: 12 units (4 courses) related to leadership (organizational theory and leadership; advocacy and community engagement and governance; teaching and learning in diverse urban settings; equity, policy and school law), with an additional course on school redesign, or teaching and learning, or special needs supports. Juxtaposed with the content courses are 5 courses related to educational research to include
both quantitative and qualitative methods as well as practitioner research, and research related directly to urban issues. An additional 15 units of research courses consist of courses on writing research, and research labs that relate directly to the research students are conducting in the field, or are preparing to conduct. These are intergenerational labs with students from different cohorts working together to discuss issues related to their research projects.

In addition to these required content courses, the students must delineate an emphasis area with a course selection of 3 units related to one of the following: school redesign, urban teaching and learning, or special needs & supports. They also have an additional 6 units of electives that span these areas: advanced pedagogical strategies, philosophy and ethics, teacher leadership, assessment, special education, language policy, legislative action and educational policy, technology, and various research courses related to evaluation, practitioner research, and single subject design. 12 credits are required for the dissertation.

In our review of the self-study provided and in conversations with college and department administration, faculty, and students we recognized the intention of the program to infuse leadership throughout the courses, and that they take a content course, coupled with a research course throughout. We also noted that the program seems to be research intensive, but in reviewing the self-study, it appears that the revised emphasis on research was intended improved the student outcomes in terms of time to degree and dissertation quality.

Assessment of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Program goals for the EdD in Educational Leadership are as follows: Educational Leadership for Justice, Access & Social Change, Knowledge & Expertise in Teaching, Learning & Organizational Change, Critical Reflection Embedded in Leadership, and Leadership that Engages with the Broader Community. From our review of the curriculum map identifying
program goals and student learning outcomes, and from our discussions with administrators, faculty, and students from the program, we note that the program goals are well covered by the curriculum. We can see that many of the courses extend across the 4 goals (e.g., EDAD 601: Org. Theory for Leadership Change, and EDAD 603: Philosophy & Ethics of Ed Leadership) while others are mostly intended to fit particular goals (e.g., EDHI 605: Laboratories of Practice, and EDSP 600: Understand & Use Research to Answer Questions). These are just some examples, of course, but it appears that the goals are well covered by the coursework.

Indeed when we asked about the courses, students told us that they felt that they learned first-hand about leadership. They noted that the “homework is related to coursework and real life experience and we can stay after to get clarification on coursework.” Another students revealed, “this program gives me knowledge and leadership skills to implement policy – how to work with people and how to implement changes.” The emphasis choice of 3 areas that is allowed in the program was important, and she noted, “instructors respect my thoughts, give me feedback, and help me meet requirements of class.” Overall we believe that the program is responsive to student needs to produce the desired student outcomes. The curriculum is well suited to that purpose through its structure and innovative approach of connecting leadership in urban schools to reform efforts relative to social justice. Further, the curriculum encourages students to connect with the broader local community.

Department Faculty

The director reports that there are 12-15 core faculty who are actively involved in the program. Our interviews the director and division chairs reported that the program frequently invites college faculty to participate in the program. The self-study outlines the process for qualifying faculty to be considered “core.” One of those being “research active,” though there
did not seem to be clear criteria for this designation. The self-study included vitae of 28 core faculty. Reviewing their publication record, we used the criteria of on-going publications for the past 10 years, as “research active;” 17 of the 28 met this criteria. It is notable that nearly all doctoral classes are taught by tenure track faculty members.

They also have affiliated faculty (some are community members) who serve on dissertation committees or fulfill other service roles in the program. In one of our interviews the dean suggested that perhaps the definition of core faculty could be expanded to draw on expertise across the university, particularly the inclusion of administrators who are academically qualified to support the new postsecondary education specialization. There is also a desire to reach out to recently-retired community college leaders to employ to support this specialization. We support both these decisions.

The self-study reports that the program supplements the university travel allocation for core faculty. During the span of this report, the program has spent over $42,000 on faculty travel to support the development of a doctoral culture. In our interviews with faculty, we noted general agreement that they felt supported and enjoyed being a part of the doctoral program. They felt the program was inclusive of faculty across the college and confirmed that there are numerous invitations for involvement. There was consistent evidence from faculty and students that faculty are highly dedicated to doctoral student progress and success. Faculty were keenly aware of the cost of the program for students, which motivated them to be work hard on students’ behalf. Faculty are well-supported in terms of credit/workload for teaching laboratories of practice. They currently receive 3 units of workload per dissertation and there is a proposal to move that load to 4 units. These structures are indicative of the program’s commitment to supporting students in their dissertation research.
Student Engagement, Outreach and Recruitment

All indicators show that students are engaged in the program. We observed a statistics class and noted that all students were working on the computers in a lab that had access to the Moodle platform. This allowed them to have immediate access to the information being used by the professor, as well as being able to take notes on the computer related to the topic. Students asked clarifying questions about sampling, testing, and confirming the null hypothesis. The professor then asked a question about when to use different tests and asked for examples from students. Various students offered answers and they seemed quite comfortable in discussing their answers with each other and the professor. The exchange between faculty and students was refreshing. There were checks for understanding, students were comfortable in asking questions that were answered by both the professor and peers, creating collaboration, interaction, and high engagement.

A staff member in the college is primarily responsible for recruitment. He holds informative sessions at the university and also reaches out to different school districts. Recruitment efforts have been fruitful, as their cohort size has continued to grow. For example, they already have 38 student applicants for the upcoming cohort. The good news is that they can begin to be more selective at this point. They indicated some concern that the new admissions platform will delay notification that may result in losing candidates to other programs. Given the very competitive environment for doctoral students in the area, the college leadership should do whatever it can to prevent loss of candidates due to technological constraints.

Program Self Recommendation and Five Year Plan

Although the program is well-funded, they note in their five-year plan that other
revenue sources will be examined in the coming years, such as gifts and grants, perhaps for scholarships for students. Relatedly, as the program grows they intend to enroll a more diverse PreK-16 student population. As such, and with a wide range of research interests, they foresee needing more curricular diversity. In order to provide for more electives to address student interests, they will need to be watchful in maintaining equity in workload among the teaching faculty in the doctoral program.

Also in their plan, the faculty noted the need for building faculty capacity with new faculty positions and invitations to existing CCOE and campus faculty to join the EdD program as core and affiliated faculty. These faculty will need an orientation to the structure of the program since EdD students are full-time working professionals, and are not full-time PhD students. This is a common issue found in practitioner-based programs. In addition, the curricular scope and sequence is critical to student success, particularly given the social justice aspect that is the hallmark of this program. They realize that in building faculty capacity, they must seek a more racially/ethnically diverse doctoral faculty. The lack of faculty diversity is an issue that has been mentioned in student surveys and focus groups.

Commendations of Strengths, Innovations and Unique Features

1. In our discussions with faculty and students we recognized that preparing the students for the dissertation and graduation was of high priority to the faculty. They revised their curriculum to improve the quality of dissertations. They also added writing workshops, and a new writing class as an elective to use as support for those who need it. In one meeting the faculty noted, “If people weren’t cutting it, [faculty] just dug in and did what they could to get them through.” They are committed to finish anyone who is admitted.
2. When we interviewed students in the program, one of the areas they consistently noted was the effectiveness of the research labs. In these they found assistance in research design and techniques from faculty and fellow students, both their own cohort members as well as members of the cohorts ahead and behind them. One of the recent graduates told us that participating in the labs were “...one way to sharpen my scholarly interest. The different levels of students were able to communicate and anticipate what problems could arise and helped me to see...their experience.” He also noted that through the intergenerational group, they built a “strong support base.” He noted, “I have great relationships to this day with those students ahead of me in the cohort. We were able to share ideas and get critical feedback – then when I was doing it, I was informing them of how my thinking evolved. It was empowering for me to help others. The lab was a place to be comfortable. I was not afraid to say my trepidations.” Another student further noted, “The opportunity [in the labs] to give feedback and talk to others was empowering. It helps them when they can explain it [their research] – they have exciting findings to share from the data. We are creating spaces where they feel ownership of it, not just do a dissertation just for a degree but also to make good decisions.”

3. The faculty and students in the program are well supported by the Dean of the CCOE and the Graduate Dean as well. The graduate resource center offers doctoral reviewers who do formatting, act as writing consultants, and also provide assistance in manuscript preparation for submission. The graduate college offers a series of workshops for presenting, research methodologies panels that include faculty and students. This has been institutionalized through student success funds. They also fund student travel, up to
70% of travel, hotel, air as long as they can show they have been invited to present at a conference.

4. The governance structure works. We inquired as to the sustainability of housing the program in one area. While faculty mentioned that doing so may seem to encourage faculty to think about it as “their program” the overwhelming response was that the best approach was for the program to remain in its home base in AASE. The faculty and students also appreciated the cross-divisional representation of the instructors.

5. The faculty and students explained that they have a diversified concept of leadership that is carried throughout the coursework in the program. One reason that they broadly define leadership is that their students come from varied backgrounds (they may be teachers, principals, working in non-profits, and/or corporations). They connect theories of leadership from the organizational theory course throughout the lessons and projects in the subsequent courses. Their dissertations are related to problems of practice in the field, which related to leadership in relation to teaching and learning, community involvement, and issues of educational policy. We find it to be a strength that the program is geared toward viewing leadership in real-time settings. As one person noted, she appreciated the advantage of groundedness in Teacher Education and professional practice versus esoteric research. As she put it, “We are up to our elbows in the real world.”

6. The program boasts a strong doctoral culture, and our conversations with the students help us understand this. The students mentioned the concern and helpfulness of the faculty in encouraging them to take on the challenging research courses. They also noted that the notion of “reaching a hand up for help, while reaching a hand down to help
"others” was strengthened by the writing workshops and the research labs. They felt that the inter-generational work among cohorts helped build the culture and also helped them to build confidence in the work they were accomplishing.

7. The chairs, acting director, and graduate students all noted how faculty go above and beyond to assist the students, support them, and move them through the program. The Dean actually inquired about this as the perception from others across campus is that the faculty could be “coddling” students in the program because of their high levels of support. Program faculty are highly aware that their students lead complex lives as full-time educators, family and community members. They are determined to move students through the program, and we believe that they are working through these issues together.

**Opportunities for Improvement**

The following recommendations are made in the spirit of continuous improvement, already a value of the program and the Charter College of Education.

1. A hallmark of the program that it considers educational leadership broadly, not necessarily being defined by specific positions. This also serves to distinguish the CSULA program from the other CSU programs in the area. However, we heard a desire (and we concur) to bring in Educational Administration faculty to enhance more traditional leadership content and preparation in the program. 

2. Although the post-secondary education specialization was launched since the date of this report, it seems appropriate to make recommendations as the program prepares for this specialization to reach full enrollment within 2 years. Currently the curriculum has 6 content courses. They may need to assess early, whether this is sufficient preparation. PS
students will have more diverse academic backgrounds, with many having master’s degrees outside education. Currently, there is only one full-time faculty member who has expertise in postsecondary education. Although, at this time, there may not be enough courses in to support a second hire in this specialization, by the time the first cohort moves to dissertation, there will be amble workload for at least 2 postsecondary faculty members. This makes AY 2017-18 an ideal year for a search, as that faculty member would on-board the semester these dissertations begin.

3. In multiple meetings we heard concerns about classroom space and labs dedicated to the program. The campus conversion to semesters has meant that the EDD program competes for space along with all other courses in the university. This becomes problematic in that does not allow for students to access resources in the college that have been created to support the doctoral culture (such as the lounge, labs, etc). We recommend that the program be strategic in securing this space, using arguments such as the high fees that doctoral students pay or perhaps by renovating classroom space or purchasing furniture for their preferred space and then making that accessible to other courses on non-doctoral class nights. There is good support for the doctoral program from the Dean of Graduate Studies, who could perhaps be an ally in this effort.

4. There are some issues regarding funding that calls for caution. There did not seem to be a good understanding of how the program pays for instruction though its self-support budget. Two recent developments make this a concern. First, marginal costs fully came to the program, until recently. This is a significant reduction in funds. Although, our interviewees were consistent in their assessment of financial health of the program as it is now- this may not last now that the number of students entering has doubled. There are
elements of the program that have dramatically improved retention and graduation rates and improved the quality of dissertations (workload for chairs, laboratories of practice), thus knowing the cost of instruction and making decisions accordingly is prudent.

5. Somewhat related to the last recommendation is to prepare to reassess program leadership compensation and administrative support if the program continues to maintain double enrollment. In one interview a college administrator acknowledged that the director was “stretched.” That will continue with the addition of the new specialization.

6. The only weakness we observed in the program was alumni engagement. There are many opportunities to engage alumni though their on-going professional development, involvement with current students, accessing them to fund student scholarships, etc. This requires systematic tracking alumni in order to communicate regularly with them. This also allows the program to track their employment, which has become a persistent measure of program impact in the CSU EDD programs. Along this line, we also recommend that they do periodic employer surveys as another measure of program impact through the work of its graduates.

7. Finally, the addition of the postsecondary specialization will make it necessary for the program to consider the impact of CSU employee waivers on program finances. This is a good time to be proactive in this regard by establishing agreements with the campus as to whom is responsible for these and how they will be managed in fees distributed to the program. There are models and practices throughout the system that can be used to guide decisions here.
Overall recommendation to the review

X Recommend Affirmation: This recommendation implies that the program is fulfilling its mission, is maintaining overall high quality, and has processes in place that assure continuous improvement. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the External Reviewer should identify issues appropriate for further improvement prior to the next five-year review.

Recommend Reaffirmation, but with specific concerns for transmittal to the program: The concerns cited may not be sufficient to preclude a favorable recommendation, but the report should reinforce the External Reviewer’s recommendation that the program attend to these concerns in its Continuous Improvement Plan.

Recommend the program remain under Continuing Review: The recommendation cites concerns the program must rectify before a recommendation for continuation can be contemplated. The External Reviewer’s Report should provide specific information on a) actions or outcomes required to address deficiencies, b) seriousness of the deficiencies identified and the length of time anticipated to address them, and c) nature and frequency of reports and reviews that will be required.

Recommend Suspension: The External Reviewer’s recommendation cites deficiencies that so seriously impair overall quality that the program is asked to show cause why it should not be terminated. This recommendation is reached only when the External Reviewer has concluded that the program cannot or will not rectify the cited deficiencies.
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This report is based on the following documents; self-study report prepared by the graduate program (May 18, 2015), an external review Feb 22-23, 2017, responses to questions from the committee, and iterative meetings with the College and Department representatives to develop this document.
Overview of the Field

1. Mission, Goals, Objectives

History
According to the Self Study:
…the Cal State L.A. EdD Program in Educational Leadership was launched in Fall 2009 during a time of national and state economic instability. The program’s inaugural year was during a time of budget and enrollment reduction mandates that presented challenges for the University and the CCOE. However, the alternate plans put in place mitigated any negative impacts to the quality of the EdD program in its early years and maintained the support that doctoral faculty needed to deliver high quality learning opportunities and mentor students through completion of the doctorate. Today, the EdD enjoys stable and adequate funding and is able to plan strategically for growth and the continued development of a vibrant doctoral program for its students.

A key feature of the EdD program is its focus on leadership in practice and an expanded understanding of the many contexts in which educational leadership takes place. The program goals and student learning outcomes guide the implementation of a rigorous, social justice oriented curriculum. Additionally, the college-wide structure of the doctoral program allows the many educational disciplines represented by EdD faculty to be available in the students’ studies of curriculum, policy and practice, leadership, and systemic change. The EdD program establishes Cal State L.A. as a model for educating diverse doctoral students who are committed to improving the educational opportunities for the historically underserved students in the communities served by the University.

Mission
All programs in the Charter College of Education (CCOE) are guided by the mission:

The CCOE mission is to develop in CCOE students the professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote the academic, social, and psychological development of diverse learners in urban schools and related agencies. CCOE graduates become teachers, special educators, school administrators, educational technologists, researchers, program evaluators, school psychologists, counselors, rehabilitation professionals, higher education faculty, and other educational specialists. Within an environment of shared governance, CCOE professional preparation programs utilize data-driven decision-making, technology-integrated instruction, meaningful curricula, and outcome-based assessments to ensure high-quality educational opportunities for all CCOE students.

Core values include: educational equity, professionalism, reflective practice, and collaboration and “an added key feature specific to the EdD program is a ‘focus on leadership in practice and an expanded understanding of the many contexts in which educational leadership takes place.’”
Goals and Learning Objectives

The learning objectives for the preK-16 program are presented in a matrix. There are 12 learning objectives within this matrix. One axis provides the following goals:

  * Program Goal #1: Educational Leadership in the Service of Justice, Access, and Social Change
  * Program Goal #2: Leadership Grounded in Knowledge and Expertise in Teaching, Learning and Organizational Change
  * Program Goal #3: Critical Reflection and Inquiry Embedded in Leadership Practice
  * Program Goal #4: Leadership that Engages with the Broader Community

On another axis, the learning outcomes are divided into:

  * Historical and Theoretical
  * Political and Contemporary
  * Urban Education Challenges

Appendix H of the Self Study provides a curricular map which shows the alignment of program goals with student learning outcomes.

**Commendations**

**To the Program:** As noted by the WASC reviewers, the EdD program has a clear vision, which aligns with the CCOE. It is also affirmed that the goals of the program are unique, as they address social justice and the public good. In addition, the thoughtful and thorough student learning outcomes and the curriculum are clearly aligned.

**Response to Recommendations from the Previous Program Review**

Since this is a new graduate program recently reviewed and approved by WCSUS, no prior program review was completed.

2. **Program Data**

According to the Self Study and External Review Summary:

*Cal State L.A. has admitted 5 cohorts into the EdD program. As of the date of the self-study (June 2015), the EdD program at CSULA has admitted 5 cohorts (the cohort entering in 2016 was not reported in the self-study). No students were admitted in 2010-11, due to budget constraints. Enrollment has ranged from 11-22 students, 6 with only the K-12 specialization included in these years. The 3-year graduation rate for Cohorts 1 and 2 was 50%. Cohort 1 is planning to graduate 87% of those who started the program and Cohort 2 is planning to graduate 64%. Subsequent cohorts have much stronger retention rates, losing only 1 student in each cohort. A total of 80 students were enrolled in these 5 cohorts, with an overall retention rate of 89.*
In the Self Study a table of the race/ethnicity of students enrolled was provided. It revealed the make-up of the student body as:

- White – 28
- African American – 14
- Asian – 12
- Native American – 1
- Filipino – 3
- Latino/Latina - 42

**Commendations**

**To the Program:** We commend the high retention rate of 89%. The program has attracted a very diverse student body, which is also commendable.

**Recommendations**

**To the Program:** The three-year on time completion rate is low. The Self Study identified on-time completion to be an issue and three solutions to possibly address this noted concern. We encourage the program to intensively begin this process, or find additional strategies, to assist students with graduating more quickly.

### 3 Program Curriculum

Per the external review:

*The curriculum for the doctoral program in Educational Leadership with specialization in PK-12 education is designed to prepare educators to lead reform efforts in California schools. Required credits total 63, and include a qualifying exam and dissertation (12 dissertation credits). The courses align with content befitting urban leadership to include required courses totaling 27 units related to leadership content and research design: 12 units (4 courses) related to leadership (organizational theory and leadership; advocacy and community engagement and governance; teaching and learning in diverse urban settings; equity, policy and school law), with an additional course on school redesign, or teaching and learning, or special needs supports.*

*In our review of the self-study and in conversations with college and department administration, faculty, and students we recognized the intention of the program to infuse leadership throughout the courses, and that they take a content course, coupled with a research course throughout. We also noted that the program seems to be research intensive, but in reviewing the self-study, it appears that the revised emphasis on research was intended and improved the student outcomes in terms of time to degree and dissertation quality.*

**Commendations**

**To the Program:** The curriculum is well conceived, with leadership content throughout. Specifically, the program’s strengths are the exploration of the many contexts in which educational leadership can take place, as well as the focus on diversity and social justice.
To the University: The EdD is gaining in popularity and prestige and furthers the universities mission of serving the public good while also training the next generation of educational leaders.

4 Program Assessment

The EdD program has multiple assessments built into the curriculum. Per the Self Study, There are four degree milestones in the EdD program that allow for assessment of student learning and achievement as illustrated in the table below.

Students take two years of coursework that includes core leadership courses and research methods courses along with the Lab courses described in Section II (See Attachment 20 for the three year coursework schedule). At the end of the first year of coursework, students are required to submit a Mid Program Review e-Portfolio as the first assessment milestone.

In the summer semester of students’ second year of coursework, students write their dissertation proposals and prepare an oral defense of their proposals for their dissertation committees. Before students can proceed to the proposal defense, all course grades are reviewed to ensure that students are in good academic standing – the second assessment milestone.

The dissertation defense is the final assessment milestone for students. The dissertation report and the oral defense of the dissertation must demonstrate that the student has successfully fulfilled the requirement of completing an independent research project.

Additional assessment from the Self Study include:
1. Multiple Data Sources to Assess Writing Supports.
2. Independent Evaluations of Dissertations. Overall, the ratings were very encouraging with the first four components of students’ dissertations (Introduction, Literature Review, Research Questions and Methodology) receiving high ratings of excellent or outstanding.
3. Independent Review of Survey Data. The EdD program asks students to complete anonymous online surveys at four specific times during the doctoral course of study: 1) the Pre-Entry Survey administered to admitted students prior to orientation and the start of the first semester of coursework; 2) the End of the First Year Survey; 3) the End of the Second Year Survey; and 4) the Graduate Exit Survey.

Commendations

To the Program: The multiple and varied assessments that are conducted throughout the program are an excellent indicator of student success in the program. When issues are identified through assessment, the program has adjusted to meet the needs of the students.

Recommendations

To the Program: Continue to identify, through assessment, ways to improve on time graduation rates.
5 Faculty and Instruction

According to the Self Study:
There are currently 23 CCOE core faculty and 5 CCOE affiliated faculty. CCOE retired faculty and CCOE faculty in the early retirement program (FERP) can continue to participate in the doctoral program. Additionally, there are eight affiliated Cal State L.A. faculty from other colleges on campus. There are six affiliated community members (four are EdD graduates) who are active in the EdD program as mentors, dissertation committee members, and guest lecturers.

The external reviewers also noted:
There was consistent evidence from faculty and students that faculty are highly dedicated to doctoral student progress and success. Faculty were keenly aware of the cost of the program for students, which motivated them to be work hard on students’ behalf.

They also noted:
Currently, there is only one full-time faculty member who has expertise in postsecondary education. Although, at this time, there may not be enough courses to support a second hire in this specialization, by the time the first cohort moves to dissertation, there will be amble workload for at least 2 postsecondary faculty members. This makes AY 2017-18 an ideal year for a search, as that faculty member would on-board the semester these dissertations begin.

Regarding classroom and less formal study space, according to the external reviewers:
In multiple meetings we heard concerns about classroom space and labs dedicated to the program. The campus conversion to semesters has meant that the EdD program competes for space along with all other courses in the university. This becomes problematic in that does not allow for students to access resources in the college that have been created to support the doctoral culture (such as the lounge, labs, etc). We recommend that the program be strategic in securing this space, using arguments such as the high fees that doctoral students pay or perhaps by renovating classroom space or purchasing furniture for their preferred space and then making that accessible to other courses on non-doctoral class nights.

Commendations

To the Program and College: We applaud the hard-working faculty and chair for their tireless dedication to the program. We support the reported decision to hire two new faculty positions will be sought for 2017-2018 – one specializing in Higher Education and one in Educational Administration.

Recommendations

To the College and University: To encourage a doctoral culture, a lounge or space that fits 40 students is deemed highly necessary by external reviewers and recommended by WASC. Consistent classroom space that is adjacent is also highly necessary to continue to encourage the interactions during the laboratory meeting times.
6 Recruitment, Outreach and Alumni

Recruitment has been successful, resulting in sufficient students for a cohort for each year, and a growing enrollment each year. Per the Self Study:

Recruitment Activities: There are several types of recruitment activities that are used for the EdD in Educational Leadership.
1. EdD webpages and Facebook account: The EdD is advertised on the Charter College of Education webpage (http://www.calstatela.edu/academic/ccoe/aase/edd-educational-leadership), a dedicated program webpage (https://my.calstatela.edu/web/edd) and an EdD Program Facebook page. The program is also featured on the CSU EdD programs page.

2. Recruitment sessions—during fall and spring semesters the EdD Director, Associate Director, and additional faculty hold recruitment sessions. These sessions are posted on the CCOE webpage and on the EdD webpage. They are held in the evenings and on Saturdays to be able to reach out to the maximum number of potential students.

3. Community College and other School Visits. Program directors and EdD faculty also visit colleges and schools in the local area to meet with administrators with the goal of recruiting potential students.

4. Classroom visits. EdD faculty visit MA classes to make brief presentations and hand out program flyers (see next page).

5. Current and former EdD students serve as ambassadors and recommend the program to colleagues and friends.


Recruitment Effectiveness
1. On campus recruitment efforts account for about 60% of applications to the program. The rest can be attributed to program websites, flyers, and current/former student recommendations.

2. Applications have increased over the past two years; this is consistent for programs at our peer campuses.

3. Future efforts will include an increased focus on the use of social media in recruitment.

Alumni engagement is one area identified by the external reviewers as being an area that needs to be improvement.
**Commendations**

**To the Program:** Recruitment and outreach efforts have been successful in ensuring sufficient students for the program.

**Recommendations**

**To the Program:** Per the external review, the following alumni engagement activities would be helpful: systematic tracking of alumni to communicate regularly with them; keep track of alumni employment which helps measure the impact of the program; and periodic employer surveys where graduates work to measure program impact.

**To the University:** One way to easily keep track of alumni would be to allow them to maintain their email addresses upon graduation. Many alumni are lost when they lose their school email and change their personal email address. The EdD program is very costly, and a perk that should be considered, would be to guarantee a lifelong email address from Cal State, LA.

**To the College/Program:** Develop and Advisory Board for the EdD program to support recruitment or make sure that the EdD program has representation of the College Advisory Board.

7 **Program Recommendations**

The following recommendations, provided in the Self Study by the program and endorsed by the program review committee, are summarized below:

1. Program reports that students do not believe that the program prepares them well for the difficult tasks associated with writing the dissertation. The independent review of the graduates’ dissertations also suggests that some students need more help with academic writing conventions. Similarly, the program reports that students were unsure if they had sufficient knowledge and skills to conduct quantitative data, and therefore select a qualitative study, which may delay graduation. Therefore, coordinating faculty instruction around helping students develop the skills necessary to complete the dissertation is needed.

2. In fall 2016, the introduction of a postsecondary specialization was launched. This will cause a further demand on faculty to coordinate and collaborate. New faculty will need to be hired and oriented to the type of program (EdD versus PhD). More racially/ethnically diverse faculty will need to be recruited to meet student needs.
8. **Summary of Commendations and Recommendations**

**Commendations**

1. **To the Program:** As noted by the WASC reviewers, the EdD program has a clear vision, which aligns with the CCOE. It is also affirmed that the goals of the program are unique, as they address social justice and the public good. In addition, the thoughtful and thorough student learning outcomes are clearly aligned with the curriculum.

2. **To the Program:** We commend the high retention rate of 89%. The program has attracted a very diverse student body, which is also commendable.

3. **To the Program:** The curriculum is well conceived, with leadership content throughout. Specifically, the program’s strengths are the exploration of the many contexts in which educational leadership can take place, as well as the focus on diversity and social justice.

4. **To the Program:** The multiple and varied assessments that are conducted throughout the program are an excellent indicator of student success in the program. When issues are identified through assessment, the program has adjusted to meet the needs of the students.

5. **To the Program:** Recruitment and outreach efforts have been successful in ensuring sufficient students for the program.

6. **To the Program and College:** We applaud the hard-working faculty and chair for their tireless dedication to the program. We are excited that two new faculty positions will be sought for 2017-2018 – one specializing in Higher Education and one in Educational Administration.

7. **To the University:** The EdD program is gaining in popularity and prestige and furthers the University’s mission of serving the public good while also training the next generation of educational leaders.
Recommendations

1. To the Program: The three-year “on-time completion rate” is low. We encourage the program to intensively begin this process, or find additional strategies, to assist students with graduating more quickly.

2. To the Program: Per the external review, the following alumni engagement activities would be helpful: systematic tracking of alumni to communicate regularly with them; keep track of alumni employment which helps measure the impact of the program; and periodic employer surveys where graduates work to measure program impact.

3. To the Program: Coordinate faculty instruction around helping students develop the skills necessary to complete the dissertation is needed; especially quantitative research methods and writing expectations.

4. To the College/Program: Develop and Advisory Board for the EdD to support recruitment or make sure that the EdD program has representation of the College Advisory Board.

5. To the College and University: To encourage a doctoral culture, a lounge or space that fits 40 students is highly necessary and recommended by WASC. Consistent classroom space that is adjacent is also highly necessary to continue to encourage the interactions during the laboratory meeting times.

6. To the University: One way to easily keep track of alumni would be to allow them to maintain their email addresses upon graduation. Many alumni are lost when they lose their school email and change their personal email address. The EdD program is very costly, and a perk that should be considered, would be to guarantee a lifelong email address from Cal State, LA.

7. To the College and University: In fall 2016, the introduction of a postsecondary specialization was launched. This will cause a further demand on faculty to coordinate and collaborate. New faculty will need to be hired and oriented to the type of program (EdD versus PhD). More racially/ethnically diverse faculty will need to be recruited to meet student needs.