



SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ED.D. IN EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP W/ PREK-12
SPECIALIZATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of this Handbook.....	2
Contact Information.....	2
Faculty	3
PROGRAM GOALS AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	4
Program Goals	4
Program Student Learning Outcomes.....	4
Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership Criteria for Program Quality	5
THE PROGRAM	8
Program Structure.....	8
Matrix of Courses for Core and Concentration Areas.....	8
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS.....	9
Cohort Program	9
Course Sequence.....	9
Advisors.....	9
Student Progress	9
PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS	11
Official Program of Study	11
Qualifying Exam	11
Advancement to Candidacy	11
The Dissertation.....	14
Dissertation Committee	14
Dissertation Proposal.....	16
Institutional Review Board	16
Writing the Dissertation	17
Intent to Receive a Degree	17
Dissertation Defense.....	18
Graduation Deadline.....	18
Milestones	19
KEY POLICIES AND REGULATIONS	20
Student Grievances	20
Plagiarism.....	20
Maintenance of Integrity in Research	21

Financial Aid	21
Residency	22
Continuing Registration.....	22
Incomplete Grades	22
Student Reinstatement.....	23
Resources.....	24
Afterword	24
PK-12 CONCENTRATION	25
Qualifying Exam	25
Dissertation Proposal.....	25
Summative Evaluation Qualifying Exam.....	27
Dissertation Purpose and Guidelines.....	27
Summative Evaluation Dissertation	28
Dissertation Submission	28
PK-12 Doctoral Practicum Overview	29
Professional Administrative Services Credential	31
Doctoral Program Sequence.....	32
RUBRICS and EDD FORMS	33

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to San Diego State University's Ed.D Program in Education Leadership, PK-12 concentration. This *Handbook* is based upon the *Graduate Bulletin of San Diego State University*, and designed as a general guide to your Ed.D program. The *Graduate Bulletin*, which represents the official regulations and procedures for programs at SDSU, may be accessed at:

<http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/bulletin/>.

The Ed.D Program in Educational Leadership seeks to advance the work of public schools, throughout San Diego and Imperial Counties. The program is committed to developing reflective leaders and change agents, capable of responding to the area's demographic shifts and the increasingly complex needs of educational organizations within this diverse multicultural region. Emphasizing theory, research, and practice, the program provides an opportunity for candidates to work within ongoing, active learning communities. As they interact with faculty and cohort peers, students acquire deeper understanding of themselves as educators, leaders, policy makers, and policy advocates, and develop the knowledge and skills necessary to improve student learning through creative, flexible, visionary, humane, and ethical leadership. The program strives to develop leaders who are:

- Experts in educational leadership
- Critical thinkers informed by scholarly literature
- Transformational change agents
- Self-aware, ethical professionals

Purpose of this Handbook

This handbook acquaints you with important procedures of the Ed.D program, selected policies and regulations of San Diego State University, and various resources available to you as a doctoral student. If you are one of the many students with full-time job responsibilities, you will find yourself relying upon your network of faculty and student colleagues. We urge you to work closely with your teachers, faculty advisor, dissertation committee, and program staff to complete the degree requirements described herein.

Doctoral students are responsible for following the procedures outlined in this handbook and staying informed about program changes, requirements for the degree, and the policies and procedures of the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs as delineated in the current Graduate Bulletin available at: <http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/bulletin/index.html> . The policies and procedures operative on the date of the student's initial enrollment govern the student's program.

Contact Information

This handbook and all application materials for the Doctor of Education Program in Educational Leadership are available at the Ed.D. website at: <http://go.sdsu.edu/education/edl/>.

For additional information contact:

Rachael Stewart

Administrative Support Coordinator

San Diego State University

Department of Educational Leadership

5500 Campanile Dr., San Diego, CA 92182-1154

Phone: [619-594-1338](tel:619-594-1338) | Fax: 619-594-3825 | E-mail: rstewart@mail.sdsu.edu

FACULTY

Ed.D. Faculty		Research Interest
Doug Fisher dfisher@mail.sdsu.edu	Dept. Chair/ Professor	Instructional improvement; English learners school-wide change; literacy leadership; qualitative research; struggling learners
Jim Marshall marshall@mail.sdsu.edu	Ed.D Program Director/Associate Professor	Learning with technology, instructional design, change management, collaborative partnerships, assessment, and program evaluation.
Nancy Frey nfrey@mail.sdsu.edu	Professor	Elementary and secondary reading instruction, literacy in content areas, and supporting students with diverse learning needs
Ian Pumpian ipumpian@mail.sdsu.edu	Professor	Urban education reform; Organizing urban educational institutions to improve student achievement and effectively prepare and support educators and other professionals for careers in culturally diverse urban areas.
Cynthia Uline culine@mail.sdsu.edu	Professor Emerita	Educational leadership; educational facilities planning and design; school change and improvement.
Cheryl Ward cward@mail.sdsu.edu	Associate Professor	Qualities/characteristics of successful principals in low performing schools; leadership coaching; 21st century teaching and skill sets
Francisco Escobedo	Lecturer	Human Resources
Karen Janney	Lecturer	Practicum
John Nelson John.Nelson@cvesd.org	Lecturer	Education Finance

PROGRAM GOALS AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Program Goals

San Diego State University's Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership seeks to advance public education throughout San Diego and Imperial Counties. The program is committed to developing reflective leaders and change agents, capable of responding to the area's demographic shifts and the increasingly complex needs of educational organizations within this diverse multicultural region. Emphasizing theory, research, and practice, the program provides an opportunity for candidates to work within ongoing, active learning communities. As they interact with faculty and other cohort members, students acquire deeper understanding of themselves as educators, leaders, policy makers, and policy advocates, developing the knowledge and skills necessary to improve student learning through creative, flexible, visionary, humane, and ethical leadership. The program strives to develop leaders who are:

- A. Experts in Educational Leadership
- B. Critical Thinkers Informed by Scholarly Literature
- C. Transformational Change Agents, Possessing the Skills of:
 - Problem solving
 - Management
 - Capacity of mission/vision articulation
 - Influencing the instructional environment
 - Creating collaborative and community partnerships
- D. Self-Aware, Ethical Professionals
- E. Professional Who Value and Promote Access, Equity, and Student Success

Program Student Learning Outcomes

Graduates of the Ed.D program will become proficient in the following:

1. **Organizational Strategy** - organize strategies to improve the quality of education and promote the success of all students, while sustaining their institutional mission. The demonstration of this outcome is based on knowledge of the organizations, their cultures, environments, and future trends (Program Goals: A, C, E).
2. **Resource Management** - equitably and ethically sustain people, processes, information, and assets, to fulfill the mission, vision and goals of their institutions (Program Goals: A, D, E).

3. **Instructional Leadership** - apply the necessary knowledge and skills to promote the academic success of all students by fostering a positive organizational culture. Graduates develop effective curricular programs, a student-centered learning environment, and ongoing professional growth opportunities for all staff (Program Goals: A, B, D, E). (PK-12 Specialization only)
4. **Communication** - use scrupulous listening, speaking, and writing skills to engage in honest, open dialogue (Program Goals: A, B, C, D, E).
5. **Collaboration** - demonstrate the ability to develop responsive, cooperative, mutually beneficial, and ethically sound internal and external relationships; ones that nurture diversity, foster student success, and promote the organization's mission (Program Goals: A, B, C, D, E).
6. **Organizational Advocacy** - recognize, commit to, and advance the mission, vision, and goals of the organization (Program Goals: A, B, C).
7. **Professional** - set high standards for self and others, demonstrate personal accountability, and ensure the long-term growth of self and the organization (Program Goals: A, B, C, D, E).
8. **Financial and Legal Forces** - identify the financial and legal forces affecting leadership in Pre-K-20 Education (Program Goals: A, D, E).
9. **Decisions Sciences** - engage in scientific methods to assess, practice, examine results, and promote sound decision-making (Program Goals: A, B, C, D, E).

Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership Criteria for Program Quality¹

[Revised According to Community Partnership Governance Committee (CPGC) Input on May 6, 2010. Revised again at the joint Ed.D. Meeting on October 7, 2010. Updated by CPGC on November 2, 2010. Approved by CPGC May, 2011.]

The San Diego State University doctoral program in Educational Leadership seeks to prepare innovative leaders who design access, equity, and student success solutions, as they address current problems and future challenges faced by PK-12 educational systems. The program is designed to provide a solid foundation in past and current PK-20 leadership practices, while at the same time challenging students to be transformational in their thought and action.

These Criteria for Program Quality are intended to frame program self-study and evaluation activities, as well as direct decisions related to the allocation of resources to ensure a dynamic educational experience for the doctoral students. In addition, these criteria will be applied in the recruitment of faculty who are committed to designing the creative learning experience required for preparing transformational educators.

1. Develop high quality university/community partnerships and ongoing contributions to the community.

San Diego State University's Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership seeks to move beyond traditional notions regarding community partnerships. Toward this end, we must continuously assess the quality of doctoral students' interactions with their surrounding communities, as well as the extent to which direct university/community partnerships are crafted and maintained.

We are required to demonstrate the contributions that program graduates make to their community. First, this requires we connect classroom learning with innovative practice in practical and long-lasting ways. Second, it requires we assess the degree to which program graduates become entrepreneurial leaders, active agents of change, and scholar-practitioners within PK-12 education communities, as well as within the community at large.

2. Ensure academic rigor.

¹ These criteria emerged from a 2007 assessment study conducted during the first year of Ed.D program implementation. Through a process of in depth interviewing, students, faculty, and community partners shared their perceptions of high quality doctoral education. Data were collected and analyzed by the Center for Educational Research and Development (CERD), identifying the common themes participants deemed central to program quality. Across the first three-year cycle of the program, CPGC members and joint Ed.D program faculty further refined the criteria.

The Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership should be of sufficient academic rigor to attract and retain quality students and faculty, as well as to engender respect and influence in shaping positive educational change. This program requires the type of personal experience for each student so that he/she will be prepared to design access, equity, and student success solutions for the future. This includes faculty members' contributions to scholarship and practice in the local community and beyond. In addition, faculty will conduct ongoing assessments of course workload to ensure its rigor and reasonableness for working professionals.

3. Foster participant connectedness within and across cohorts.

The collaborative virtues of the cohort model constituted a common theme cited in the initial interviews. The students have self-reported the value of participating in purposefully designed learning communities, the size of which allows for meaningful relationships. The students desire to have this maintained. This connectedness should be encouraged and thus opportunities for connectedness will be provided across PK-12 cohorts from year to year.

4. Develop education leaders who are driven to re-imagine, re-design, re-affirm policies and programs through the lens of the 21st Century.

The current technology-driven, global environment requires that PK-12 and Postsecondary Education leaders reassess and realign expectations, policies, curricular content, and instructional practice to ensure all students graduate prepared for leadership and work in the 21st Century. Thus, SDSU Doctoral Program candidates must learn to synthesize knowledge within and across disciplines and apply this knowledge to solve complex problems of practice. To the degree they are provided opportunities to advance their own cross-cultural sophistication, they will graduate prepared to engage actively and responsibly within this global context.

5. Provide opportunity for students to graduate within three years.

We are legislatively required to provide students with the opportunity to complete the Doctoral Program within three years. This requires that faculty provide students with the supportive environment to complete the degree in three years, including expedited and ongoing quality feedback regarding coursework and dissertation milestones. Faculty conduct ongoing assessment of the degree to which course content supports dissertation research and writing.

THE PROGRAM

The following are the required components of the Ed.D Program in Educational Leadership.

- 60 semester units of course work including practicum/internship and dissertation credit
- Qualifying exam
- Dissertation
- Defense of the dissertation

Program Structure

1. Course of study designed to be completed in 3-calendar years, 60-semester unit program.
2. Classes scheduled in the evenings, on weekends, and blended with in-class and distance formats.
4. Courses offered in the fall, spring and summer sessions.
5. Program consists of lectures and seminars (ranging from 15 to 30 students), individualized research support courses, internships, qualifying exam, and dissertation.

Matrix of Courses for Core and Concentration Areas

CORE COURSES		
ED 815	Re-Thinking Leadership	3 units
ED 840	Seminar in Ed. Leadership for a Diverse Society	3 units
ED 855	Seminar in Ed. Leadership for Developing Educational Systems	3 units
ED 860	Seminar in Leadership and Educational Change	3 units
ED 850	Seminar in Quantitative Methods of Inquiry	3 units
ED 851	Seminar in Qualitative Methods of Inquiry	3 units
ED 836	Seminar in Research and Writing Support	6-9 units
ED 885	Educational Program Planning & Evaluation (3)	3 units
AREA OF CONCENTRATION COURSES		
<i>Educational Leadership PK-12</i>		
EDL 830 Leadership for Learning (3)		
EDL 880 Seminar in Advanced Topics in Educational Leadership (3)		
EDL 720 Human Resource Development in PreK-12 Educational Organizations (3)		
EDL 755 Governance and Policy Development in PreK-12 Learning Organizations (3)		
EDL 760 Internship in Educational Leadership (3)		
ED 895 Seminar: Writing and Research (3)		
EDL 707: Educational Finance (3)		
Dissertation Credit		
ED 899 Doctoral Dissertation (12 units)		

COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

LEADERSHIP CORE COURSES

ED 815 -- Re-Thinking Leadership (3)

Consider concepts related to individual and collective leadership in educational environments; explore practices and policies related to effective leadership and management; study the ethical implications of leadership practice.

ED 840 -- Seminar in Leadership in a Diverse Society (3)

Explore the nature and extent of variations in admission, access, acceptance, academic growth, retention, and graduation and the role educational leaders play in ensuring that all students enjoy high levels of academic attainment.

ED 855 -- Seminar in Leadership for Developing Educational Systems (3)

Consider the skills and processes for developing educational systems through communications, adult learning, and professional development.

ED 860 -- Seminar in Leadership and Educational Change (3)

Consider the complexities of educational change; investigate various models of organizational change; explore relevant leadership skills and strategies; develop action plans for addressing related educational leadership challenges.

RESEARCH CORE COURSE

ED 885 -- Seminar in Educational Program Planning and Evaluation (3)

Develop effective monitoring and evaluating systems to improve educational programs, educational systems, and educational policymaking; integrate principles and methods of program evaluation into personal frameworks for use in educational organizations.

ED 850 -- Seminar in Quantitative Methods of Inquiry (3)

Inquiry and empirical research in educational settings within public schools, postsecondary institutions, and public and private sector educational organizations, culminating in a dissertation proposal.

ED 851 -- Seminar in Qualitative Methods of Inquiry (3)

Theory and methods of qualitative research and evaluation. Computer applications in qualitative research. Match methodology to research settings in education; design a research or evaluation proposal; collect and analyze data; and present results of qualitative research.

ED 836 -- Research and Writing Support (6-9) Cr/NC

Identification and clarification of a researchable problem in PreK-12 and community college leadership; analysis of related literature, investigation of possible methodology; application to Institutional Review Board. Maximum credit nine units.

ED 895. Seminar – Research and Writing Support (3)

Prerequisite: Admission to the doctoral program or consent of the graduate coordinator.

Investigation of a particular topic or issue, emphasis on empirical research in education. See Class Schedule for specific content. Maximum credit eight units applicable to an advanced degree.

PRE K-12 LEADERSHIP COURSES

EDL 720 -- Human Resource Development in PreK-12 Educational Organizations (3)

Investigate human resource management in preK-12 educational administration including selection and evaluation of staff, contract management, and staff development; consider personnel managerial styles, staff leadership, and motivation techniques related to morale and productivity; analyze educational personnel systems and employee assistance programs.

EDL 755 -- Governance and Policy Development in Pre-K-12 Learning Organizations (3)

Consider the impact of educational policy and politics in governance and administration of PreK-12 educational systems; understand the functions of federal, state, and local education agencies; explore the influences of lay citizens and special interest groups; identify the roles of the judiciary, employee organizations and students.

EDL 830 -- Leadership for Learning (3)

Explore the challenges associated with improving a broad spectrum of learning indicators for all students; consider the research on leadership practices that influence school and district learning results; utilize the research to inform, challenge, and justify theories of action regarding the improvement of teaching and learning.

EDL 880 -- Seminar in Advanced Topics in Educational Leadership (6)

Explore various topical issues relevant to leadership practice within PreK-12 American education systems; consider these various concerns and/or dimensions of leadership as influencing educational institutions within the context of diverse democratic communities.

EDL 760 -- Practicum in PreK-12 Educational Organizations (3)

Participate in and observe leadership practices in local schools and educational settings.

EDL 707 -- Educational Finance (3)

The primary objectives of this course are to provide students with both an understanding of the methods of financing public schools, as well as with a basic overview of budgeting and evaluation principles to ensure that available resources are allocated with optimum efficiency and effectiveness.

Cohort Program

Ed.D. students participate as members of a learning community (cohort) dedicated to enhancing educational leadership practice on behalf of the organizations and students they serve. As a member of this learning community, you are expected to learn from your colleagues, teach your colleagues, assist your colleagues, and provide and receive support from them.

Course Sequence

All students take classes together as a participating member of a learning community. The specific sequence of classes for your three-year program is included in this document.

Advisors

Your faculty advisor will assist you in completing the various phases of your degree program. As you progress through your program, you may work with a number of advisors serving in different capacities. You will be assigned an initial advisor who will provide you with some guidance as you begin the program. Once assigned, your dissertation advisor assumes the primary advising role, supporting you in completing the dissertation project. Students have the right to ask for a change in advisor. Please speak with program directors to initiate such a change. Your dissertation advisor, one additional faculty member, and one community member, comprise your dissertation committee. First charged with approval of your dissertation proposal, this committee then oversees your completion of the dissertation and the oral defense of your dissertation. Finally, the dissertation committee recommends you to the Graduate Dean of San Diego State University to be awarded the Ed.D.

At San Diego State University, only those faculty members who have been approved by the College of Education and the Dean of the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs may serve as advisors to doctoral students or as members of qualifying exam or dissertation committees. If you are interested in working with an SDSU faculty member who has not yet been approved for service in these capacities, you are encouraged to discuss this request for approval with the faculty member in question and the program coordinator. Be advised, however, that approval of such requests is not automatic and is considered within guidelines established by the College of Education and the Graduate Division at San Diego State University.

Student Progress

Doctoral students are expected to make steady progress toward completion of requirements for the degree. The time required to complete the degree depends less

on units of credit or semesters of attendance than it does on the mastery of the subject matter field and completion of a satisfactory dissertation. However, the program is designed for a student to successfully complete the program in three years, thus the faculty expect that students will be able to complete their degrees satisfactorily in three years.

The student's progress in the course-taking expectations of the program, progress toward completion of the dissertation, and the student's strengths and weaknesses will be reviewed in this assessment meeting. Students will be presented with verbal and, possibly, written feedback on their progress, as well as with ideas for improvement, when warranted. See the concentration sections of this manual for additional information.

In order to remain in satisfactory academic standing, doctoral students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in all coursework. Letter grades for classes will include plus and minus grades. Doctoral students who have a grade point average below 3.0 in two successive terms will be disqualified from the program. Students must meet all the requirements of graduate doctoral students as outlined in the university Graduate Bulletin.

Doctoral students who fail to make satisfactory academic progress may be officially disqualified from the university after consultation with the Program Executive Committee. A doctoral student may be disqualified because of unsatisfactory academic progress only after a careful review and written recommendation by the Ed.D program faculty. To ensure that a decision to disqualify a doctoral student from the program is just, basic due process requirements will be met, including an opportunity for appeal by the doctoral student following the guidelines in the university Graduate Bulletin. A doctoral student who has been disqualified is considered to have been terminated from the university and will not be allowed to continue in the program, enroll in courses, or register again without readmission.

PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Official Program of Study

By the third term, students must ensure that a program of study is filed with the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs. Functioning as your contract with SDSU, the Program of Study outlines all the requirements you will complete to be eligible for Graduation. The Program Director will forward an electronic copy to you and to the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.

Qualifying Exam

The qualifying examination provides the doctoral student opportunity to demonstrate appropriate progress toward achieving competence in the Ed.D Program goals. Through this examination, students demonstrate expertise in their area of study and readiness to advance to candidacy and dissertation work. The written qualifying exam allows for two submission dates: early submission will occur at the end of the Fall semester and regular submission will be the first day of spring semester. Specific dates will be announced in classes. This examination will cover the three curricular areas of the program, including (1) Leadership core courses, (2) Research Methodology courses, and (3) Concentration courses, completed up to that time.

The examination will be evaluated by a committee comprised of at least two program faculty members and one PK-12 partner doctoral faculty member. In order to pass the exam, doctoral students must successfully demonstrate competence in all three curricular areas. A pass requires agreement among a majority of the evaluators. If a doctoral student does not pass a portion of the examination or the entire examination, he or she will have one opportunity to take remedial action, as determined by the readers of the examination. Successful completion of assigned remediation is required for advancement to candidacy.

Advancement to Candidacy

The advancement to candidacy for the doctoral degree is an acknowledgment of a students' potential to successfully complete the specific requirements of the program. Eligibility for advancement to candidacy is based on the successful completion of the qualifying examination. Candidacy is confirmed on the Application for Advancement to Candidacy (Ed.D. 3 Form) which details the degree requirements to be met by the individual student. At this milestone, students officially become "doctoral candidates" and can proceed with work toward the dissertation.

The Dissertation

Ed.D. students are required to complete a dissertation. The primary goal of the dissertation is to generate knowledge that contributes to the understanding of educational leadership practices, policies, reforms or improvements. The Ed.D dissertation constitutes an original scholarly work or program review set in a scholarly context that applies rigorous research methods in the study of educational problems and practices. The dissertation proceeds from a cohesive theoretical framework and includes a comprehensive review of relevant literature. The dissertation traditionally includes an in-depth presentation of data, qualitative and/or quantitative, and a thorough analysis of these data. The dissertation advances an interpretation of the findings, a discussion of their significance/implications for practice, and an indication of important areas for further research. Candidates must register for a minimum of 12 dissertation units (ED 899) during their program. Candidates also need to be enrolled in three (3) units of ED 899 during the semester in which they submit their dissertation to Montezuma Publishing. Candidates should become familiar with graduate student responsibilities regarding research found at: <http://library.sdsu.edu/research-services>.

Dissertation Committee

The student's Dissertation Committee counsels the student on all aspects of the doctoral research to foster the student's progress, and to monitor the quality of the research and resulting dissertation. The Dissertation Committee will consist of at least three members; one who will serve as Chair. Co-chairs are allowed. More than three committee members are acceptable and may be requested by the student and the chair. The doctoral student should consider faculty who might make an appropriate Chair or committee member no later than the end of the third term of study.

Students first determine a Chair for their dissertation. The Chair must be a member of the College of Education's Doctoral Faculty. The Chair and the candidate then collaborate on nominating a committee of at least two additional members. Since the doctorate was designed to reflect and foster necessary community partnerships, where appropriate and when a qualified community representative is available, the community member will become the third member of a dissertation committee, along with two SDSU graduate faculty. The community representative must meet SDSU requirements to serve on a dissertation committee. In certain cases, a fourth member can be added to the committee if expertise in a certain area would enhance the committee's work. This member can be a SDSU faculty member or a member of the professional community. Once the committee members have agreed to serve, the student must file the Nomination of the Dissertation Committee Ed.D. 4 Form

with the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.

A. Selecting your Chair

Typically, your Committee Chair will be selected first. Criteria for doctoral faculty members to be eligible to chair a dissertation committee are as follows:

1. An earned terminal degree.
2. The chair or at least one of the co-chairs must be a tenured or tenure track faculty member.
3. Demonstrate expertise (theoretical, methodological, or topical) in areas germane to the dissertation research
4. Exhibit a record of published research (continuous and recent)
5. Be approved by the Dean of Graduate Affairs
6. Successful completion of service as a member of a Dissertation Committee; or, for new Doctoral Program, the requirement for previous Dissertation Committee service may be waived for a person who has unique expertise germane to the dissertation.
7. Must not represent a conflict of interest such as a member who is your direct or immediate supervisor, your subordinate, your relative or anyone with whom you have a related business relationship.

Remember Committee Chairs are “asked” to serve. Students should consider faculty members with whom they have established a professional, working relationship. The Chair should have a keen interest in, and knowledge of, the given topic.

B. Selecting your Committee Members

Typically, selection of committee members is done in cooperation with your Chair. The Chair should take an active role in assisting you to identify committee members. It is important that your Chair has or will be able to establish a positive, working relationship with all committee members. Dissertation committee members must meet all of the following criteria.

1. An earned terminal degree.
2. Hold a faculty appointment in the department.
3. Demonstrate expertise (theoretical, methodological, or topical) in areas germane to the dissertation research
4. Exhibit a record of published research or successful practice in the discipline.
5. Have successful teaching experience at the graduate level.
6. Have demonstrated ability in directing others in research
7. Be approved by the Dean of Graduate Affairs and the Dean of the College of

Education.

8. Must not represent a conflict of interest such as a member who is your direct or immediate supervisor, your subordinate, your relative or anyone with whom you have a related business relationship.

C. Steps to Form your Committee

1. Identify your Chair by the beginning of the third semester.
2. Work with your Chair to identify other members.
3. Ask Chair to approve the list of committee members.
4. Officially ask the members to serve.
5. Office of the Ed.D. Program Director submits Dissertation Committee Form **\after you have been advanced to candidacy.**

Dissertation Proposal

The dissertation committee guides the work of the candidate during the process of shaping an acceptable research proposal and writing a dissertation. Expectations for the contents of the dissertation proposal may vary across areas of concentration. Please check your Area of Concentration Guidelines for more details. Candidates are advised to seek guidance from the chair of their dissertation committee regarding the form of the proposal. Upon tentative approval of the dissertation proposal by the dissertation committee chair, the candidate shares a draft of the proposal with other members of the committee, and schedules a meeting of the committee to discuss the proposal. The student comes to the proposal meeting prepared with a copy of the Proposal Approval Form (Dissertation-related forms available at: <http://go.sdsu.edu/education/edl/currentstudents>). If the committee indicates approval, students file the form with the Program Director.

Institutional Review Board

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at SDSU must approve all doctoral research. Candidates must complete an online assessment of ethical research

and submit an IRB protocol before conducting any research involving human subjects. Students must review the specific procedures in place at SDSU for the submission of research protocols to the IRB.

Information about this process can be found on the web at <https://newscenter.sdsu.edu/researchaffairs/irb.aspx>

Writing the Dissertation

Candidates will work closely with their dissertation chair during the research process and the writing of the dissertation. Depending on the type of research conducted, completing a dissertation can take from one to two years. Throughout the process, candidates should refer to the doctoral handbook to ensure timeliness in executing the proper paperwork and accuracy in following established procedures. As they approach completion, they should closely follow the deadlines for submitting *SDSU Petition for Graduation Form*, which may be obtained from the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.

Specific guidelines for writing and preparation of the dissertation can be obtained from Montezuma Publishing and at: <http://montezumapublishing.com/HOME/THESISFORMATTINGNEW/tabid/220/Default.aspx>. Montezuma publishing is also responsible for posting deadlines for submittal, please stay apprised of these dates as you approach completion. Deadlines and important dates can be found here <http://www.montezumapublishing.com/thesis1/ThesisDeadlines.aspx> Additional information about the dissertation can be found at: http://go.sdsu.edu/education/edl/edl_useful.aspx

Intent to Receive a Degree

The *Petition to Graduate Form* <http://gra.sdsu.edu/grad/graforms.html> must be filed with the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs by mid-September if the candidate expects to complete all Ed.D requirements in time for a December graduation and by early February if he/she expects to receive the degree in May. Check the current Graduate Bulletin for actual deadline dates. <http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/registrar/academiccalendar.html>

Dissertation Defense

All dissertation defenses are open to the public. At least two weeks prior to the defense date, the student must prepare a one-page dissertation announcement and email the announcement, along with an electronic version of the dissertation abstract, to the Program Director's office in the area of concentration within which the defense will take place.

The Dissertation Committee conducts a final oral examination during which the doctoral student defends the dissertation. The dissertation defense will address the theoretical and conceptual framework, relevant literature, data collection techniques, data analysis strategies, and results and implications concerning the question(s) studied. The Committee may vote to approve the dissertation and recommend conferral of the degree by unanimous vote or it may request minor and/or substantive changes. In the event that the Dissertation Committee requires substantive changes, the final vote of the Committee will be postponed until the changes are completed. The Committee may also vote to reject the dissertation, ending the doctoral student's participation in the degree program.

Graduation Deadlines

Exact dates pertaining to institutional requirements for December, May or August graduation are listed in the current SDSU Graduate Bulletin available on line at: <http://aztecgrad.sdsu.edu/gra/>

Major Milestones in the Ed.D Program

Task	Process	Form/Submission	Responsible for filing
File a Program of Study	Work with advisor to confirm program then send it to Ed.D. Director	By the third term	Program Director submits program to the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs
Nomination of Qualifying Exam Committee	Student and Chair decide on the composition of this committee	During fourth term	Student's Dissertation chair submits to the Program Director
Qualifying Exam/ Advancement to candidacy	Student secures necessary signatures indicating passage of qualifying exam	During fifth term	Student Department submits to the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.
Nomination of Dissertation Committee	Student and Chair decide on the composition of this committee	During fifth term	Student's Dissertation chair submits to the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.
Defense of Dissertation Proposal	Student submits the Defense of dissertation Proposal form	End of sixth term	Student Department submits to Program Director
IRB Approval	Student works with IRB office to obtain Human Subjects Committee Approval of the research protocol	By end of sixth term	Student emails research protocol approval notification to Chair and all committee members.
Student begins research; consults with Chair and committee members on chapters.			
Student submits graduation application via WebPortal			
Dissertation Defense	Student prepares a final draft to present to Dissertation Committee. When student has met committee expectations, this form is signed	As appropriate	Student submits to the Division of Graduate and Research Affairs.

KEY POLICIES AND REGULATIONS (Specified in the SDSU Graduate Bulletin)

Students are encouraged to be familiar with all policies and regulations for Graduate Programs at SDSU as outlined in the current Graduate Bulletin at <http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/bulletin/>.

Several of the Graduate Bulletin policies are repeated here for your convenience.

Student Grievances

If a student believes that a professor's treatment is grossly unfair or that a professor's behavior is clearly unprofessional, the student may bring the complaint to the proper University authorities and official reviewing bodies by following the Procedures for Handling Student Grievances Against Members of the Faculty, adopted by the Faculty Senate. A copy of the procedures may be obtained from the Ombudsman's Office in the Student Services building. Students are urged to review the specific procedures in place at SDSU. Information about the SDSU process can be found on the web at <http://www.sa.sdsu.edu/ombuds/grievancecommittee.html>.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is formal work publicly misrepresented as original; it is any activity wherein one person knowingly, directly, and for lucre, status, recognition, or any public gain resorts to the published or unpublished work of another in order to represent it as one's own. Work shall be deemed plagiarism: (1) when prior work of another has been demonstrated as the accessible source; (2) when substantial or material parts of the source have been literally or evasively appropriated (substance denoting quantity; matter denoting qualitative format or style); and (3) when the work lacks sufficient or unequivocal citation so as to indicate or imply that the work was neither a copy nor an imitation. This definition comprises oral, written, and crafted pieces. In short, if one purports to present an original piece but copies ideas word for word or by paraphrase, those ideas should be duly noted.

Lindey, Alexander. *Plagiarism and Originality*, 1952.

San Diego State University is a publicly assisted institution legislatively empowered to certify competence and accomplishment in general and discrete categories of knowledge. The President and faculty of this University are therefore obligated not only to society at large but to the citizenry of the State of California to guarantee honest and substantive knowledge in those to whom they assign grades and whom they recommend for degrees. Wittingly or willfully to ignore or to allow students' ascription of others' work to themselves is to condone dishonesty, to deny the

purpose of formal education, and to fail the public trust.

The objective of university endeavor is to advance humanity by increasing and refining knowledge and is, therefore, ill served by students who indulge in plagiarism. Accordingly, one who is suspected or accused of disregarding, concealing, aiding, or committing plagiarism must, because of the gravity of the offense, be assured of thorough, impartial, and conclusive investigation of any accusation. Likewise, one must be liable to an appropriate penalty, even severance from the University and in some cases revocation of an advanced degree, should the demonstrated plagiarism clearly call into question one's general competence or accomplishments.

Maintenance of Integrity in Research

San Diego State University expects the highest standards of ethical behavior of all members of the academic community involved in the conduct of research, including graduate students. Although instances of misconduct in research are rare, reports of possible scientific fraud concerning faculty, staff, and graduate students employed in research contracts and grants are dealt with in accordance with the university's assurance of compliance with the United States Public Health Service scientific misconduct regulations. The administrative process for handling allegations of scientific misconduct and for protecting the rights and reputations of all persons involved is detailed in the **Policy on Maintenance on Integrity in Research and Scholarship** and published in the *SDSU Policy File*. Reports and/or charges of misconduct in research at SDSU should be directed to the chair of the department or dean of the college in which the alleged misconduct has occurred. Such reports may also be directed to the Vice President for Research in Graduate and Research Affairs for referral to the appropriate college dean.

Financial Aid

Like other national universities, San Diego State University makes available to students admitted to advanced degree curricula a variety of financial support programs designed to substantially reduce or eliminate economic barriers to the pursuit of graduate study. The most widely known of these are the state and federal aid programs available to degree-seeking students who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States. Equally important are the university programs that address the unique financial needs of individual students across a broad range of economic and academic circumstances. The on-campus programs for advanced degree students at San Diego State University include appointments as graduate teaching associates, graduate assistants, research assistants, and student assistants as well as tuition and fee payment assistance, fellowships, scholarships, grants, and forgivable loans.

Information about all state, federal, and institutional aid programs is available from the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships located in Student Services, Room 3605. The phone number is 619-594-6323. Information about the available programs as well as the academic standards that a student must maintain to remain eligible for such aid can be accessed at <http://starter.sdsu.edu/fao/>. The Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) is all you need to begin the application process. You may apply by using FAFSA on the Web site at <http://www.fafsa.gov>.

Residency

After formal admission to a doctoral program, the student must spend at least one year in full-time residence. At San Diego State University, the minimum of one year of full-time residence consists of registration in and completion of at least six semester units each semester of the required year's residence. Students must be enrolled or pay a continuation fee each semester in order to maintain good standing.

Continuing Registration

Once required coursework at San Diego State has been completed, the student is required to maintain continuing registration through completion of all degree requirements. The student can do this by submitting a leave of absence through their department each semester until the semester they intend to graduate. Students need to be enrolled in three units of ED 899 the semester they intend to graduate.

Time Limits

The Ed.D program is designed in order for students to be able to complete all requirements in a three year timeframe. With your advisor's approval and the approval of the Department Chair a first time extension of one year may be granted. To apply for an extension, complete the SDSU extension form during the semester in which your time limit expires. Subsequent extensions may be granted for one year with the approval of your advisor and the Department Chair. A timetable outlining your plan for completing all outstanding degree requirements is attached to the Petition for Extension and submitted to the advisor who obtains the appropriate Department Chair signature. Extensions will not exceed a total of 7 years from a student's initial date of enrollment.

Incomplete Grades

With the approval of the course instructor the grade of Incomplete ("I") may be recorded to indicate that a portion of required coursework has not been completed and evaluated in the prescribed time period due to unforeseen, but fully justified,

reasons and that there is still a possibility of earning credit. It is the student's responsibility to explain to the instructor the reasons for non-completion of the work and to reach agreement on the means by which the remaining course requirements will be satisfied. The instructor should discuss with the student the conditions and deadline for completion, whenever possible. The conditions for removal of the Incomplete should be recorded in writing by the instructor and given to the student with a copy placed on file with the department chair until the Incomplete is removed or the time limit for removal has passed. A final grade is assigned when the work agreed upon has been completed and evaluated.

The Incomplete grade is not counted in the computation of the grade point average, nor is credit earned for the semester/session for which the grade was authorized. Students who receive a grade of "Incomplete" for a SDSU course must complete the required work and receive a grade within one year of the end of the course. Failure to complete the required work by these deadlines will result in an automatic "F" being recorded in place of the incomplete, and usually results in the student being placed on academic probation. Please remember that making up an incomplete is ultimately the student's responsibility, and failure to do so is not an acceptable excuse for later petitioning to have the "F" removed from your record.

Contract forms for Incomplete grades are available at the Office of the Registrar Web site at <http://www.sdsu.edu/registrar>.

Student Reinstatement

Students who fail to make satisfactory progress toward the required deadlines, who have dropped out of the program for any reason or those who do not maintain continuous enrollment will be dismissed from the program. Students may appeal this decision by applying for readmission. The procedure for readmission may require a new personal statement of interest in the program, three new letters of recommendation and a complete set of current transcripts. Students who reapply may be considered at the same time as those seeking admittance for the first time. In considering the readmission request, faculty will evaluate previous coursework, and other activities both in and out of the program. If the student is re-admitted, the faculty may recommend redoing any or all of the student's coursework depending on the length of the time away from the program and the original reason for leaving the program. There is, however, no guarantee of readmission.

Resources

Graduate Student Forms and Deadlines:

Division of Graduate and Research Affairs

<http://gra.sdsu.edu/grad/graforms.html>

Department of Educational Leadership

Department of Administration, Rehab and Post-Secondary Education

Graduate Bulletin: <http://arweb.sdsu.edu/es/catalog/bulletin/>

Check for information on all policies including:

- Student responsibilities
- Privacy rights
- Grading system
- Grade appeals
- Withdrawals
- Repeated courses
- Probation and disqualification
- Leaves of absence
- Non-discrimination policy
- Student conduct and grievances
- Student Disability Services
- Graduate assistantships
- Scholarships and awards
- Fellowships
- Forgivable loans
- Fees

Ed.D. Website: <http://go.sdsu.edu/education/edl/>

Electronic Ed.D. Forms: <https://newscenter.sdsu.edu/education/edl/edd-pk12-concentration.aspx?>

Afterword

This handbook provides a general set of guidelines for the Ed.D in Educational Leadership Program, PK-12 concentration. In order to provide future Ed.D candidates a thorough understanding of degree requirements, we welcome your suggestions for enhancing content and/or presentation

PK-12 CONCENTRATION

Qualifying Exam

As noted previously in the student handbook, the qualifying examination provides the opportunity for the student to demonstrate appropriate progress toward achieving competence in the Ed.D program goals. Through this examination, the student demonstrates expertise in their area of study and readiness to be advanced to candidacy and dissertation work. The written qualifying exam allows for two submission dates: early submission will occur at the end of the Fall semester and regular submission will be the first day of spring semester. Specific dates will be announced in classes. This examination will cover the three curricular areas of the program, including (1) Leadership core courses, (2) Research Methodology courses, and (3) Concentration courses completed up to this time.

In the PK-12 area of concentration, the student's qualifying exam will consist of an initial draft of the student's dissertation proposal as described below. This substantive draft is presented to the Ed.D. Qualifying Exam readers (Committee comprised of 3 PK-12 Concentration program faculty and one community representative).

Dissertation Proposal

The dissertation research proposal is the foundation for your dissertation work. The proposal defines your research in operational terms, and outline's expectations for completion. Faculty expectations for the contents of the dissertation proposal may vary. The form and content of the proposal also varies based on the type of research to be conducted: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. Students are advised to seek guidance from the chair of their dissertation committee regarding the form/content of the proposal.

The *initial draft* of the proposal includes the first three chapters of the dissertation. In general it should contain the following:

Draft Chapter One: An introduction to the proposed dissertation research, including the following:

1. A brief statement of the research problem (2 pp).
2. A statement regarding the purpose of the study (2 pp).

3. A presentation of the research questions or hypotheses.
4. A brief summary of the relevant research and scholarship (5pp).
5. A brief description of the proposed methodology (2-3 pp).
6. A brief summary of the limitations of the study (1 page or less).
7. A statement regarding the significance of the research to theory, practice and policy (1 page).

Draft Chapter Two: A review of the literature and its application.

This chapter has three very specific and important purposes. First, it establishes the relationship of your research to the concepts/theoretical framework you are applying. Second, it establishes the relationship between your work and the empirical research of others. Third, it describes the various methodological approaches applied by others who have investigated the topic, providing the foundation for decisions about the appropriate methods for investigating the proposed research questions, hypotheses, or program evaluation plan (20-30pages).

Draft Chapter Three: A description of the proposed research methods.

Chapter Three discusses the type of methodology proposed (e.g., quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods), and identifies the specific data collection methods selected (e.g., case study, survey, quasi-experimental design, etc.). It explains the rationale for these choices and provides appropriate citations as support for these decisions.

Chapter Three also describes the population and the context of the study as appropriate, identifying and explaining the sampling design as well as the rationale for why this sampling design was selected using citations as support for these decisions.

Chapter Three describes the various data collection instruments and the manner in which the data will be collected using citations as support for these decisions. Included are descriptions of how the instruments were selected and/or designed using citations. It also explains, using data, how valid and reliable the instruments are (if applicable).

The chapter identifies and describes how data will be analyzed using citations as support for these decisions. It details the steps of how, when, and who will

collect and analyze the data, describing how data will be triangulated, if applicable.

The chapter describes how findings will be validated or audited, if applicable.

Finally, Chapter Three addresses, in detail, all ethical issues related to the research and outlines how confidentiality of subjects will be maintained *throughout every aspect of the study (10-15pp)*.

Summative Evaluation of the Qualifying Exam

The substantive proposal is evaluated according to the [PK-12 Qualifying Exam Rubric](#) aligned with the core content elements of the qualifying exam. Passing score is an average of 3 on each criterion.

Dissertation Purpose and Guidelines

San Diego State University's Ed.D Program in P-12 Educational Leadership seeks to prepare transformative leaders who understand the inherent complexities of educational systems, recognize and analyze critical problems of practice, and apply relevant research and scholarship to formulate responses appropriate to specific contexts. These change agents apply the skills of keen diagnosis, scrupulous implementation, and rigorous evaluation in a manner that challenges the status quo and brings about fundamental change to P-12 educational systems.

In preparation for this incisive work, the culminating experience of the Ed.D program at San Diego State University, the Ed.D dissertation, necessarily addresses an identified problem of practice within a specific public school or district context. The following guidelines assist doctoral candidates in developing an appropriate research question and choosing the corresponding research methodologies for conducting their dissertation study.

1. The problem of practice may originate directly from the candidate or from a given educational institution.
2. The concern may call for evaluation of a specific program within an educational institution. This evaluation might be the vehicle for the dissertation study.
3. A range of methodologies can be applied within the Ed.D dissertation study, including quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods approaches.

4. Ed.D dissertations can be organized around thematic topics, encouraging teams to investigate a given problem of practice from different perspectives and through different theoretical lens. These joint efforts have the capacity to deepen our understanding of a particular concern. Likewise, individual researchers benefit from collective analysis and interpretation of the data. Although team members focus on a shared topic and may collaborate at different points in their studies, each participant produces an original work.
5. The Ed.D dissertation typically includes five chapters. Chapter One presents an introduction to the study and its context. Chapter Two reviews the relevant research and scholarship. Chapter Three describes the research methodology. Chapter Four reports the results of the project. Chapter Five includes interpretation, discussion, and implications of the research results. The number of chapters, focus of each, and chapter order described here will not necessarily apply to all dissertations. These decisions rest with the dissertation chair and committee.
6. Within San Diego State University's Ed.D. Program in P-12 Educational Leadership, the *implications of results* stand as essential outcomes of all dissertation research. Here the candidate articulates the potential of their research to influence and improve practice in P-12 education, demonstrating their capacity to make a difference in the lives of children.

Summative Evaluation of the Dissertation

The dissertation is evaluated according to the [Written Dissertation and Oral Dissertation Defense Rubrics](#). Final passage requires the following: An average score of 3 or above is required on each written dissertation and oral defense criterion. In addition, an overall average of 4 or above is required across all written dissertation and oral defense criteria.

Dissertation Submission

The submission of your dissertation will follow your dissertation defense. You will work with your dissertation chair to plan your defense date. A graduation application must be submitted on time for the semester in which you are graduating. Applications are completed through your web portal account, click on the tab "apply to graduate" and follow the instructions. Application deadlines can be found at SDSU's Graduate Affairs Office website <http://aztecgrad.sdsu.edu/gra/>. You must also be registered in at least 3 units of 899 the term you submit your dissertation, and all program courses must be completed by the last day of the semester.

Students are encouraged to work with their chair and a professional formatter and editor before submitting their dissertations. Dissertations are submitted to Montezuma Publishing <http://www.montezumapublishing.com/>. We recommend the following options towards formatting:

1. Format the document yourself
2. Hire a vetted formatter from the list of professional support found on:
3. Hire Montezuma Publishing to format your dissertation

In addition to formatting, it is recommended that you hire a professional editor to review your dissertation. Please consult with your dissertation chair and or department for recommendations.

Next Steps Overview:

1. Register in ED 899 during the semester in which you are graduating
2. Confirm with your department that you have registered and will have completed all program requirements for graduation.
3. Work with an editor and formatter to review your dissertation document so that it is ready to be submitted to Montezuma Publishing after completing dissertation defense.
4. Schedule dissertation defense with dissertation chair.
5. Bring the Report of Filing of the Dissertation Form (Ed.D. 5) with you at your defense. You should also have at least 2 signature pages for your committee to sign.
6. Prior to submitting your dissertation for review, schedule an appointment to meet with Rita Baumann at the Graduate Affairs Office for next steps towards dissertation submission and graduation

Rita J. Baumann
Student Service Professional
Doctoral Coordinator
SDSU/Graduate Affairs
[\(619\) 594-1504](tel:(619)594-1504)
[\(619\) 594-0189](tel:(619)594-0189) fax
rbaumann@mail.sdsu.edu

PK-12 Doctoral Practicum Overview

The Ed.D in Educational Leadership, PK-12 Concentration, Program of Study includes participation in a Doctoral Practicum (EDL 760). This Practicum provides the doctoral candidate a unique opportunity to experience a particular educational leadership setting beyond his/her current work environment. Within this new context, the candidate will work with a mentor/professional colleague to apply course learning and/or explore dissertation-related theory and research. This Doctoral Practicum is an invitation for candidates to apply their academic preparation, leadership expertise, and research interests within authentic settings.

The Practicum will also provide the opportunity for school districts or other educational institutions to benefit from the interaction with a doctoral candidate.

Students have the opportunity to design this Doctoral Practicum experience. A learning plan, prepared in advance of the experience, identifies the proposed context, the mentor/professional colleague, the proposed practicum activities/experiences, the intended learning outcomes, and procedures for evaluating the Practicum as a learning experience and the student's performance within it. This learning plan will serve as a blueprint for the doctoral candidate and the mentor/professional colleague. This course will also fulfill the practicum requirements for the Professional Administrative Services Credential for those doctoral students who need to complete this Tier II requirement.

Doctoral Practicum Goals

- a) To provide the doctoral candidate opportunity to work with a mentor/professional colleague within an educational setting that offers new and additional learning opportunities.
- b) To provide the doctoral candidate opportunity to design a learning experience within a given professional setting based on his/her own interests and professional goals.
- c) To encourage the doctoral candidate to apply knowledge and skills gained in doctoral coursework and research.
- d) To engage the doctoral candidate in reflection related to his/her advancing leadership, change agency, and research expertise.

Doctoral Practicum Requirements

The Doctoral Practicum must be conducted in a setting other than the candidate's work place. The Doctoral Practicum must involve the student actively in an educational leadership context within which there are opportunities for advanced learning related to educational policy, research, and/or leadership practice. The identified mentor/professional colleague must possess expertise appropriate to the proposed practicum learning outcomes.

To be applied to a candidate's Doctoral Program of Study, the proposed Practicum must receive the prior approval of the student's assigned EDL 760 Doctoral Practicum Instructor. Candidates arrange for their Practicum experience in consultation with the EDL 760 Doctoral Practicum Instructor. Deadline for approval is two weeks prior to the start of the Practicum. A Practicum not approved in

advance will not be counted toward meeting program requirements. Each doctoral candidate is responsible to secure approval by the due date.

As a minimum, the Doctoral Practicum consists of 15 hours devoted to Practicum-related activities for each credit unit received. The Practicum also includes an initial Practicum Proposal and a Practicum Final Report.

Doctoral practicum proposal

This 3-page proposal includes the following:

1. Description of, and rationale for, the proposed practicum setting as a site for learning.
2. Identification of the mentor/professional colleague and the expertise he/she will offer.
3. Statement of learning outcomes (What I will know and be able to do as a result of this practicum experience?).
4. Description of the activities/duties to be performed, along with a preliminary timeline.
5. Description of self and mentor/colleague evaluation procedures.

The proposal is due to the EDL 760 Doctoral Practicum Instructor and the Ed.D. Director at least two weeks prior to the beginning of the Doctoral Practicum.

Professional Administrative Credential

Doctoral students who have not earned the professional administrative credential may do so while enrolled in the Ed.D program. If eligible, doctoral students who also enroll in the Professional Administrative Credential Program must meet the standards set forth in the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) approved program documents submitted by SDSU. Candidates who do not have a Preliminary or Clear Credential, should seek the advice of program faculty.

-

Department of Educational Leadership
Ed.D. in Ed. Leadership PK-12 Concentration
2017 Cohort Program Checklist

NAME: _____

Red ID: _____

TERM: _____

Program Advisor: _____

Year One			
Course	Units	Semester	
ED 815 Re-Thinking Leadership	3	Summer 2017	
ED 830 Leadership for Learning	3	Summer 2017	
ED 851 Seminar in Qualitative Methods of Inquiry	3	Fall 2017	
ED 895 Seminar in Research & Writing	3	Fall 2017	
EDL 880 Seminar in Advanced Topics in Ed. Leadership	3	Spring 2018	
ED 850 Seminar in Quantitative Methods & Inquiry	3	Spring 2018	
ED 840 Seminar in Ed. Leadership in a Diverse Society	3	Summer 2018	
Year Two			
Course	Units	Semester	
Qualifying Exam			
EDL 760 Internship in PreK-12 Educational Organizations	3	Fall 2018	
ED 855 Seminar in Ed. Leadership for Developing Educational Systems	3	Fall 2018	
ED 836 Seminar in Research Support & Writing Support	3	Fall 2018	
EDL 720 Human Resource Development in PreK-12 Educational Organizations	3	Spring 2019	
EDL 707 Education Law & Finance	3	Spring 2019	
ED 836 Seminar in Research Support & Writing Support	3	Spring 2019	
Dissertation Proposal Approval			
ED 860 Seminar in Leadership & Educational Change	3	Summer 2019	
EDL 755 Governance & Policy Development in PreK-12 Learning Organizations	3	Summer 2019	
ED 899 Doctoral Dissertation	6	Summer 2019	
Year Three			
Course	Units	Semester	
ED 885 Seminar in Educational Program Planning & Evaluation	3	Fall 2019	
ED 899 Doctoral Dissertation	6	Fall 2019	
Dissertation Defense			

Comments:

*This is a sample course sequence checklist. Course sequence may be revised per cohort.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
 Graduate and Research Affairs
 Graduate Division

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Program in Educational Leadership

Nomination of the Committee for Qualifying Examinations

Name _____ RED ID _____

Address _____

Email _____ Phone _____

Area of Concentration: _____ PK-12 _____ Community College

In the opinion of the Department of _____, the student named is ready to proceed in the Qualifying Examinations for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.

The following persons, who have agreed to serve, are nominated as the Doctoral Committee for the Qualifying Examination:

Committee Chair	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Approved by:

Graduate Advisor Signature	Date

Dean, Graduate and Research Affairs	Date

Distribution: Graduate Dean, Graduate Advisor, Student

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
 Graduate and Research Affairs
 Graduate Division

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Program in Educational Leadership
Report of Qualifying Examination and Advancement to Candidacy

Name _____ RED ID _____

Address _____

Email _____ Phone _____

Area of Concentration: _____ PK-12 _____ Community College

TO: Dean of Graduate and Research Affairs

The members of the Ed.D. Doctoral Committee for the Qualifying Examination report that the candidate has completed all pre-dissertation requirements in the specialization and has **successfully completed** the qualifying examination on _____ (date). The committee recommends advancement to candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership.

Committee Chair	Signature	Department
-----------------	-----------	------------

Committee Member	Signature	Department	Institution
------------------	-----------	------------	-------------

Committee Member	Signature	Department	Institution
------------------	-----------	------------	-------------

Committee Member	Signature	Department	Institution
------------------	-----------	------------	-------------

Approved by:

Graduate Advisor Signature	Date
----------------------------	------

Dean, Graduate and Research Affairs	Date
-------------------------------------	------

Distribution: Graduate Dean, Graduate Advisor, Student

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
 Graduate and Research Affairs
 Graduate Division
 Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Program in Educational Leadership

Nomination of the Doctoral Dissertation Committee

(Submit only if the Dissertation Committee is different from the Qualifying Examination Committee)

Name _____ RED ID _____

Address _____

Email _____ Phone _____

Area of Concentration: _____ PK-12 _____ Community College

The student named has established eligibility for the nomination of a dissertation committee.

Proposed Title of Dissertation: _____

The following persons, who have agreed to serve, are nominated as the Doctoral Dissertation Committee:

Committee Chair	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Committee Member	Academic Title	Department	Institution

Approved by:

Graduate Advisor Signature	Date

Dean, Graduate and Research Affairs	Date

Distribution: Graduate Dean, Graduate Advisor, Student

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
Graduate and Research Affairs
Graduate Division

Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Program in Educational Leadership

Dissertation Proposal Approval Form

Name _____ RED ID _____

Address _____

Email Address _____

Title of Proposal: _____

Student's Signature _____ Date _____

The following signatures are testimony that the student's proposal has been accepted and that the student may proceed with the dissertation.

Dissertation Committee Signatures

Committee Chair Signature Department

Committee Member Signature Department Institution

Committee Member Signature Department Institution

Committee Member Signature Department Institution

Human Subjects Committee Approval Date: _____
(Attach copy of approval)

Dean, Graduate and Research Affairs Date

Distribution: Graduate Dean, Graduate Advisor, Student

Distribution: Student, Committee Chair, Graduate Advisor

SDSU Ed.D. Dissertation Proposal Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
2 Review of Literature	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings.	
3 Methods / Approach	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	
6 Writing Quality	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 5th edition APA.	
Comments:						

Student's Name: _____

SDSU Ed.D. PK-12 Concentration Qualifying Exam Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
<p>1 Introduction: Problem, purpose, questions or hypotheses</p> <p>1a. Discussion of potential significance to theory, practice, policy</p>	<p>Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose/problem/ questions were unfocused and unclear.</p> <p>Little or no discussion of project. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by elements of the proposed research.</p>	<p>Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose/problem/ questions were poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely connected to the proposed research.</p>	<p>Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose/problem/questions were somewhat focused and clear.</p> <p>Discussion is too brief/excessive. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally appropriate to proposed research.</p>	<p>Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose/problem/ questions were clear and focused.</p> <p>Discussion sufficient but not particularly engaging or thought provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary appropriate to proposed research.</p>	<p>Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose/problem /questions were clear and focused.</p> <p>Brief and concise discussion of significance. Engaging and thought provoking. Conclusions/summary appropriate to proposed research.</p>	
<p>2 Review of Literature</p>	<p>Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.</p>	<p>Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.</p>	<p>Somewhat adequate review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.</p>	<p>Substantial review of literature relevant to the study. Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies.</p>	<p>Substantial review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/ exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings.</p>	
<p>3 Methods / Approach</p> <p>3a. Exploration of Ethical Issues</p>	<p>Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.</p> <p>Inappropriate identification of ethical. Inappropriate strategies/ safeguards for minimizing participant risk.</p>	<p>Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.</p> <p>Inadequate description of the ethical concerns posed by proposed research. Inadequate strategies/ safeguards for minimizing participant risk included.</p>	<p>Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.</p> <p>Somewhat adequate description of the ethical concerns posed by proposed research. Strategies/ safeguards to minimize participant risk not necessarily aligned with proposed research.</p>	<p>Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.</p> <p>Adequate description of the ethical concerns posed by proposed research. Brief mention of strategies/ safeguards to minimize participant risk.</p>	<p>Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.</p> <p>Insightful description of the ethical concerns posed by proposed research. Summary of appropriate strategies/ safeguards to minimize participant risk.</p>	
<p>4 Writing Quality</p>	<p>The exam lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 6th edition APA.</p>	<p>The exam is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 6th edition APA conventions.</p>	<p>The exam is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 6th edition APA conventions.</p>	<p>The exam is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 6th edition APA.</p>	<p>The exam is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 6th edition APA.</p>	

Passing score is an average of 3 on each criteria.

Oral Dissertation Defense Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Organization	Lacked sequence in presentation or missing information. Presented too little/much material for allotted time.	Poor sequence or illogical presentation of information. Some relevant information not presented. Presentation not well timed.	Some information presented out of sequence. Had some pacing and timing problems.	Information presented nearly complete and relevant and presented in logical sequence. Pace and timing appropriate.	Information presented was complete and in logical order. Easy to follow. Very well-timed and well-paced.	
2 Originality	Problem/purpose lacked creativity or not new. Duplication of previous work. Design/approach inappropriate and/or ignored previous well-established work in area.	Problem/purpose limited in originality and creativity. Design/approach only marginally appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose moderately original or creative. Design/approach moderately appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose fairly original or creative. Design/approach appropriate or innovative.	Problem/purpose very creative or original with new and innovative ideas. Explored original topic and discovered new outcomes. Design/approach introduced new or expanded on established ideas.	
3 Significance/ Authenticity	Project has no significance/authenticity to field and will make no contribution.	Project has little relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make little contribution.	Project only moderate relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make a nominal contribution.	Project has fair relevance or significance/authenticity to field and will make good contribution.	Project extremely relevant or has significant importance/authenticity to field and will make an important contribution.	
4 Discussion and Summary	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of material. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Few inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, included no recommendations.	Discussion was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
5 Delivery	Presenter unsettled, uninterested, and unenthused. Presentation was read. Inappropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and poor communication skills. Poor quality of slides/presentation materials; did not enhance presentation/performance.	Presenter unenthused, monotonous and relied extensively on notes. Voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills sometimes inappropriate. Poor quality of slides/presentation material; poor enhancement of presentation/performance.	Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Read small parts of material. Occasionally struggled to find words. Generally appropriate voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Moderate quality of slides/presentation materials.	Relied little on notes. Displayed interest and enthusiasm. Good voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Good quality of slides/presentation materials; enhanced presentation/performance.	Relied little on notes. Expressed ideas fluently in own words. Genuinely interested and enthusiastic. Exceptional voice mannerisms, body language, and communication skills. Exceptional slides/presentation quality materials; greatly enhanced presentation/performance.	

Final passage requires the following: An average score of 3 or above is required on each written dissertation and oral defense criterion. In addition, an overall average of 4 or above is required across all written dissertation and oral defense criteria.

Student's Name: _____ Reviewer's Name: _____

Date: _____

SDSU Ed.D. Written Dissertation Rubric

	1	2	3	4	5	Score
1 Introduction	Failed to convey project in context of literature. No rationale. Purpose was unfocused and unclear.	Vaguely conveyed project in context of literature. Weak rationale. Purpose was poorly focused and not sufficiently clear.	Project moderately conveyed in context of literature. Moderately clear rationale. Purpose was somewhat focused and clear.	Conveyed project within context of literature. Moderately-strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	Clearly conveyed project within context of literature. Strong rationale. Purpose was clear and focused.	
2 Review of Literature	Failed to review literature relevant to the study. No synthesis, critique or rationale. Lacks description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Inadequate review of literature relevant to the study. Poorly organized. Weak rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Insufficient description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Moderately well organized. Some mention of the relatedness of scholarship. Moderately clear rationale for choice of theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Somewhat focused description of research samples, methodologies, & findings.	Review of the literature is fairly well organized, acknowledging the relatedness of the research and scholarship. The rationale for including/excluding various theoretical perspectives/empirical studies are apparent. Includes description of research samples and methodologies.	Comprehensive review of literature relevant to the study. Well organized, with nuanced critique regarding the relatedness of the research and scholarship reviewed. Includes specific criteria for inclusion/exclusion of various theoretical perspectives/ empirical studies. Clearly describes research samples, methodologies, & findings.	
3 Methods / Approach	Little or no description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Inadequate description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Moderate or excessive description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Most detail included/slightly excessive detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/ approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	Appropriate detail in description of (if applicable): subjects, design/approach, methods/procedures, and statistical analyses.	
4 Results /Outcomes	Absence of pertinent results. Table/figures are absent or inappropriate, not labeled, and no legend.	Few pertinent results. Table/figures are inappropriate or incomplete, poorly labeled, and inadequate legend.	Some pertinent results not reported; results presented in clear and concise manner. Table/figures generally labeled appropriately and included legend.	Most pertinent results reported and in fairly clear and concise manner. Table/figures labeled appropriately and included legend.	All pertinent results reported and in clear and concise manner. Table/figures are labeled appropriately and included legend.	
5 Discussion and Summary	Little or no discussion of project findings/outcomes. Displayed poor grasp of understanding. Conclusion/summary not supported by findings/outcomes.	Major topics or concepts inaccurately described. Considerable relevant discussion missing. Conclusions/summary not entirely supported by findings/outcomes.	Discussion is too brief/excessive, needs to be more concise of major findings/outcomes. Several inaccuracies and omissions. Conclusions/summary generally based on findings/outcomes.	Discussion sufficient and with few errors, though not particularly engaging or thought-provoking. Greater foundation needed from past work in area. Conclusions/summary based on outcomes and appropriate, but included no recommendations.	Brief and concise discussion of major findings/outcomes. Was superior, accurate, engaging, and thought-provoking. Conclusions/summaries and recommendations appropriate and clearly based on outcomes.	
6 Writing Quality	The dissertation lacks clarity and precision. Sentences are poorly constructed and confusing. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling reflects poor grasp of basic writing conventions. Narrative absent. Incorrect use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is unclear throughout. Frequent errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative discussion lacks focus and coherence. Frequent errors in use of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is moderately clear. Several errors in word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling. The narrative lacks focus. Uneven application of 5th edition APA conventions.	The dissertation is written with clarity and precision. Writing is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are adequate. The narrative is logical and coherent. Mostly correct use of 5th edition APA.	The dissertation is written with great clarity and precision. Each sentence is understandable. Word choice, grammar, punctuation, and spelling are excellent. The narrative is logical and coherent. Correct use of 5th edition APA.	

Final passage requires the following: An average score of 3 or above is required on each written dissertation and oral defense criterion. In addition, an overall average of 4 or above is required across all written dissertation and oral defense criteria.