




CSUSB
JAMES R. WATSON &
JUDY RODRIGUEZ WATSON
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION



Doctor of Education in Education Leadership
Doctoral Program Guidelines
Cohort 17
2023-2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WELCOME & CONTACT INFORMATION	1
INTRODUCTION	2
PROGRAM OVERVIEW	3
PROGRAM OF STUDY REQUIRED FOR THE DEGREE.....	5
COURSE SCHEDULE	6
CATALOG DESCRIPTION OF COURSES	8
DOCTORAL STANDARDS	11
STUDENT SUPPORT AND SCHOLARLY OPPORTUNITIES	12
ED.D. FACULTY/FACULTY ADVISORS	13
MAINTAINING SATISFACTORY PROGRESS, DISMISSAL, AND APPEAL OF DISMISSAL.....	14
DISSERTATION COMMITTEE AND DISSERTATION PROCESS.....	18
DISSERTATION DEFENSE PROTOCOL.....	24
ROLE OF THE ADVISOR.....	27
ROLE OF THE DISSERTATION CHAIR.....	28
ROLE OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE MEMBER.....	30
MILESTONE GUIDANCE.....	31
DISSERTATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL PROCESS.....	34
CSUSB ED.D. MILESTONE CHECKLIST SPRING THIRD YEAR GRADUATION.....	35
APPENDIX A- FORMS & EVALUATION	38
APPENDIX B- REGULATIONS & PROCEDURES.....	43
ACADEMIC REGULATIONS.....	43
PROFESSIONAL ETHICS.....	45
CSUSB COE PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS & DISMISSAL PROCEDURES.....	46
FEES AND PAYMENT PROCEDURE.....	50
COYOTE ONE CARD	52

PARKING PERMITS	53
STUDENT EMAIL POLICY	54

WELCOME

Dear Cohort 17 Doctoral Scholar-Practitioners,

As we begin our inaugural semester here at California State University, San Bernardino, it is our sincere privilege to welcome you to the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership Program!

Our program is a very special place where we sustain a culture of mutual respect, collaborative inquiry, scholarly practice, and practitioner-oriented academic endeavors. We are pleased that you have joined our program and look forward to working with you through your studies.

Your choice to pursue the doctoral program highlights your dedication to both acquiring and sharpening 21-century leadership skills and increasing your responsibility as educational leaders. It is a clear indication of your ongoing commitment to intellectual challenge in support of diverse environments. We, the faculty and staff of the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership, pledge to offer you the same, and hope you will find in the program a continuing collegiality that sustains you in your leadership roles.

This unique experience is awaiting you and we encourage you to call on the program director, esteemed faculty and dissertation committee members, and program staff for support throughout your academic involvement at CSUSB. We are here to participate in, and to cultivate, your success.

Most sincerely,

Your CSUSB Doctoral Team

Enrique G. Murillo, Jr., Ph.D.
Faculty Director
emurillo@csusb.edu

Karen Escalante, Ed.D.
Faculty Co-Director
karen.escalante@csusb.edu

Stacey Ortiz, Ed.D.
Program Specialist
stacey.ortiz@csusb.edu

Candice Sykes, MPA
Administrative Support
Coordinator
candice.sykes@csusb.edu

Office of Doctoral Studies | College of Education Building, Room 335 | 909 537-5651 | edd.csusb.edu

INTRODUCTION

The *Doctoral Program Guidelines* are designed to serve as a general guide for the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership program and to aid the student's orientation to, and progress in, the program. It is based upon the *2023-2024 Bulletin of Courses of California State University, San Bernardino*. The *Bulletin* represents the official regulations and procedures of the doctoral program and is generally to be relied upon to guide students.

The *Guidelines* will acquaint students (scholar-practitioners) and faculty with the procedures of the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership, with selected policies and regulations of CSU San Bernardino, and with some of the resources available to all as doctoral scholar-practitioners. For many doctoral students with full-time job responsibilities, developing a network of faculty and student colleagues can be a challenge. In addition to attendance in classes, students attend specific seminars that seek to provide guidance and support throughout the doctoral journey.

Special opportunities to meet with the faculty and staff are offered, beginning with the mandatory orientation session in July. These opportunities offer additional ways for scholars to become familiar with the research interests and projects of faculty and peers and to gain insights on such matters as qualifying examinations or finding financial support.

Scholar-practitioners also need to take responsibility for getting to know the CSUSB Ed.D. faculty better through setting up interviews in order to make the best selection for their dissertation committee.

Students are encouraged to work closely with advisors and faculty committees and with program staff to complete the degree requirements.

As doctoral scholar-practitioners, you are responsible for following the procedures outlined in the guidebook and for staying informed of program changes.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

CSUSB Ed.D. in Educational Leadership Mission Statement

Context

The Inland Empire region, comprised of San Bernardino and Riverside counties, faces considerable social, political, and economic challenges. These contextual challenges have a direct impact on the quality of education across the PK-20 educational pipeline. Low-income children, Students of Color, English learners, students with disabilities and many others face resource deficiencies and inequitable opportunities to learn. Educational institutions must effectively respond to these disparities by engaging parents and communities to establish deliberate, co-equal partnerships that result in high-quality centers of educational excellence for the 21st century.

Mission

The mission of the Doctor of Education program is to prepare educational leaders with the knowledge base and skills to lead reform efforts that result in improved student outcomes and who are committed to equity, inclusion, and social justice.

Commitments

We believe 21st century leaders must develop cultures of excellence in their respective institutions and communities where educators and community stakeholders support, inspire, and effectively communicate with one another; establish and maintain a culture of high expectations; celebrate and cherish human relationships; and communicate these values clearly and respectfully with all communities and stakeholders. Our leaders must also become visionary agents of change who can solve pressing problems, are committed to lifelong learning, are innovative, and are technologically savvy. Finally, our leaders must demonstrate integrity, practice self-reflection, and strive towards in-depth knowledge of local cultures and communities.

Through the coursework and design of the program, we will focus on equity, inclusion, and social justice through the following commitments:

- a) *Inclusivity*: of people, perspectives, and purpose when working with students, families, and communities to shape goals and outcomes;
- b) *Student Success*: Relentless promotion of and creation of environments that promote student success readiness at all levels of education;
- c) *Excellence*: Commitment to learning from models of excellence and transforming institutions, when necessary, to demand excellence, opportunity, and equitable outcomes;

- d) *Leadership Development*: Equipping well-prepared educational leaders with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to lead and guide communities in positive change in California's PK-12 and college/university systems;
- e) *Commitment to Praxis*: Building research collaborates around “Community Problems of Practice” that focus on relevant challenges in the field to improve student achievement, opportunity, and community well-being;
- f) *Bridging the Pipeline*: Preparing a pipeline of PK-12 educators/leaders and community college/university leaders with continuous support for career and personal growth;
- g) *Interdisciplinary*: Engaging distinguished faculty and community stakeholders with varied disciplinary perspectives in coursework examining research, theory, and significant challenges; and
- h) *Community Engagement & Development*: Including outstanding community/educational leaders in instructional roles, mentoring roles, and in curricular development as well as programmatic dialogue and decision-making; Vision of stakeholders as partners for educational progress including students, parents, educators, leadership, business partners, non-profits, and others;

California State University, San Bernardino and the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership have been approved and accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The doctoral program is housed in the College of Education which is also accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC).

The faculty members in the California State University, San Bernardino doctoral program represent broadly-based and disciplinary expertise such as educational leadership, curriculum and instruction, educational psychology, counseling, language literacy and culture, science education, quantitative analysis, management, communication, and public administration.

CSU San Bernardino has several active research centers and institutes that help to create the broad-based applied research culture of the program, such as the Institute for Research, Assessment and Professional Development, the Center for Developmental Disabilities, the Institute for Child Development and Family Relations, the Learning Research Institute, the CSUSB Center for the Enhancement of Mathematics Education, and the Community-University Partnership Institute. Faculty have active research programs and/or initiatives, and scholar-practitioners are encouraged to seek out such initiatives as possible dissertation opportunities.

PROGRAM OF STUDY REQUIRED FOR THE DEGREE

The Program of Study is 60 semester units in length and is designed to be completed in three calendar years, including two summers. The 60 semester units include 27 Core course units, 21 Specialization course units, and 12 Dissertation units. There are no units given for the qualifying examination. The course of study is offered as a cohort program with a fixed sequence of courses for all students. If, for any reason, a student must take a leave of absence, they must work with the Doctoral Studies office to develop a new program plan.

Classes normally are taught using the executive model. This model is Friday 5:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. and Saturday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. for only four weeks. Classes are held every other weekend and scholars attend only one class at a time (two classes per semester).

On Saturday mornings the entire cohort will meet together on the San Bernardino campus. For the Friday class, the classes may meet on Zoom. Summer courses are offered for two summers and students **must attend the summer courses**; courses offered in the summer cannot be taken as Independent Study courses during the academic year.

All students complete a dissertation based on a review of the literature and independent research on a community problem of practice related to educational leadership, student achievement, or school/community college improvement. Scholar-practitioners are assisted in planning, researching, and writing the dissertation through research methods courses and meetings with their dissertation chair. The final dissertation should be defended during the spring semester of year three.

Students are strongly encouraged to plan ahead to finish all coursework and the dissertation within three years.

Regarding requirements for graduation, the [CSUSB Bulletin](#) serves as the document to be followed:

[Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership Community College Specialization](#)

[Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership, PK-12 Specialization](#)

Year 1 – Semesters

Program Plan Cohort 17 (Beginning FALL 2023)





Fall 2023	Spring 2024	Summer 2024
<p><u>EDDL 7801 Scientific Inquiry (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDUC 7907 Diversity and Equity in Education (3) (All) (Core)</u></p>	<p><u>EDDL 7901 Theories and Principles of Leadership (3)</u></p> <p><u>EDDL 7902 Leadership and Educational Reform (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p> General Acknowledgement (Form 1) Annual Student Review (Form 2) Program Plan PK12 Program Plan CC </p>	<p><u>EDDL 7803 Applied Qualitative Research (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDDL 7020 Foundations of Community Colleges and Other Higher Education Institutions (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDDL 7012 Foundations of Leadership in PK-12 Institutions (3) (PreK-12) (Specialization)</u></p> <p> Dissertation Committee Approval (Form 5) </p>
Total: 6 units	Total: 6 units	Total: 6 units

Year 2 – Semesters

Fall 2024	Spring 2025	Summer 2025
<p><u>EDDL 7802 Applied Quantitative Research (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDUC 7908 Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p>EDDL 7980 Qualifying Exam (QE) (0) (ALL)</p> <p> Application for the QE (Form 3) Report of Completion of QE & Advancement to Candidacy (Form 4) Update Program Plan for advancement to candidacy </p>	<p><u>EDDL 7905 Field-based Practicum in PK-20 Settings (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDDL 7903 Leadership and Fiscal Management (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p> Scheduling of the Proposal Defense (Form 6) Completion of Proposal Oral Defense & Sum of changes (Form 7) Update Program Plan Update Annual Student Review IRB forms and approval letter (check IRB website) </p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete Ch 1-3 by March & send to committee for review 2 weeks before preliminary defense Schedule preliminary defense between April & May By May & post preliminary defense submit CITI Certification, IRB application* <p>*See IRB Process Flow Chart</p>	<p><u>EDUC 7420 Career and Technical Education Leadership in Community Colleges (3) (All) (Core and Research)</u></p> <p><u>EDUC 7412 Leadership in Pupil Personnel Services (3) (PreK-12) (Specialization)</u></p> <p><u>EDDL 7904 Human Resources Development and Management (3) (All) (Core)</u></p> <p>• After IRB approval, collect data (June-October)</p>
Total: 6 units	Total: 6 units	Total: 6 units

Program Plan Cohort 17 (Beginning FALL 2023) (Cont.)

Year 3 - Semesters

Fall 2025	Spring 2026	Summer 2026
<p>EDDL 7120 Leadership for Teaching and Learning In Community College/Higher Education (3) (CC) (Specialization)</p> <p>EDDL 7112 Leadership for Teaching and Learning in PreK-12f (3) (PreK-12) (Specialization)</p> <p>EDDL 7220 Higher Education Organization, Governance and Policy (3) (CC) (Specialization)</p> <p>EDDL 7212 Public School Organization, Governance, and Policy (3) (PreK-12)(Specialization)</p> <p>EDDL 7804 Dissertation Study (6) (All)</p> <p> Update Program Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After IRB approval, collect data (June-October) If graduating Spring 2026, file for a Graduation Check Between November-January: enter & analyze data, draft Ch 4 & send to chair, work on Ch 5 while waiting for feedback 	<p>ESPE 7906 Leadership in Program Development for</p> <p>EDDL 7320 Assessment and Data Drive Decision-ma (3)(CC) (Specialization)</p> <p>EDDL 7312 Assessment and Data Driven Decision-m</p> <p>EDDL 7804 Dissertation Study (6) (All) Final</p> <p>Dissertation Defense</p> <p> Update Program Plan</p> <p> Scheduling of the Final Defense (Form 8)</p> <p> Completion of the Dissertation Final Defense (Form 9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between January-March finalize Ch 4-5 By March distribute entire dissertation to committee 2 weeks before final defense By April complete final defense Check with Graduate Studies for submission deadlines & how to submit to ScholarWorks Order cap and gown around February 	<p>(Anyone who has not completed by Spring 2026, must continuously enroll in each semester until the program has been completed)</p> <p>*Continuous Enrollment must be maintained through graduation</p> <p>Dissertation work is contingent upon availability of faculty during the summer.</p> <p>File for a Graduation Check a semester before graduation</p>
Total: 12 units	Total: 12 units	

KEY:

Courses for PreK-12

Courses for CC


Courses for All

Total : 60 units

Core Courses

Specialization Courses

Dissertation Units

 Send documents to edd@csusb.edu

	PreK-12	CC
Year 1:	18 Sem. Hrs.	18 Sem. Hrs.
Year 2:	18 Sem. Hrs.	18 Sem. Hrs.
Year 3:	24 Sem. Hr s.	24 Sem. Hrs.
Total:	60 Sem. Hrs.	60 Sem. Hrs.

CATALOG DESCRIPTIONS OF COURSES

EDDL 7801 - Scientific Inquiry: Offers guided practice in the critical review and application of current educational literature, the development of comprehensive research questions and/or hypothesis development, and design of basic quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods through a field-based problem of practice approach. Three hours seminar and two hours activity. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7802 - Applied Quantitative Research: - Offers guided practice in developing and conducting quantitative research in education. Supports the design and application of quantitative studies adhering to rigorous scientific standards, including data analysis and write up. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7803 – Applied Qualitative Research: Offers guided practice in developing and conducting qualitative research in education. Supports the design and application of qualitative studies adhering to rigorous research standards, data analysis and write up. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7901 – Theories and Principles of Leadership: Examines the relationships between theories of educational leadership, applied research, and practice in PK-12 school districts and community colleges. The course provides a context for understanding the current and emerging nature and roles of educational leaders and the importance of visionary leadership based on a shared vision and ethical decision-making. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7902 – Leadership and Educational Reform: Explores governing educational policy, including significant laws, legal principles, recent litigation, teacher and faculty rights and duties, administrative behavior, board relationships and labor management relations. Focuses on connections between legislative and judicial action and the social, political and economic forces affecting education and leadership practice. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7903 - Leadership and Fiscal Planning in Complex Organizations: Methods of financing public education. Identifies budgeting and accounting techniques used by school districts and college leaders in support of the instructional process and considers legal requirements and public reactions to the financing of education and resource allocation to achieve student outcomes. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7904 – Human Resources Development and Management: This course examines leadership issues surrounding human resources in PK-20 contexts, including: state and federal laws, union relations, employee hiring and evaluation, professional development, and capacity building. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7905 - Field-based Practicum in PK-20 Settings: Field-based experiences that enhance leadership practice and provide for significant interaction in either PK-12 and/or community college/higher education settings. (3 units) (ALL)

ESPE 7906 - Leadership in Program Development for Students with Disabilities:

Leadership and administration of programs for students with disabilities, including the review of legislative authority and state and federal regulations. Emphasis will be placed on accessibility and inclusive practices. (3 units) (ALL)

EDUC 7907 – Diversity and Equity in Education: This course prepares educational leaders to promote equity and diversity in PK-20. In-depth focus on issues of race, class, gender, immigrant status, sexual orientation and identity, language, and other forms of marginalization. Students review theories, interpret policies, and develop inclusive leadership practices. (3 units) (ALL)

EDUC 7908 - Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Leadership ethics and the utilization of principles of personal balance in daily life and work. Covers decision-making theories and how decisions are made at various levels in PreK-12 and community college/higher education to effectuate positive and sustaining change. (3 units) (ALL)

EDDL 7012 - Foundations of Leadership in PK-12 Institutions: Provides an in-depth overview of California's PK-12 education system. Students will use critical thinking to analyze and evaluate the complexities of historical, philosophical, and socio-political aspects of PK-12 education systems. Emphasizes impact of leadership on societal and legal issues affecting relationships between PK-12 and higher education. (3 units) (PK-12)

EDDL 7112 - Leadership for Teaching and Learning in PK-12: This course presents leadership skills, strategies, and models for leading, teaching, and learning. Emphasizes leadership for improving teaching strategies related to learning theories, instructional reform, and professional development for school improvement. (3 units) (PK-12)

EDDL 7212 - Public School Organization, Governance, and Policy: Examines PK-12 governance and policy at the district, county, state, and federal level using organizational theories. The course focuses on leaders applying practices that connect legislative and judicial action with social, political, and economic forces affecting PK-12. (3 units) (PK-12)

EDDL 7312 - Assessment and Data Driven Decision-Making in PK-12: Establishes the understanding and application of assessment and evaluation to inform leadership practices that promote equitable student outcomes. This course will focus on the concepts and processes of conducting program evaluation using a variety of evaluation models. (3 units) (PK-12)

EDUC 7412 - Leadership in Pupil Personnel Services: Leadership roles in providing the array of pupil personnel services including counseling, school psychology, speech therapy, and other adjunct or related services. Examines the key role that these services represent in overall program design and operation. (3 units) (PK-12)

EDDL 7020 - Foundations of Community Colleges and Other Higher Education Systems: Provides an in-depth overview of California's higher education system. Students will use critical thinking to analyze and evaluate the complexities of historical, philosophical, and socio-political aspects of higher education systems. Emphasizes impact of leadership on societal and legal issues affecting relationships between higher education and PK-12. (3 units) (CC)

EDDL 7120 - Leadership for Teaching and Learning in Community College/Higher

Education: Presents teaching and learning theories, policies, and practices that a leader can engage to foster college student transition, persistence, and completion. Emphasizes leadership practices that coordinate resources, improve student learning, and foster academic achievement for diverse student populations in the community college and higher education sector. (3 units) (CC)

EDDL 7220 - Higher Education Organization, Governance, and Policy: Examines higher education governance and policy at the institutional, state, and federal level using organizational theories. The advanced course focuses on leaders applying practices that connect legislative and judicial action with social, political, and economic forces affecting higher education. (3 units) (CC)

EDDL 7320 – Assessment and Data Driven Decision-Making in Community

Colleges/Higher Education: Establishes the understanding and application of assessment and evaluation to inform leadership practices that promote equitable student outcomes and sustain the health of higher education. (3 units) (CC)

EDUC 7420 - Career and Technical Education Leadership in Community College:

Examines the leadership role of career and technical education in community colleges and its overall mission. Focus areas will include the relationships between PK-12 and community college programs with emphasis on state and federal regulations. (3 units) (CC)

EDDL 7804 - Dissertation Study: Directed independent study. Students prepare their dissertations with faculty support. Dissertation focus is primarily on problems of practice and leadership roles that impact the regional service region. (3 units for each registration for a total of 12 units) (ALL)

DOCTORAL STANDARDS

In general, doctoral study offers students more complex ideas and demands more sophisticated techniques, research, and critical analysis than either graduate or undergraduate study. Extensive research is required in the program and high-quality writing is expected. Scholar-practitioners are advised to consider these factors before committing to a rigorous doctoral program.

Ed.D. scholar-practitioners are required to demonstrate professional behavior in all aspects of the program. Scholars are expected to be knowledgeable about and adhere to the professional standards for the field as well as the University standards outlined in the Schedule of Classes and Catalog, especially the sections on Student Conduct, Graduate Admission, and Academic Dishonesty.

Doctoral scholar-practitioners in the Ed.D. Program are expected to demonstrate:

- Personal responsibility and accountability
- Respect for all individuals enriched by an understanding of culture and diversity
- Commitment to lifelong learning
- Commitment to working collaboratively
- A wide range of knowledge and skills
- An understanding of the necessity of theory to ground practice
- Ethical character (demonstrating integrity and trustworthiness, honesty, courteousness, an open mind, the treatment of all others with fairness and impartiality)

STUDENT SUPPORT AND SCHOLARLY OPPORTUNITIES

University Ombuds Services

<https://www.csusb.edu/ombuds>

CSUSB ScholarWorks: Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations

https://libguides.csusb.edu/submit_thesis

John M. Pfau Library

<https://www.csusb.edu/library>

Office of Graduate Studies

<https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies>

Counseling and Psychological Services

<https://www.csusb.edu/caps>

CSUSB Graduate Writing Center

<https://www.csusb.edu/writing-center/graduate-writing-center>

Obsershaw Den

<https://www.csusb.edu/basic-needs/food-security/obershaw-den>

Ed.D. PROGRAM FACULTY

Faculty Members

The Ed.D. program consists of full-time or FERPING CSUSB faculty and doctoral qualified community partners with expertise in either PK-12 or Community College/Higher Education educational leadership. Ed.D. program faculty must demonstrate an active record of scholarly work such as presentations and publications. The purposes of the Ed.D. program faculty are to teach Ed.D. courses and to serve as chairs and/or committee members on doctoral student dissertation committees. Ed.D. faculty who have not previously chaired a dissertation committee must have at a minimum served on a dissertation committee before serving as a dissertation chair.

Previous Ed.D. Faculty Website (as of Summer 2022): <https://www.csusb.edu/doctorate-educational-leadership/faculty>

New Ed.D. Faculty Website Update (as of 8/16/21): <https://www.csusb.edu/doctorate-educational-leadership/program-faculty>

Faculty Advisors

Students are advised by the program directors and program specialist during the first year of the program. After the Qualifying Exam, students will select their dissertation chairs. They may approach faculty to serve as the chair before this time if they have a topic and feel they are ready to select a chair. Once the student and the faculty member agree to this relationship, the dissertation chair becomes the student's faculty advisor. The Role of the Faculty Advisor is addressed later in this handbook.

Dissertation chairs may only be changed in extreme circumstances and these changes must be approved by the program director.

Normally, faculty members will chair no more than two student dissertation committees from one cohort at a time. A faculty member can petition the program director for a waiver of this limit.

MAINTAINING SATISFACTORY PROGRESS, DISMISSAL, AND APPEAL OF DISMISSAL

Time limits for Matriculation to Degree

The Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership is designed for completion of the degree requirements in three years. Completion of degree requirements between three and a half and four years is normally acceptable. The qualifying examination will be taken after completion of core courses. A student may not advance to candidacy until they have passed the qualifying examination. The total time to qualifying examination and advancement to candidacy may not exceed three years, unless there are mitigating circumstances and the doctoral faculty and program director have approved the extension; such extension may not exceed one year.

Total registered time in the Ed.D. program is not expected to exceed five years, and extension beyond this period requires approval by the Ed.D. faculty and program director. Extension of the period for degree completion beyond the period of five years is normally granted to students in good academic standing, not to exceed a two-year period. It is the student's sole responsibility to cover all tuition fees during these extensions as financial aid is not available in the form of loans or otherwise for students who do not complete their degree within the allotted three-year period. During the two-year extension period, continuation each term after the extension is granted requires determination of satisfactory progress by the Ed.D. faculty and program director.

Extension of the period by more than two years can be granted only under special circumstances and is based upon approval by the Ed.D. faculty and program director. Such extension requires that the student has maintained currency in the field, including current literature, coursework validation, and research in the field. Scholar-practitioners must maintain continuous enrollment and pay full fees during any granted extensions.

Satisfactory Progress

Scholar-practitioners are expected to maintain satisfactory progress toward approved academic objectives in accordance with the Ed.D. program of study. Students must maintain continuous enrollment in the program in order to be considered a student in good standing. Only courses included in the Ed.D. program of study will be used in the grade point average (GPA) calculation that determines the satisfactory progress of an enrolled doctoral student.

In order for a student to maintain satisfactory progress in the doctoral program, several standards must be met. First, the student must maintain at least a 3.0 cumulative grade point average throughout the program. Second, the student may not have a grade point average below a 3.0 in any two terms. Students who fall below a 3.0 grade point average in a semester will be notified that they are on academic probation. In addition, students receiving two "C's" in courses will be dismissed from the program unless one of the courses with a "C" grade is repeated and the grade improved. Students will be advised in writing that they are on academic probation after receiving the first "C" and will be dismissed immediately after receiving the second "C" in any course in their program of study.

The student must advance to candidacy and complete all courses and examinations satisfactorily in the time period specified by the program guidelines.

Incomplete Grades

Students will be allowed to carry no more than 2 incomplete grades. After receiving 1 incomplete grade, the student will receive a letter of warning and placed on Academic Probation by the program director. Students who are on academic probation normally will not be permitted to enroll in additional courses until all incompletes are cleared. Students must meet with the program director(s) to appeal this restriction or to determine any other course of action the student must take to rectify the situation. Students should refer to the appropriate Bulletin year for further details.

Normally, it is expected that the student will make up an “I” (Incomplete) grade during the next semester. However, the incomplete must be made up within one calendar year immediately following the last day of the semester during which it was assigned. This limitation prevails whether or not the student maintains continuous enrollment. Failure to complete the assigned work will result in the “I” becoming a failing grade for grade point average computation. A student may be dismissed from the program if the deadline for rectifying incomplete grades outlined above is not met. Incomplete grades must be cleared before a degree is awarded. In the absence of the instructor who has assigned the incomplete, a student seeking to make up this grade should consult with the program director(s).

Dismissal

If a student receives a grade point average below 3.0 in a second semester, they will be dismissed from the program. Students may appeal their dismissal through the appropriate appeal process established by the Ed.D. faculty. After consultation with the Ed.D. faculty, students who fail to make satisfactory academic progress and are recommended for dismissal from the program by the Ed.D. faculty will be notified officially in writing. A student who has been dismissed from the program, which has the effect of being terminated from the University, will not be allowed to continue in the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, enroll in doctoral-level courses, or register again in that doctoral program, without application and readmission.

Appeal of Dismissal

To ensure that a decision to dismiss a student from the program is just, basic due process requirements set by the University Graduate Division must be met.

Attendance

Scholar-practitioners are expected to attend all classes and be active participants. Students who must miss class because of an emergency must contact the instructor prior to class; it is expected that these events will be rare. Students who miss class for any reason may be administratively withdrawn from the course by the instructor. A student being administratively withdrawn from a course means that the student must retake the entire course when it is next offered (normally one year later). Students should also make every effort to be on time for class and not plan on leaving early. Scholar-practitioners are valuable partners in the teaching

and learning process and attendance is vital to higher level academic learning.

Doctoral Culture

The Ed.D. is the highest degree attainable for educational practitioners, and is known as a terminal degree. Therefore, it is important that students have the utmost expectations of themselves as learners and scholar-practitioners in a higher-level academic environment. It is the doctoral student's responsibility to:

- Communicate effectively with faculty, faculty members, staff members, dissertation chairs and or committee members
- Exercise the highest integrity in all aspects of their work
- Work towards their degree in a timely fashion

Policy and Procedures for the Qualifying Exam and Advancement to Candidacy

To be eligible to take the Qualifying Exam, scholar practitioners must:

- Satisfactorily complete all Core Courses through their second fall semester (including clearing all incomplete grades)
- Satisfy any conditions associated with admission

The Qualifying Examination

The qualifying examination consists of scenario-based questions related to material covered during the Core Courses. Each faculty member teaching a Core course will develop two questions (one focusing on PreK-12 and one focusing on CC/HE) pertaining to their course material and a scoring rubric outlining what is acceptable in a student response.

The questions written for PreK-12 and CC/HE will generally be the same differentiated by the context (PreK-12 and CC/HE). The director (or designee) will randomly select four questions to be given to each student **one month** before the qualifying exam. At the time of the exam, three of those questions will be randomly selected for each student to be addressed during the four-hour testing time. These questions will be given to the student at the time of the exam. Students will address the questions in depth, based on their core course materials.

As noted above, students will have four hours to take the exam, will use an on-campus computer lab, and will not have access to references (hard copy or online). Two faculty members will monitor the exam.

An ad-hoc Qualifying Examination Committee will be appointed each year and the Director (or designee) will select the questions, administer the exam, select the exam readers, and also read and score some of the qualifying examinations (as appropriate). The faculty whose question was given during the exam will be assigned as first score reviewer. Another core faculty member who is familiar with the subject area will be the second reviewer. All exams are graded blindly by faculty. If there is a significant difference between the two readers, a third reader will be asked to read the paper. The two most similar scores will be used for that paper.

Students will be given two opportunities to pass the qualifying exam. If a student fails the first exam they will be tested on a new question(s) from the same content area(s) in which they did not pass. The question(s) will not be made available to the student prior to the examination date. The re-examination will be administered similar to the first examination. The re-examination must be taken within 30 days of the notification that the student did not pass the question on the first exam, unless otherwise approved by the program director. Exam time will be calculated depending on the number of retake questions. For example, if the student only needs to retake one question they will be given one hour and fifteen minutes to answer the question. It is highly recommended that any student needing to retake any part of the qualifying exam set up a meeting with the instructor for the content area not passed to gain a better understanding of the content before the re-examination.

If the student does not pass the examination after the second attempt, the student will be dismissed from the program and not permitted to take additional courses. Students who wish to appeal the decision made on their qualifying examination must use the university process for grade appeals.

Advancement to Candidacy

When the student has passed the qualifying exam and completed the selection of the dissertation committee, the student will update their Program Plan Form: [PK12, Community College](#) and complete all other relevant forms and send it/them to the Doctoral Studies office. The Program Plan will be forwarded to the Office of the Registrar by the Program Office so the student may be advanced to candidacy.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE AND DISSERTATION PROCESS

Choosing a Topic and Refining a Topic

Choosing a topic for a dissertation project is a process rather than an instant decision. It involves participating in various forms of conversation that gradually shape up the topic into a format that makes possible a significant investigation.

Identify a Field of Interest

The first focus of these conversations should be on identifying a field of interest.

Identify a Topic within the Field

Within this field of interest it is likely that there will be a range of specific topics that you are interested in. To follow them all can amount to a lifetime's work, so it is necessary to narrow them down and select a particular focus for one study (if you intend to graduate).

Identify a Specific Problem

Once you have narrowed down the field of study to a specific area, the next step is to identify a specific problem that can be addressed through empirical study. Not all problems can be addressed empirically so it is important to be careful here.

Construct a Research Question

An identified problem leads to the asking of a question that will form the basis of inquiry. This is your research question. It may have several sub-questions that together lead you to being able to answer the main question.

Decide How You Will Collect Data to Answer the Question

Then you have to identify a process of collecting data that will be relevant to addressing that question. All this is necessary before you start to collect the data. It is not a simple straightforward process of decision-making that can be done in half an hour. Often it contains many false starts, revisions, gradual refinements over time, and last minute alterations in the process of writing the final document. But the process has to start somewhere and it often requires patience to stay with it through its twists and turns and through the surmounting of unexpected obstacles.

A Conversation

In practice, the process described above does not happen in one person's mind in isolation, even when, in the final written version, it may look so. The topic actually develops in conversation with others.

One conversation that students need to become familiar with is the one that is taking place in the literature in a field of interest. Before writing something into this conversation you should

take care to read what others are saying in this conversation. Your topic will usually be in some way a response to what others are saying. It is extremely rare for a student, or even a professor, to initiate a brand new conversation. Eventually your reading of this conversation will feed into your literature review. And you have to first demonstrate that you are listening to what others are saying, before you can earn the right to contribute your two cents worth.

Another conversation you need to participate in is with prospective committee members. To work with your committee, it is important to find people that you can work with because they hold similar interests. They may have programs of research they are engaged in that you can participate in.

Conversations in class with other students and in class assignments can also help develop your topic as well.

When you have settled on a field of study and are refining a problem into a research question, expect to have a series of conversations with your committee in order to refine the study into a research question that can be investigated. This conversation is often not a brief step that can be quickly accomplished so that the ‘real’ work can begin. It is a major part of the ‘real’ work and sometimes amounts to half of the exercise. It is often not complete until lots of reading into the literature has been done and sometimes the data collected itself requires further revisiting of the topic in the very process of data analysis.

Forming a Committee

Forming a committee for a dissertation project is critical for the successful completion of the project. It should, therefore, be approached with care and not rushed. Choosing a committee chair is particularly important since it is necessary to work closely with this person over time.

Forming a committee involves a two-way contract and both parties need to be conscious of the implications of making a commitment to your project. Remember that being a committee chair is a substantial commitment on the part of a professor and it must fit with their own professional trajectory before they take it on.

An ideal approach is to hold frank exploratory conversations with several possible committee chairs before making any commitment on either side. Of course, sometimes there are not many options within your field of study and the choice appears more obvious. But even then, an exploratory contracting conversation is advisable.

The following are some suggested questions that might serve as an agenda for such a conversation:

To the Student

- a) What is your field of interest? Why are you interested in that? How has this interest developed?
- b) How does that interest relate to your previous experience (personal or professional)?
- c) What have you read about this topic so far?
- d) Where might that topic lead you in future? What might be the eventual value to you of studying this topic?
- e) How much do you know about my work in this area?

- f) Why are you approaching me?
- g) When do you plan to complete this project?
- h) How does this project fit into other things happening in your life (work, family, other commitments) that may compete for your attention?
- i) What is your style of working? How might this kind of project stretch you beyond what you have done in the past and demand that you develop new ways of working?
- j) How would you assess your own writing skills?
- k) What specific kinds of help do you anticipate you might need from your committee in relation to this project?
- l) How will you allocate time to this project? How will you use the summer to advance the project?
- m) How much do you prefer to work closely with your committee or independently?
- n) Do you prefer a highly structured or more easygoing, casual approach to supervision?
- o) Do you have any plans to move to a different area before the dissertation/thesis is complete?

To the Professor

- a) Here is what I am interested in ... Is that something that interests you? Does it connect with what you have worked on in the past (either in your own research or with other students)?
- b) What have you written in this area that I could read?
- c) Do you have a program of research that you are pursuing that I could join in?
- d) How many dissertations, theses or research projects have you chaired or been a committee member for in the past?
- e) How many other students' committees are you currently involved in? Do you have the time to commit to mine?
- f) What is your style of supervision? How do you prefer to work with students working on a project?
- g) How do you try to balance the provision of encouragement and critique of student work?
- h) How much help can you offer me, on the basis of past experience, with regard to specific areas (conceptual; theoretical; data collection methods; data analysis methods; thesis/dissertation writing) for this topic?
- i) Are there gaps in what you can offer me that might guide my choices of other committee members?
- j) What other students have you worked with who could help me understand whether your style of working will suit me?
- k) When I submit drafts of my work to you, how long should I expect to wait for feedback?
- l) How often do you prefer to meet? Where? What sort of meetings do you hold with students? Whose responsibility is it to set the agenda? Who should take notes or minutes?
- m) Do you prefer a highly structured or more easygoing, casual approach to supervision?
- n) Do you have any upcoming sabbatical or other leave plans or trips away I should know about? What is your availability during the summer?
- o) Do you know any sources of funding that might support my study?
- p) How much experience do you have with the IRB process at this university? Are you willing to come with me to an IRB meeting if necessary?
- p) In what formats do you prefer to receive student work? Paper or electronic? PC or Mac? Pdf or Word? Line spacing? Do you use track changes? Etc.
- q) I am considering also inviting Dr. X. to be on my committee. Would you work well with this person? Who else would you recommend?

- r) If things change, for whatever reason, can we renegotiate our commitment?

What You Can Expect of a Committee

You will work most closely with your committee chair (sometimes this will also include a co-chair) who will supervise the development of the dissertation proposal, an application to the IRB for ethical approval (if required), and the writing of the various chapters of the final study.

Other members of your committee may be more or less closely involved in the process according to their interest and your need.

When the dissertation is complete, all members of the committee will be involved in reading your study and assessing it. For a doctoral dissertation, this will also involve the committee members being present for your Oral Defense.

You Can Expect the Following from your Committee Chair

- Be available for regular meetings to supervise and guide your progress
- Discuss with you the appointment of other committee members
- Assign you tasks to complete
- Read the work you submit within a reasonable timeframe
- Provide encouragement and helpful feedback
- Make suggestions for macro-editing and sometimes micro-editing
- Be honest with you if your work is not adequate
- Attend a meeting with the IRB alongside you (if required)
- Act as your academic advisor through a doctoral degree
- Attend to administrative responsibilities within the university
- Treat you and your views with respect
- Listen to and address any concerns you express
 - about the process
 - about the relationship between you and any committee members (including the chair)
 - about any judgments of your work made by committee members.

You Cannot Expect the Following from your Committee Chair (or Committee Members)

- Find literature for you
- Collect the data for you
- Write pieces of the study for you
- Copy edit your dissertation
- Automatically agree with your views or conclusions about the data

- Grant you a passing grade for your project if it is not complete or adequate
- Drop his/her other responsibilities in order to read your work
- immediately provide feedback within impossibly short timeframes

You Can Expect Your Committee Members to Do the Following

- Be available for consultation about specific areas of your work in which they have expertise
- Read the work you submit within a reasonable timeframe
- Provide encouragement and helpful feedback
- Be honest with you if your work is not adequate
- Treat you and your views with respect

Your Committee Can Expect the Following of You

- Take primary responsibility for your own project
- Be available to meet with your chair and committee
- Attend supervision meetings prepared to address issues you are encountering
- Bring an agenda to meetings with your committee and take your own notes of what comes out of the meeting
- Make yourself familiar with university and college deadlines and requirements for project presentation and formatting
- Type, copy edit, and spell-check your own work
- Give your committee time to read at least two drafts of your dissertation, thesis or project
- Follow through on what you say you will do
- Respond to feedback
- Establish your own timetable for completion
- Meet deadlines

Disputes with Committees

From time-to-time, issues can arise that lead to conflict between students and committee members. It is understandable that this can happen because dissertations projects often involve things that both students and faculty are passionate about and have personal commitment to.

Differences can arise on ideological or methodological grounds, which can necessitate a change in the make-up of the committee, including the chair. Changes can also result from student decisions to change direction and alter the topic to an extent that different faculty expertise needs to be called upon.

It is therefore not impossible for a committee to be changed. However, while the student needs to have an important say in and can initiate such a change, it also needs to be recognized that a committee is appointed in the end by the Director or Coordinator of the program and the Dean. They therefore have the final say about such a change.

There are some reasons why change of committee would not be justified. Objecting to a chair

or committee member insisting on high academic standards, for example, is not a good reason for a committee change.

Nor should the decision to change a committee be taken hastily or without sufficient discussion. Students should recognize that changes in committee personnel have implications for faculty members as well as for themselves. Timely progress toward project completion is also very likely to be impeded by changes to the makeup of a committee – another reason why the decision should not be taken hastily and lightly.

A process of decision-making should be involved rather than simple action on a spur-of-the-moment decision. Students should be expected to discuss with a professor the reasons for their concerns and both the student and the professor should be expected to attempt to address these concerns without disrupting committee membership. If this effort is not successful then the next step should be to involve the program director or coordinator or the department chair.

Reference

Cone, J.D. & Foster, S. L. (2006). *Dissertations and theses from start to finish: Psychology and related fields* (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

DISSERTATION DEFENSE PROTOCOL

The Candidate, Dissertation Defense and room location are announced one week prior to the event. This announcement is made to Doctoral faculty, College of Education faculty, doctoral students, and the campus via email. The announcement appears outside the Office of Doctoral Studies.

Welcome: The Chair introduces the committee members and the candidate. Observers are given instructions about how they may and may not participate.

Dissertation defenses are open to any interested member of the academic or professional community (other program or non-program faculty members, other program students or graduates, and so on). Only the committee members and the graduate studies dean are allowed to ask the candidate questions following the defense. Others in attendance are only allowed to observe the presentation.

Guests, adult friends or family members may attend, but this should be approved by the committee chair ahead of time. The doctoral studies office must be informed at least one week ahead of time of the numbers of guests who will attend.

It is not the purpose of the presentation to substitute for the committee's reading. The committee has already read the dissertation document and given detailed written feedback. The Dissertation Defense is to demonstrate that the candidate can speak to what they did.

1. **Presentation of Dissertation by Candidate: (30) Minutes**

The Candidate is expected to provide a concise description of the Dissertation. In doing so, the Candidate is expected to describe:

- a. The problem examined and its importance
- b. The research methodology (e.g., sample, data collection, data analysis)
- c. The findings of the study
- d. Study conclusions and implications

2. **Questions Asked by Dissertation Committee Members: (35) minutes**

Dissertation Committee Members ask the Candidate questions that they consider warrant discussion with the Candidate prior to approval of the Dissertation. These questions may pertain to such matters as why particular approaches were or were not taken by the Candidate, the meaning of the data contained in the Dissertation, or the relationship of the Dissertation findings to other studies.

3. **Concluding Statement by Candidate: (5) Minutes**

During this period, the Candidate may be asked to make concluding comments. This is an opportunity for the Candidate to clarify unresolved issues. The Candidate may wish to return to specific questions asked by Committee members if they have more information to add.

In addition, the concluding statement might address areas for future research. As applicable, this might relate to both (a) further analyses to address issues raised by the Committee and (b) additional questions for study that derive from the Dissertation research and which the Candidate considers important. Finally, the Candidate should end with a brief concluding statement. It should summarize the significance of the dissertation in terms of the contribution it makes to the area of study.

4. Discussion by Dissertation Committee Members (20 Minutes)

The defending student and all guests are asked to leave the room while committee members discuss the candidate's dissertation and defense of it and will vote on whether to (a) approve it, (b) approve it with minor modifications, or (c) request additional work on it. Approval of the Dissertation (a or b) requires a unanimous vote of the three Committee Members. In the event that additional work is needed, a written agreement (the form to be used is available online: [Completion of the Dissertation Final Defense](#)) should be completed. The Committee's decision will be communicated immediately to the Candidate.

Dissertation Proposal Decision

The dissertation proposal is typically the first three chapters of the dissertation in draft form, which constitutes the foundation for the dissertation study. The dissertation proposal will be submitted to the student's dissertation committee approximately 2 weeks before the proposal defense. The chair will convene the dissertation committee. The examination will consist of an oral discussion about the proposal, which includes a definition of the topic, research design, and initial data collection instruments in addition to a timeline for completion. This information should be included visually for a presentation. The dissertation chair reserves the right to guide included content for the presentation and written proposal. The committee will make suggestions at the time of the examination for refinement of the research topic, question, design and data collection tools.

If the majority of committee members feel that the student has met the standard for proceeding, then the committee will signify this by signing the Dissertation Proposal Decision form. If the committee feels that the study is not appropriate or well defined or that the student is not adequately prepared to complete the study, the student may be required to resubmit and present the proposal again at a date determined by the committee.

The committee will review the proposal based on the following criteria:

- 1) Definition of educational issue
- 2) Use of professional literature
- 3) Research design
- 4) Plan for completion

The details of each criteria are located on the reverse side of the decision form. The committee will rate the proposal as: a) approved as written; b) approved with minor revisions; or c) revise and resubmit. The form will be signed by the student, chair and

committee, and the Program Director. Under no circumstances should a student proceed with the collection of their data until:

- a) their dissertation proposal has been approved by their committee as evidenced by the Proposal Decision Form signed by all parties concerned and submitted to the doctoral studies office, and
- b) they have received an official approval letter from the IRB and that letter has been submitted to the doctoral studies office.

Report of the Dissertation Defense/Final Examination

The [Completion of the Dissertation Final Defense](#) form is filled out after the adequacy of the dissertation has been completed. Generally, this form is signed at the time of the Dissertation Defense. The dissertation will either be approved unanimously or not unanimously and recommended or not recommended. If not recommended on the first attempt, then a written agreement will be made outlining the steps the student will need to meet the defense requirements. The form will be signed by the student, committee chair and all members, and Program Director. The [Committee Certification Form](#) (required by the Office of Graduate Studies) is also required at the time the dissertation is submitted and is the responsibility of the student to obtain and submit this form. See Graduate Studies: [The Review Process Website](#) for additional details.

Adequacy of the Dissertation

This form may be attached to the Report of the Dissertation, showing the Quality Indicator for each section. There is no signature required for this form. The three-chapter model for the proposal and the five-chapter model for the dissertation are the preferred models.

ROLE OF THE ADVISOR

The student is expected to meet with the advisor (s) at least by the end of the spring semester of the first year. Program Directors and Program Specialist will serve as student advisors until the student selects a dissertation chair. The following information can be used to guide the advisor-advisee conversation. The advisor will support the student by:

First Year Fall Semester

- Reviewing program plans
- Reviewing the milestone checklist with the student
- Supporting any student questions regarding the *Ed.D. Guidelines*

First Year Spring Semester

- Having conversations with the student about areas of research interests
- Exploring with the student possible alignment with CSUSB Alumni research
- Exploring with the student possible community partners on such research
- Exploring with the student the Ed.D. program faculty for serving as chair on the student's dissertation committee
- Reviewing with the student the Dissertation Committee Approval Process
- Reviewing and signing the student's year 1 annual review form and submitting to the doctoral studies office
- Reviewing and signing the student's first year program plan and submitting to the doctoral studies office

ROLE OF THE DISSERTATION CHAIR

The dissertation chair must come from the list of CSUSB Ed.D. core faculty. Once the chair and the student have come to a mutual agreement to serve as chair, and the Dissertation Committee Approval Form has been signed, the chair is asked to support the doctoral student by:

- Exploring some potential committee members (a core or affiliated faculty member and a qualified community partner)
- Reinforcing the importance of following appropriate protocol for establishing the student's dissertation committee and communicating with any other faculty member they have interviewed as possible members on their committee
- Exploring some potential workshops/conferences/webinars/educational organizations/educational journals that might provide additional resources for the student's intellectual and personal growth
- Exploring some scholarship/funding/award opportunities and developing a plan for completing the application(s)
- Reviewing and completing the Ed.D. student/faculty research and travel application, and the graduate studies research and travel application once a research plan and scholarly opportunities have been identified
- Conducting the student's year 2 and year 3 annual review
- Signing all doctoral program forms when applicable
- Supporting the development of the potential direction for the student's "research inquiry" as well as the research question(s)
- Exploring potential problems of practice in the school/organization/community that might provide setting and context for the student's inquiry, while presenting the possibility of "transformation" because of the student's inquiry
- Discussing potential "products" or "deliverables" that might emerge from the student's inquiry (post-dissertation) that might serve to transform the context(s) or setting(s) associated with the student's research inquiry

- Ensuring that the student defend their dissertation proposal first with approval from all committee members before submitting their IRB application for approval
- Thoroughly reading the student's IRB application, providing suggestions for corrections/modifications, and ensuring the student includes the dissertation proposal form with committee signatures before you sign and the student submits it for review
- Letting the Doctoral Studies Office know when the student should be enrolled in their EDDL 7804 Dissertation Study Units (12 units total)
- Letting the Doctoral Studies Office know one semester in advance when the student expects to graduate
- Ensuring the student submits final dissertation in to TurnItIn, reviewing the report with the student, and sending an e-mail to graduate studies letting them know you have reviewed the TurnItIn report with the student
- Ensuring that the writing of the dissertation is of high quality and free from grammatical and syntax errors before submission to ScholarWorks

ROLE OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE MEMBER

The role of the dissertation committee is as follows:

- Reviewing chapters 1-3 of the dissertation upon the request of the chair
- Attending a dissertation proposal defense session
- Reviewing chapters 1-5 of the dissertation upon the request of the chair
- Attending a dissertation defense session
- Signing all doctoral program forms when applicable

MILESTONE GUIDANCE

Advisor Meeting

You are expected to meet with your advisor at least by the end of the spring semester of your first year. During this meeting you need to review the CSUSB Ed.D. checklist, and review the *Doctoral Program Guidelines*. Also, begin having conversations with your advisor about your overall areas of research interests, including but not limited to, collaborating with community partners on such research, and formulating your doctoral studies committee by the summer semester first year.

Program Plan

Students must submit their signed Program Plan and update that plan annually. Students must submit their updated signed program plan to the doctoral studies office each year. They may request a change in their Program Plan in writing, stating the nature of the change requested and the reasons the change is necessary. Such changes must be recommended by the Student's Academic Advisor/Chair and approved by the Director. The student and advisor or chair will sign the plan and submit the original to the Office of Doctoral Studies.

Annual Student Review

Students will be evaluated and provided with feedback annually. Feedback is to be delivered by the faculty member serving as the student's Advisor the first year and the student's Chair the following years. Meetings need to be conducted by the end of the spring term of each year.

Annual Student Review form reports the students' GPA total units completed and outlines the rating scale.

Any grades lower than a B will be entered onto the form. The Advisor/Chair will complete the form, using the scale as defined on the form (*1 = Not Acceptable, 2 = Below Expected, 3 = As Expected, 4 = Above Expected and 5 = Outstanding*). Any rating below 3 or above 4 should be supported by documentation or reason for that score. In a manner consistent with the four performance categories rated on this form (Academics, Research Progress, Application of Learning to Practice, and Progress with Milestone Events), a global rating also will be given at the bottom of the review form. One of four global evaluative labels will be used: *Excellent; Good; Requires a Doctoral Progress Plan/Assessment Plan; Doctoral Progress Plan Goals Not Met – Grounds for Dismissal*. Any global rating of less than *Good* would result in a follow-up progress report at approximately six months. No global rating of *Doctoral Progress Plan Goals Not Met – Grounds for Dismissal*, may be used unless the student has previously received a global rating of *Requires a Doctoral Progress Plan*.

If a student receives a C grade or a rating *Requires a Doctoral Progress Plan/Assessment Plan* rating, a plan will be developed and implemented, and the student will again be evaluated in January of the next Academic Year. If the student is still not *Good/Satisfactory*, the committee may move to a global rating of *Doctoral Progress Plan Goals Not Met – Grounds for Dismissal*.

It is assumed that discussion of each individual student will not take long if progress is

satisfactory; however, if the student's evaluation on the Doctoral Progress Plan is not *Excellent* or *Good* specific description of what aspects of their performance deemed inadequate is noted.

The evaluation ratings with any accompanying notes or documentation should be shared with the student within two weeks of the evaluation meeting. At this time, the Advisor/Chair and the student will work together to develop a Doctoral Progress Plan which identifies specific directions and behavioral goals with a time line for completion. The student and advisor/chair will each sign the Doctoral Progress Plan and it will also be submitted to the Office of Doctoral Studies for approval.

For any student requiring a Doctoral Progress Plan, a formal guidance committee will be assembled. This committee will consist of the student's Advisor/Chair, the Ed.D. Program Director and at least one other Ed.D. faculty member who has the student in class or is part of the student's plan for addressing the identified gaps or deficiencies in their overall progress. This committee will convene at approximately six months following the initial evaluation to re-evaluate the student's progress. The student will be invited to participate in this review. The Annual Student Review Form is to be signed by students, advisor/chair.

Dissertation Process

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 a significant scholarly work or program review set in a scholarly context that applies rigorous research methods in the study of community problems of practice. The dissertation proceeds from a cohesive theoretical framework and includes a comprehensive review of relevant literature. The dissertation also 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.

Students will be enrolled in dissertation units after they have advanced to candidacy. There are two oral defenses associated with the dissertation, the dissertation proposal defense and the dissertation defense. The Final Dissertation Defense is an important event demonstrating the doctoral candidate's scholarly grasp of the chosen research area and a time to present their original contribution.

Generally, the Final Dissertation Defense consists of two major parts:

1. A public presentation of the purpose(s), method(s) of study, synthesis of findings, analysis, and conclusion by the student.
2. A question and answer period involving all members of the Dissertation Committee.

The Dissertation Defense is scheduled and announced as a public presentation to which all students, faculty, and guests are invited.

The evaluation of the Final Dissertation Defense is the responsibility of the student's Dissertation Committee. After reviewing the student's Final Dissertation Defense according to the Final Dissertation Defense Rubric, the Dissertation Committee either approves the defense or recommends further work needed to meet Doctoral Program standards.

After a successful Final Dissertation Defense, the student submits any required final written revisions to the Dissertation Chair for final approval. The student must follow the Graduate Studies Guidelines: <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/current-students/thesis-project-dissertation>

Videotapes of previous CSUSB doctoral students' defenses are held in the doctoral studies office for students' review.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL PROCESS

All committee members must hold a doctoral degree or an equivalent degree. Committees must consist of two CSUSB faculty members and one external member. The committee chair must be a CSUSB Ed.D. core program faculty member. A second committee member may be either a core or an affiliated Ed.D. faculty member. The doctoral program office keeps an updated list of faculty who can serve on dissertation committees. The third committee member may be chosen from the community and must hold a terminal degree. Students are strongly encouraged to select a scholar-practitioner to serve as the external member.

A list of CSUSB Ed.D. program faculty and fellows can be found here: [Faculty and Program Fellows Descriptions](#) (updated 8/2/21)

Please make sure during the process of selecting your dissertation committee that:

- You consult with your advisor regarding an appropriate chair for your committee
- You meet with the faculty member(s) who you and your advisor have agreed might be a good fit as your chair
- You gain approval from the faculty member to serve as your chair
- You gain that faculty member's signature on the dissertation committee form who has agreed to serve as your chair
- You communicate with any other faculty member that you might have interviewed to serve as your chair and let them know that you have made another selection
- You consult with that faculty member who has agreed to serve as your chair regarding two additional members to serve on your committee
- You meet with the faculty members you and your chair have selected to gain their acceptance to serve on your committee
- You gain these two members' signatures on the dissertation committee form
- You communicate with any other faculty member that you might have interviewed to serve on your committee to let them know that you have made another selection
- You have your advisor's signature on the dissertation committee form as well acknowledging that you have consulted with her or him
- You give the dissertation committee form with your signature, your advisor's signature, your chair's signature, and your two committee members' signatures to the doctoral studies office

As discussed previously, only under rare circumstances should you decide to change your committee membership once the dissertation committee approval form has been signed. You must have written permission from the program director. If the program director gives you written permission to change your committee membership, it is your responsibility to inform the

original committee member(s) that you are changing and complete a new form with signatures.

CSUSB ED.D. MILESTONE CHECKLIST SPRING THIRD YEAR GRADUATION

*Email all signed forms with ** to the doctoral studies office at edd@csusb.edu. Please note that students do not advance to candidacy until they successfully pass their qualifying exam.*

Fall, Year One

___ Review Program Plan and program guidelines

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

Spring, Year One

___ ** Complete Program Plan and General Policies Acknowledgement form ([Form 1](#))

___ ** Undergo Annual Student Review ([Form 2](#))

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

___ Begin to assess potential dissertation chair and committee members

Summer, Year One

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

___ ** Complete Dissertation Committee Approval form ([Form 5](#))

Fall, Year Two

___ Prepare for qualifying exam (**[Form 3](#))

___ Take qualifying exam

___ Upon passing qualifying exam complete: **[Form 4](#), update **program plan for advancement to candidacy

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

Spring, Year Two

___ ** Schedule Dissertation Proposal Defense ([Form 6](#))

___ Dissertation proposal (Chapters 1-3) PPT presentation and IRB to committee

___ Dissertation Proposal Decision form ([Form 7](#)) (students must present their proposal first to committee and gain approval before submitting the IRB application)

___ ** Update Program Plan and submit for review by advisor/chair

___ ** [Annual Student Review](#)

___ ** Submit IRB forms and get IRB approval letter ([IRB Website](#))

___ Satisfactorily complete required courses

Summer, Year Two

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

___ Collect Data (June-October)

Fall, Year Three

___ ** Program Plan form updated

___ Data collection and begin analysis of your dissertation (Chapter 4)

___ Submit Chapter 4 to Chair of Committee

___ Satisfactorily complete required courses

Spring, Year Three

___ Complete analysis of your dissertation (chapter 5)

___ Submit Chapter 5 to Chair of Committee

___ Schedule dissertation defense (PPT presentation) ([Form 8](#))

___ Satisfactorily complete required coursework

___ File a grad check: [Office of the Registrar Graduation Requirement Check](#)

___ Order cap & gown (approximately February)

___ ** Completion of the Dissertation Final Defense ([Form 9](#))

___ ** Update Program Plan submit for review by advisor/chair

___ Set up appointment with graduate studies coach for ScholarWorks consultation

___ Dissertation submitted through ScholarWorks: [Graduate Studies The Review Process](#)

___ Complete Exit survey

___ ***Graduation!***

Do not forget to file a grad check whenever you know the semester you are graduating!!
Do not forget to order your cap and gown whenever you know the semester you are graduating!!

You must complete all requirements, including defense and ScholarWorks submission of final document before you can walk in commencement. You must be enrolled in the semester that you officially submit and complete this work but not necessarily when you walk in commencement.

Students/Chairs/Committee Members:

The purpose of the Ed.D. Milestone Checklist is to remind everyone of the milestones and corresponding forms/documents that need to be submitted as a student moves through the program. Meeting these milestones are required as are the corresponding forms/documents that indicate that the student has fulfilled the requirement.

APPENDIX A:

Forms to Be Completed by Students and Committee Members

Forms are available digitally as Form Fillable PDFs via the links below. If you have difficulty accessing for any reason, please reach out to our office.

[CSUSB Doctorate in Educational Leadership General Policies \(Form 1\)](#)

[Annual Student Review \(Form 2\)](#)

[Completion of the Qualifying Exam and Advancement to Candidacy \(Form 4\)](#)

[Dissertation Committee Approval \(Form 5\)](#)

[Scheduling Proposal Defense \(Form 6\)](#)

[Oral Defense Dissertation Proposal Decision \(Form 7\)](#)

[Scheduling Final Defense \(Form 8\)](#)

[Dissertation Defense/Final Examination Decision \(Form 9\)](#)

[CC/HE Program Plan | PreK-12 Program Plan](#)

[Request for Non CSUSB Faculty Committee Member](#)

[Request to Modify Dissertation Committee](#)

Dissertation Proposal Criteria and Standards for Evaluation

	Approved as written, all crucial elements present	Approved with minor revisions	Revise and resubmit, one or more elements lack quality or are missing
Definition of educational issue	Proposal makes a convincing argument, including using multiple perspectives to explain the significance of the topic	Proposal generally makes a convincing argument but needs minor revisions in areas of argument, need to align with multiple perspectives, or the significance of the topic	Description of issue is, at times, vague, unsupported, and either very limited in scope or too broad to be reasonably researchable. One perspective dominates. The significance of the topic is unclear.
Use of Professional Literature	Literature is well chosen to explore the issue and present multiple perspectives that add to the significance of the issue.	Literature is missing minor element or needs additional perspectives to address the significance of the issue.	Literature use is evident, but either limited in the scope or perspectives
Research Design	The design addresses major components of the issue and is reasonable in terms of methodology and data instruments.	The design lacks minor elements of the issue to be reasonable in terms of methodology and data instruments that may be addressed with minor revisions	The design does not address all significant areas of the issue or attempts to do too much. Methodology and/or data collection instruments may not be appropriate for setting or researcher's resources.
Plan for Completion	A realistic timeline for completion of data collection, analysis and writing of the dissertation is included.	Timeline is missing minor elements for completion of data collection, analysis and writing of the dissertation, that may be corrected with minor revisions	The timeline is either unrealistic in terms of time or resources required; or no timeline is included.
Committee Decision	Approval - May continue with dissertation work	Approval with necessary modifications	Lack of Approval – Must revise, resubmit and re-sit for examination

Adequacy of Dissertation Rubric Ed.D. in Educational Leadership

Name: _____

<u>QUALITY INDICATORS DISSERTATION</u>	5 Approved with Commendation, Exceptional Level of Scholarship	4 Approved as Written, All Critical Elements Present	3 Approved with Minor Revisions	2 Revise and Resubmit, one or more Elements Lack Quality	1 Revise and Resubmit, one or more Elements Missing
---	---	---	------------------------------------	---	--

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study: Statement of the Problem (Overall Focus/Purpose)

Quality Indicator

1. How research topic was developed is explained.
2. Importance of the research question addressed.
3. Novelty/creativity/originality is evident in framing the question.
4. Objective(s) of the study clearly stated.
5. Question/problem is situated in context in which it is to be studied.
6. Significance of potential contribution to literature is plausibly argued.
7. Significance of potential contribution to schools or student achievement established.
8. Linkage between question/problem and method chosen is justified

Chapter 2: Review of Background Literature

Quality Indicator

1. Research is clearly placed in a research tradition.
2. The appropriateness/adequacy of literature reviewed is considered.
3. Clear links are made between theory and the problem as posed.
4. Previous research relevant to the research question is critically evaluated.
5. Problems or gaps in existing literature which this study will address are clearly identified.
6. Review of current relevant research is extensive and in depth.
7. The literature review is organized into a coherent and logical argument.
8. The literature review establishes a convincing basis for the proposed study.
9. "Stage is set" for the hypothesis(s) and/or the use of the literature within which the study is grounded.

Chapter 3: Design of study and methodology for research using inferential statistics and quantitative methods

Quality Indicator

1. Overall study design is appropriate for research question(s) posed.
2. Research design is linked to the background literature.
3. Research design and methodology is clearly presented and explained.
4. Independent/dependent variables/other analytical approaches are relevant to research questions.
5. Relevant ethical issues are clearly identified and addressed.
6. Consideration of critical variables is adequate in scope.
7. Method of sampling is clearly described.

8. Instrumentation, equipment, materials and measurements used are well-chosen and adequate to the task.
9. Choice of methods of analysis are soundly justified.
10. Psychometric properties/operational concepts are defined (as appropriate)
11. Description of the research design and method is complete.

Chapter 3: Design of study and methodology for research using qualitative methods.

Quality Indicator

1. Overall study design is appropriate for research question(s) posed.
2. Research paradigm and research tradition is adequately explained and justified.
3. Clear description of the researcher as a “credible witness”.
4. Research design is linked to background literature.
5. Research design and methodology are clearly presented and explained.
6. Triangulation issues, where appropriate, are addressed.
7. Data collection methods are clearly described.
8. The criteria/process for selecting participants is appropriate and clearly explained.
9. The role of the researcher in relation to participants is examined and explicated.
10. Relevant ethical issues are clearly identified and addressed.
11. The process of analyzing and generating meaning from the data is clearly explained.
12. The process for keeping track of emerging understandings is described in detail.

Chapter 4: Presentation of findings from quantitative research study.

Quality Indicator

1. Quantification efforts are adequate.
2. Data is clearly, logically and economically presented and explained.
3. Variations from the study as proposed are explained and justified.
4. Data presented is linked logically to the research question(s).
5. Data as presented advances an argument which is clearly laid out.

Chapter 4: Presentation of findings from qualitative research study.

Quality Indicator

1. Data is handled with appropriate concern for accuracy and methodological rigor.
2. Data is clearly, logically and economically presented and explained.
3. Meanings generated are justified by the data.
4. Where appropriate, the researcher is established as a “credible witness.”
5. Variations from the study as proposed are explained and justified.
6. Data presented are linked logically to the research question(s).
7. Data as presented advances an argument which is clearly laid out.

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

Quality Indicator

1. The chapter begins with a brief overview of how and why the study was done, reviewing the questions or issues addressed and a summary of the findings.
2. The interpretation of findings includes conclusions that address all the research questions or hypotheses with references to outcomes listed in Chapter 4.
3. The argument of what has been established from the data is well-considered, justifiable, and presented in an appropriate tone.
4. Generalizations, where indicated, are confined to the population from which the sample was drawn.
5. Limitations of what can be claimed from the study are acknowledged and adequately considered.
6. The study makes an original contribution to a field of knowledge and explains how it is original.
7. Directions for future research are clearly explained.

OVERALL PRESENTATION: STYLE AND FORMAT

Total

The dissertation must conform to guidelines for style as set forth in the most recent edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA Manual). This includes, but is not limited to:

1. Correct grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
2. Proper in-text citations for references, direct quotations, and paraphrasing.
3. The reference list.
4. All tables and figures
5. Headings and sub-headings

APPENDIX B:

University Regulations and Procedures ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Dropping a Course After the Census Date

See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures.

Extension of Time to Complete an Incomplete Grade

See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures.

Grade/Academic Grievance Procedures

See the policies and procedures for advising and academic services
<https://www.csusb.edu/registrar/records/grade-grievance>

Graduation Requirements Check

Candidates for degrees to be awarded must request a graduation requirement check through the Office of the Registrar at least one semester prior to the end of the term of their expected graduation. To avoid late fees, the grad check should be filed by the deadlines established by the Office of the Registrar at <https://www.csusb.edu/registrar>. Students not completing their degree in the term applied for will need to refile and pay for the later term. Access to registration for terms subsequent to the stated graduation term will not be granted until the graduation check is refiled.

Leave of Absence

Doctoral students must be continuously enrolled (including the summer) until all requirements for the degree are completed, including the qualifying exam and dissertation. See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures.

Probation and Dismissal

See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures. See <http://bulletin.csusb.edu/colleges-schools-departments/education/educational-leadership-technology/educational-leadership-community-college-edd/> and <http://bulletin.csusb.edu/colleges-schools-departments/education/educational-leadership-technology/educational-leadership-pk12-edd/> for further information on doctoral studies graduation requirements.

Repeating a Course

See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures.

Retroactive Withdrawal

See <https://www.csusb.edu/graduate-studies/policies-and-procedures> for further information on policies and procedures.

Five Year Limit on Applicable Course Work

The doctoral program must be completed within a five-year period. Ed. D. courses shall be validated in accordance with the policies from the Chancellor's Office (EEO 991) and Graduate Studies at CSUSB. For Cohorts 16 and beyond, after 5 years has passed, course currency will be assessed by the faculty who are currently teaching the course(s). The course(s) will be validated using the latest Qualifying Exam Questions to determine if the student is still current with the course content. The exam would be administered the same way the regular Qualifying Exam is administered (i.e., student gets the question(s) to be answered 30 days before the exam and the exam is proctored with 1 hour allotted per question). The exam is a closed book with no additional resources (notes, references, internet access, etc.) available during the exam.

If more than half of the student's courses need to be validated, a random selection of 3 questions (one of which will be a methods course question) will be administered per the procedure outlined above. If the student does not pass the question for a particular course, the student will be required to retake the course or an equivalent substitute as deemed appropriate by the program directors. If the student fails to pass an equivalent course within the next 6 months, the student will be dismissed from the program.

Transferrable Course Credit

The program allows up to 9 semester units to be transferred in to the CSUSB Ed.D. Program, but it is up to the discretion of the Director. Units cannot be transferred in for Electives and units from any level lower than the doctoral level will not be accepted. Unless the course directly matches the doctoral level course content, transferable units will not be accepted. Decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis. Students must include the course syllabi and a brief rationale describing why they are requesting transferable units in to the program and submit those documents to the doctoral studies office. The Director(s) will make the final decision and notify the student.

Decisions will be based on curricular alignment, core principles guiding the CSUSB Ed.D. Program, and competencies acquired in previously completed coursework.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty.

As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom (FAM 501, Statement Concerning Professional Ethics and Responsibilities).

Plagiarism and cheating are violations of the Student Discipline Code (see Appendix of the CSUSB Catalogue and Programs) and may be dealt with by both the instructor and the Judicial Affairs Officer. Questions about academic dishonesty and the policy should be addressed to the Office of the Vice President, Student Affairs or the Dean of Graduate Studies. (FAM 820, Policy and Procedures Concerning Academic Dishonesty).

Please be sure to carefully review the following sections associated with student conduct (CSUSB College of Education Professional Expectations and Dismissal Procedures, Academic Regulations, and Doctoral Standards).

Please also be sure to carefully review the following CSUSB sites on student conduct and student dishonesty:

<https://www.csusb.edu/student-affairs/community-resources/policies-and-forms>

<https://www.csusb.edu/student-conduct>

<https://www.csusb.edu/student-conduct/student-academic-dishonesty-form>

CSUSB COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS AND DISMISSAL PROCEDURES

The faculty members in the College of Education are committed to holding our students accountable for exemplary ethical and professional dispositions and conduct. Academic dishonesty or an evidenced failure to exhibit dispositions consistent with the profession, are grounds for disciplinary action or dismissal from any COE program. In addition to other University policies for adherence to regulations for student conduct, the College of Education specifies further standards of integrity and professional dispositions.

Academic Standards of Integrity

Any form of cheating or plagiarism is incompatible with academic integrity and the expectations of those taking courses in the College of Education. Plagiarism is the act of presenting the ideas and writings of another person as one's own. Cheating is the act of obtaining or attempting to obtain credit for academic work through dishonest, deceptive, or fraudulent means. Plagiarism and cheating include but are not limited to:

- a. Representing the work of another person as one's own either through the attempt to deceive or a failure to sufficiently document the original sources in one's own work.
- b. Copying, in part or in whole, from another's test, software, or other evaluation instrument.
- c. Submitting work previously graded in another course unless this has been approved by the course instructor or by departmental policy.
- d. Submitting work simultaneously presented in two courses, including fieldwork observation hours, unless this has been approved by both course instructors or by the department policies of both departments.
- e. Falsification of information or documents submitted for any university, college, program, or credential purpose.
- f. Using or consulting during an examination sources or materials not authorized by the instructor.
- g. Altering or interfering with grading or grading instructions.
- h. Sitting for an examination by a surrogate, or as a surrogate.
- i. Using unauthorized materials during an examination or assessment.
- j. Falsification of any documents or assignments submitted to any instructor, such as but not limited to, fieldwork observation, fieldwork assignments, supporting documentation for fieldwork hours, fieldwork reports, evaluations and medical notes.
- k. Falsifying or inventing information used in an academic exercise with the intent to suggest that the information or citation is legitimate.
- l. Any other act committed by a student in the course of academic work which defrauds or misrepresents, including aiding or abetting in any of the actions defined above.

Dispositional Standards and Conduct

All degree and credential candidates are expected to exhibit professionalism and ethical conduct. In this case of teacher credential programs, this is an expression of the California Code of Regulations, Title 5 section 41100 which states that the teacher credential candidate must "demonstrate suitable aptitude for teaching in public schools" (b)(3) and that teacher

credential candidates “shall demonstrate personality and character traits that satisfy the standards of the teaching profession. The assessment of the candidate shall be made by the teacher education faculty of the campus, who may also consider information from public school personnel and others’ (California Code of Regulations, Title 5 section 41100 (b)(6)).

The CSUSB College of Education holds all degree, certificate, and credential candidates to the professional and ethical standards outlined below.

- a. Adhere to local, state, federal laws, CA Education codes, and professional codes of ethics applicable to their field of study and practice.
- b. Protect the privacy of those within the professional setting except in cases where the safety of another person is compromised by doing so. This includes protecting the privacy of others when using the internet and social media.
- c. Exhibit a commitment to respect diversity and a willingness to serve, evidenced through behavior, the educational and developmental needs of students and community members irrespective of race, ethnicity, nationality, economic class, language, sex, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, religion, physical/mental ability, or age.
- d. Promote the safety of all K-12 students and work to insure that all students are protected from harassment, discrimination, or bullying.
- e. Promote the safety of professional colleagues, fellow CSUSB students, staff, and faculty and work to insure that they are protected from harassment, discrimination, and bullying.
- f. Exhibit professional behaviors and attitudes such as respectful treatment of others at the university and in field settings, punctuality, exemplary attendance, adherence to deadlines, professional appearance, and working collaboratively with others.
- g. Exhibit a willingness to accept feedback and change one’s behaviors to align with course or program expectations, dispositions, and professional standards.

Disciplinary Process

Whenever a faculty member, adjunct faculty, field supervisor, principal, resident teacher/supervisor (aka, CSUSB representative) has concerns regarding a student’s academic performance, conduct, or professionalism, the CSUSB representative should first attempt to meet with the student to resolve the concerns. If the concern cannot be resolved or is of a very serious nature, such as physical, sexual, or emotional harassment, the concern is referred to the program coordinator and department chair. At this time the student may also be referred to entities outside the College of Education (e.g., Student Affairs, Title 9, or campus police) as is appropriate or warranted.

If the above attempts by the CSUSB representative to address misconduct, unprofessionalism, or adherence to the program’s expected dispositions are unsuccessful, the program coordinator can request that the department chair form a Student Review Committee (SRC). The request is activated when the *Student Conduct Referral* is submitted to the department chair. Once the department chair receives the *Student Conduct Referral*, the chair has 10 working days to form the SRC. The SRC is composed of the program coordinator (who acts as chair) and at least two other faculty members not parties to the problem. If the program coordinator is involved in the situation beyond the role of coordinator and cannot be impartial, the department chair will appoint another faculty member to replace the coordinator.

Within 10 working days of being formed, the Student Review Committee reviews supporting documentation and meets with the student(s) to hear all perspectives on the situation. During this meeting, the committee will ask the student to attend as well as other parties involved in the situation. The student may bring one representative to the meeting as well. After consideration of the information, the Student Review Committee can recommend that no action be taken, that the student(s) continue in the program with conditions (articulated in the *Student Improvement Plan* outlined below), or be dismissed from the program.

Decisions

a. Continuation with Conditions: If the decision is to continue with conditions, the program coordinator works with the student to develop a *Student Improvement Plan*. The plan includes the following:

- i. detailed description of the concerns or misconduct;
- ii. description of any actions to be undertaken by the student;
- iii. deadline by which the student must demonstrate the required level of knowledge, skill, behavior, or ethical conduct;
- iv. a description of what type of evidence provided by the student would indicate that the concern has been addressed and student improvement has occurred;
- v. signature sheet signed by the department chair, program coordinator, and the student indicating agreement with the plan and that failure to complete plan may result in dismissal from the program.

The plan will be filed in the student's file and, if appropriate, a hold placed upon the student's registration until the conditions outlined in the plan have been met. The program coordinator shall, on or before the date specified in the plan for completion of the remediation, review student progress based upon evidence provide by the student and/or a faculty member. One or two actions must be taken to resolve the concern.

If the plan is met and the concern is alleviated, the student will be notified and no further action will be taken.

If the concern is not alleviated as determined by the program coordinator or representative, the Student Review Committee meets to consider further action. The Student Review Committee can recommend (a) the creation of a new plan or (b) that the student be dismissed from the program. If the recommendation is for the creation of a new plan, the committee simply repeats the procedure outlined above. If the Student Review Committee recommends dismissal, the case is referred to a meeting of the program faculty.

Dismissal: The SRC can recommend dismissal if the student fails to meet the conditions of the *Student Improvement Plan*. Alternatively, if by agreement of the SRC the misconduct was serious enough to warrant immediate dismissal without further intervention, the SRC can

recommend dismissal without the development of a *Student Improvement Plan*. In either case, the recommendation for dismissal, along with supporting documentation, is forwarded to a meeting of the program faculty for consideration. The recommendation for dismissal may be for immediate dismissal or dismissal at the completion of the current academic semester. After examining the documentation presented by the program coordinator, the decision for dismissal is determined by a simple majority of program faculty present in the meeting. The decision is then communicated to the student and the record of the decision placed in the student's file.

Procedure for forming the Student Review Committee (SRC)

At the beginning of each academic year each department chair recruits for four faculty members to join a college-wide pool of department faculty. These faculty members will potentially serve on ad hoc Student Review Committees. When the need arises, chairs recruit from among the members of the pool, excluding faculty who may be involved in the situation being considered.

FEES AND PAYMENT PROCEDURE

A letter will be mailed to you by admissions containing the instructions for activating “MyCoyote”.

1. You are given a temporary ID and password. On the CSUSB website <https://www.csusb.edu/> click on *MyCoyote Login*.
2. Click on First Time Users Activate Account. This will give you step-by-step instructions.
3. You are also given a CSUSB email address. The University will post information on this email for you, however, the Doctoral Studies Office will keep you apprised of information you will need. The Office of Doctoral Studies will use the email address provided by you.

All students accepted into the doctoral program (Ed.D. in Educational Leadership) for the 2021-2022 Academic Year will be registered into classes by the Office of Doctoral Studies. All students must pay fees at the bursar’s office (cash, check, ATM/money order) or online at through MyCoyote. See the [Student Financial Services How To Guide](#) for details.

Doctoral Program fees are established by the Board of Trustees. All fees are approximate and subject to budgetary adjustments. The Doctoral Program is year-round: fall, spring and summer. The doctoral fees are a flat rate for all students for all semesters. The fees are not based on number of units. See additional information on Tuition and Fees: <https://www.csusb.edu/student-financial-services/tuition-and-fees>

Tuition	Fall	Spring	Summer
Tuition Fee	\$5,919	\$5,919	\$5,919
Campus Fees	\$976.60	\$960.37	\$960.37
Total	\$6,895.60	\$6,879.37	\$6,879.37

Doctoral students may be eligible for various kinds of financial aid or loans. Details about these resources can be found in the [Financial Aid Resource Guide for Doctoral Students](#) or at the Financial Aid website. <https://www.csusb.edu/student-financial-services/tuition-and-fees>

Please do not wait for a billing statement as CSUSB does NOT mail billing statements. You can access your tuition fee due date through MY COYOTE SELF SERVICE. The tuition fee payment due date is based on the date of your registration/enrollment. The Office of Doctoral Studies will enroll you right after priority registration.

****Note:** If you are having difficulty paying your fees, particularly for fall semester, please use the following instructions:

Fall semester:

MyCoyote will say that you do not owe for fall because you are not enrolled.

1. On the home page click the link “SB Make Payment” It will ask you to pay credit or e-check.
2. This will take you to the E-Payment Page Click the tab on top that says “Make Payment”
3. This page will show items to pay for. Don’t choose all of them, just choose “Tuition For Fall” Doctoral Program. Then the amount of tuition will show.
4. Place in shopping basket, and follow the prompts for payment.

THE COYOTE ONE CARD

The Coyote One Card is the official California State University San Bernardino identification card. It provides proof of University enrollment and/or employment. Your card will provide access to library services, self-instructional computer labs, gym, and health center services. They are located in the Pfau Library Wedge on the first floor, PL-1108 inside the Technology Support Center. At PDC it is located in the Indian Wells Building, Room 102. <https://www.csusb.edu/its/support/coyote-onecard>

You must know your Student Identification Number and have a picture I.D. If you are taking classes at our Palm Desert Campus, you do not need to travel to the main campus to receive your ID. Contact PDC library staff for assistance.

If you are a continuing/returning CSUSB student, your current ID is valid as long as you are registered for the current semester.

PARKING PERMITS

Permits are required for parking on the CSUSB campus at all times - 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. All regulations i.e. 30 minutes, carpool, faculty/staff, service vehicles, disabled spaces are enforced 24 hours a day 7 days a week. For the Fall, Spring and Summer semesters. Parking is enforced 24 hours a day 7 days a week, there is No Grace Period.

Annual, Semester, and Daily Parking Permits are available. Annual and Semester permits may be purchased online: <https://www.csusb.edu/parking/parking-permits/student-permits>

You may use the parking permit at both the San Bernardino campus and Palm Desert Campus.

Parking permit dispenser locations can be found on the San Bernardino campus map:

[Dispenser Locations.](#)

STUDENT EMAIL POLICY

The University intends to replace many of the letters sent to students via the U.S. Postal Service with email communications. As a result, it is strongly recommended that students check their email accounts daily. The consequences of not checking email are the same as those for not checking a U.S. Postal mailbox. Some of these consequences include missing payment deadlines, missing registration deadlines, missing immunization deadlines, missing out on opportunities for financial aid, and missing requirements and deadlines for graduation.

Students are responsible for the consequences of not reading university related communications sent to their email account. Students have the responsibility to recognize that certain communications may be time critical. Errors in forwarding email to a personal email address or failure to read emails regularly are not acceptable reasons for missing university deadlines. Students have the responsibility to clean their email accounts and avoid emails being rejected due to limited space in their account. Students must also be sure that their forwarding e-mail is included in the doctoral studies distribution list, and the Blackboard site.