I. Minutes:
Approval of Academic Senate minutes for meeting of March 5, 2002 (pp. 2-4).

II. Communications and Announcements:
Election results for 2002-2003 senators (pp. 5-6).

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair:
B. President’s Office:
C. Provost’s Office:
D. Statewide Senators:
E. CFA Campus President:
F. ASI Representatives:
G. Other:
   1. Anny Morrobel-Sosa: Status report on AS-574-01/MH, Resolution on RTP Criteria and Retention of New Faculty (summary to be distributed).

IV. Consent Agenda:

V. Business Items:
B. Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program for Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership: Hamings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee/Konopak, Dean for UCTE, second reading (pp. 8-26). [The complete proposal is available in the Academic Senate office.]
C. Resolution on Name Change for Extended Studies: Hood, academic senator, first reading (p. 27).

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Adjournment:
I. Minutes: The minutes for the Academic Senate meetings of January 22, February 12, and February 19, 2002, were approved without change.

II. Communications and Announcements: Business item D will be the first business item to be considered. Handout from CFA president Phil Fetzer on tentative contract agreement, which is available on the back table, will be referred to when he makes his report.

III. Reports:
A. Academic Senate Chair: (Menon) Cal Poly Plan Steering Committee has decided to provide special support for bottleneck courses in GE and Support Areas to assist student with availability and access to classes.
B. President's Office: None.
C. Provost's Office: (Zingg) The fact finder report is now available for review and is a mixed report filled with points of merit and lack of merit. The budget will provide about 9.3% increase to SSIs and 2.65% to GSIs and additional compensation to department heads/chairs' base salary. Counselors will be moved to the faculty salary structure. There is only 3% identified to fund the 9.3% so there are questions on the status of the state budget, which we learned has a 5% error in the negative. The question to consider is what items need to be cut in order to fund increases.
D. Statewide Senators: None.
E. CFA Campus President: (Fetzer) A tentative agreement was reached over the weekend in Los Angeles on the contract that we have been working on for many months. The report from the negotiating team was unanimous supported by the negotiating team, all the chapter presidents, and all state board members. Even though there are some areas that are less than ideal, the overwhelming consensus was that this is a good settlement and the objectives that the bargaining team put out compared to the achievement were substantial. Copies of the contract will be made available within a day or two in the CFA office in building 38, room 141. All faculty are invited to attend a question and answer faculty forum, which will be held on March 13 in building 52 room E27 from 4-5pm. The areas of concern include the lack of retroactive GSI due to the finite amount of money available, lecturer health benefits and counselor parity, and achieving SSIs. (Foroohar) Bargaining started about a year ago with two sets of goals. One of those goals being monetary support of GSI, SSI, and the other an increase in salary for department chairs. In addition, CFA was very serious about trying to stop the erosion of the entire state system, which creates major problems including the hiring and retention of new faculty because of low salary and high workload. Keeping the SSI was crucial for the bargaining team. From the very beginning the entire team was unanimous in agreement, that we would not sign an agreement without SSI. Trying to find job security for lecturers was also important to the bargaining team and a very important achievement was that FMI is gone even for SSI. The Chancellor’s offer from the very beginning was 2% GSI this year nothing else and for next year a possible 1% if we don’t get budget cuts at the May revise. The bargaining team
felt that it was more important, at this time, to add to the base salary and to take the loss of the past 9-months of the 2% GSI.

F. ASI Representatives: None.
G. Other: None.

IV. Consent Agenda: None.

V. Business Items:
A. **Resolution on Name Change for Extended Studies**: Parks, Dean for Extended Studies, second reading. This resolution requests a name change for Extended Studies to better reflect the programs currently being offered. M/S/P to approve the following amendment presented by Hood:

   RESOLVED: The College of Continuing Studies shall meet with Curriculum Committee at least once a year to discuss relevant policy and curriculum issues and the College of Continuing Studies shall submit an annual report on such issues to the Academic Senate.

   M/S/P to table discussion until the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee/Chair, David Conn, and Dennis Parks meet to discuss the procedure for senate oversight of courses.

B. **Resolution on Academic Integrity, Program Accountability, and 180 Units for Degree**: Hannings, chair of the Curriculum Committee, second reading. This resolution requests that each program undertake a self-review of their curriculum and provide justification for a baccalaureate requiring more than 180 units. There was no second to move the resolution, therefore it failed.

C. **Resolution on Process for Change of Major**: Breitenbach, chair of the Instruction Committee, second reading. This resolution offers a uniform process for students to change major. The following friendly amendments was made by Senator Brown to page 20 of *Process for Change of Major*:

   **Minimum Requirements**

   An application for internal change of major will not be considered until/unless a student:

   1. has completed at least one quarter at Cal Poly;
   2. has a minimum of a 2.0 grade point average in the target major’s prefix and/or support courses; and
   3. is not presently on academic probation.

   Friendly amendment by Senator Greenwald:

   Process for Admitting Students to Target Major

   Depending on the degree of impact of the target major (i.e., the relationship between the number of applicants to the major and the number of places available), decisions on admitting students who wish to change major will be made by one or other of the following processes. Each major will publicize in advance which process it is using.

   1. Applicants will be evaluated against published performance criteria. Those who meet the criteria will automatically be admitted to the major and will be so notified prior to the start of the next course registration period; OR

   2. Applicants meeting published minimum performance criteria will be considered in a competitive process for acceptance into a limited number of available spaces in the major. One or two firm dates each year will be set for making and notifying students of admissions decisions; these dates will be announced in advance. For an applicant meeting the minimum published criteria and admissions decision shall be made within 10 weeks of time submitted excluding summer.

   Discussion will continue at next week’s Academic Senate meeting.
D. **Resolution on Proposed New Degree Program for Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership:** Hannings, Chair of the Curriculum Committee/Konopak, Dean for UCTE, first reading. This resolution approves the proposal for a joint Doctor of Education in education Leadership degree with University of California at Santa Barbara. The resolution was moved to a second reading at the next meeting.

E. **Resolution on Name Change for Environmental Horticultural Science and Crop Science Departments:** Due to lack of time, this item was forwarded to the next Academic Senate meeting.

F. **Resolution to Change the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Section III.B.8.(b):** Due to lack of time, this item was forwarded to the next Academic Senate meeting.

VI. Discussion Item(s):

VII. Meeting recessed until next Tuesday at 3:00 pm.

Submitted by,

Gladys Gregory
### COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE (7 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dingus, Del</td>
<td>E&amp;SoilSci</td>
<td>62753/62261</td>
<td>dingus</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannings, Dave</td>
<td>H&amp;CropSci</td>
<td>62870/62279</td>
<td>dhanning</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, John</td>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>62426/62702</td>
<td>jharris</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel, Jay</td>
<td>Agribus</td>
<td>65014/65000</td>
<td>noel</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Sarah</td>
<td>AE&amp;Comm</td>
<td>67272/62803</td>
<td>sastephe</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (5 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boswell, Mike</td>
<td>C&amp;RP1g</td>
<td>62496/61315</td>
<td>mposwell</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epstein, Bill</td>
<td>ConstMgt</td>
<td>62797/61323</td>
<td>wepstein</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn, Abe</td>
<td>ArchEngr</td>
<td>62152/61314</td>
<td>alynn</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelischer, Maurice</td>
<td>LandArch</td>
<td>62864/61319</td>
<td>mnelisch</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reich, Jon</td>
<td>Arch</td>
<td>62881/61316</td>
<td>jreich</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (5 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Mary Beth</td>
<td>Accctg</td>
<td>62084/61384</td>
<td>marmstro</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson, John</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>61606/61543</td>
<td>jdobson</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griggs, Ken</td>
<td>Mgmt</td>
<td>62731/62012</td>
<td>kgriggs</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqbal, Zafar</td>
<td>Accctg</td>
<td>62977/62831</td>
<td>ziqbal</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING (7 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agbo, Sam</td>
<td>ElecEngr</td>
<td>61528/62781</td>
<td>sagbo</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeTurris, Dianne</td>
<td>AeroEngr</td>
<td>61515/62562</td>
<td>ddeturri</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goel, Rakesh</td>
<td>C&amp;EEngr</td>
<td>62052/62947</td>
<td>rgoel</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddren, Jesse</td>
<td>MechEngr</td>
<td>61386/61334</td>
<td>jmaddren</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menon, Unny</td>
<td>IndEngr</td>
<td>61180/62342</td>
<td>umenon</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS (9 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>@calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Francisco</td>
<td>Philos</td>
<td>62044/62041</td>
<td>flores</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forooahar, Manzar</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>61707/61707</td>
<td>mforooha</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampsey, John</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>62239/62596</td>
<td>jhampsey</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Terry</td>
<td>SocSci</td>
<td>62523/62260</td>
<td>tjones</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laver, Gary</td>
<td>Psyc&amp;HD</td>
<td>62865/62033</td>
<td>glaver</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, Joe</td>
<td>Philos</td>
<td>62952/62041</td>
<td>jlynch</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmond, Penny</td>
<td>GrphComm</td>
<td>62408/61108</td>
<td>posmond</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinzler, Paul</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>65792/62406</td>
<td>prinzler</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANCY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forooahar, Manzar (stwd sen)History 61707/61707 mforooha 2005

### COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (8 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>@calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Ron</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>62439/62448</td>
<td>rbrown</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elrod, Susan</td>
<td>BioSci</td>
<td>62875/62788</td>
<td>setrod</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldenberg, Stu</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>62130/62206</td>
<td>sgoldenb</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwald, Harvey</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>61657/62206</td>
<td>hgreenwa</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, George</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>62333/62206</td>
<td>glewis</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, John</td>
<td>Chem&amp;BC</td>
<td>62694/62693</td>
<td>jmaxwell</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puhl, Susan</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>62087/62545</td>
<td>spuhl</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rein, Steve</td>
<td>Stats</td>
<td>62941/62709</td>
<td>srein</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood, Myron</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>62352/62206</td>
<td>mhood</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL CONSULTATIVE SERVICES (5 representatives)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>@calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andre, Barbara</td>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>65837/61477</td>
<td>bandre</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brar, Navjit</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62631/62631</td>
<td>nbrar</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlan, Sallie</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62403/62403</td>
<td>sharlan</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery, Wayne</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62057/62057</td>
<td>wmontgomery</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spradlin, Wendy</td>
<td>CLA AdvCtr</td>
<td>66200/66200</td>
<td>wspradli</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1 representative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>OFC/DEPT</th>
<th>@calpoly.edu</th>
<th>TERM END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hernandez, Anita</td>
<td>UCTE</td>
<td>65537/61503</td>
<td>aichernan</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

POLY REPS Launch True Mustang Night with a Kissing Chain

SAN LUIS OBISPO – Poly Reps, a student group with 30 members who serve as university ambassadors and spirit leaders, will establish a new tradition at this year’s Open House: True Mustang Night, where students can become “True Mustangs” with a kiss under a full moon at the stroke of midnight.

“Several other universities have a similar tradition and it’s a real university spirit builder,” said Poly Rep Joel Conn. He explained how the tradition works: once a month on the night of the full moon, students, faculty and alumni gather in the middle of their campus. At midnight, those present are kissed by a ‘True Aggie’ or a ‘True Cardinal’ and they become one themselves.

“It’s a tradition that’s been going on for more than 100 years at some campuses. We think this will be great new spirit-raising tradition for Cal Poly and a great tradition for a new century,” Conn said.

The Poly Reps think it’s a fine tradition to bring to Cal Poly, starting at Open House 2002. The first True Mustang Night at Cal Poly is scheduled April 19 from 11:30 p.m. to 12:30 a.m. April 20, at the Cal Poly Mustang statue at Grand Avenue and Perimeter Way outside the University Union.

At midnight, True Mustangs gathered at the Mustang statue will start the kissing tradition.

“Ordinarily it would work with upperclassmen kissing underclassmen” to convey True Mustang status, Conn explained.

“But since this is the first time, the True Mustang Night ceremony will have a kissing chain. The True Mustang kiss will begin with a special guest and pass from person to person down the chain,” Conn said. Faculty, staff, alumni and students can all participate, regardless of their year or class. “We suggest everyone come on out for a midnight kiss -- no partner required.”

Note to Editors: To interview Conn about the inaugural True Mustang ceremony, contact Teresa Hendrix at thendrix@calpoly.edu or (805) 756-7266.
Adopted:

ACADEMIC SENATE
of
CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY
San Luis Obispo, CA

AS-___-02/

RESOLUTION ON
PROPOSED NEW DEGREE PROGRAM FOR
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

WHEREAS, The faculty and Curriculum Committee of the University Center for Teacher Education (UCTE) have unanimously approved the attached Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program between Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, and University of California, Santa Barbara; and

WHEREAS, The above approvals are contingent upon state funding; and

WHEREAS, The proposal has been approved by the Grevitz Graduate School of Education at UC Santa Barbara and will soon be presented to its Faculty Senate; and

WHEREAS, The proposal has the support of the San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools who participated in its creation and who will be an integral part of the program; and

WHEREAS, The proposal reflects Cal Poly’s “learn by doing” philosophy; and

WHEREAS, The proposal represents Cal Poly’s first joint doctoral program although there are at least 16 such programs in the CSU; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee recommends approval of the proposal contingent upon state funding; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly approve the attached proposal for a joint Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership degree with University of California at Santa Barbara, contingent upon adequate state funding.

Proposed by: Academic Senate Curriculum Committee and the University Center for Teacher Education
Date: January 31, 2002
1. Title of Proposed Program.

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

2. Reason for Proposing the Program.

The purpose of the Doctor of Education degree program is to provide advanced graduate-level study of educational leadership concepts and their application to schools and school agencies. The program is deliberately designed as a collaborative endeavor among Cal Poly, UCSB, and school partners, blending theoretical and research perspectives with practice in the field. Students will study scholarly literature on leadership, acquire quantitative and qualitative research methodology skills, and engage in field-based research that explores authentic school-based issues and problems. The major goal of the program is to prepare a new generation of exemplary educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to:

(1) engage in scholarly research and effectively use extant data to make sound, data-driven decisions,
(2) critically examine current educational policies and practices from a variety of theoretical perspectives,
(3) formulate and implement effective leadership, managerial, and instructional approaches that will improve student achievement and organizational productivity, and
(4) engage in reflective praxis to assess personal and professional leadership effectiveness.

The program has several unique characteristics that make it particularly viable. First, California, despite a few large metropolitan districts, is a non-urban state. While most doctoral programs focus on urban education, this program will specialize in training leaders for mid-sized to rural school districts. Second, this tri-partite endeavor, linking research-oriented and practice-oriented universities with school partners, supports the establishment of new professional development districts (PODs). These will serve as living laboratories for advancing the application of research and producing new knowledge needed by the field. Third, the program will be offered in the central region of California, a geographical area that currently supports only satellite doctoral programs from private institutions such as the University of Southern California. There is a great demand for doctoral-trained school administrators in the area, and this program will offer access to an affordable, practice-oriented doctoral degree.

3. Anticipated Student Demand.

Number of majors: at initiation--15; after three years--36; after five years--36.

Number of graduates: after three years--15; after five years--36

4. Indicate the kind of resource assessment used in developing the program proposal. If additional resources will be required, the summary should indicate the extent of department and/or college commitment(s) to allocate them.

An analysis of faculty, classroom space, library, and computer resources has been completed. (1) The Cal Poly educational administration program currently has two tenured professors; a third professor will be required to coordinate and teach in the new doctoral program (a search is now
underway. (2) Classroom space is sufficient; in addition to Cal Poly, courses will be offered at UCSB and at different school/district sites. (3) Additional library resources may be required as a complement to the UCSB holdings; these will be determined as new Cal Poly courses are offered in the second year of the program. (4) Computer resources are sufficient at present; the University Center for Teacher Education now has a new computer lab and SMART classroom, and there is access to distance education facilities on campus and at the SLO County Office of Education.

Funding to support the new faculty position and possible library holdings will come from two primary sources specified under the new CSU/UC agreement on joint doctoral programs: (1) a portion of funds allocated for program implementation ($2 million CSU), and (2) fees recovered from students enrolled in the program (based on the UC structure). Other sources may include the University Center for Teacher Education for program support and grants/contracts for research support.

5. If the program is occupational or professional, summarize evidence of need for graduates with this specific education background.

Evidence of the need for graduates with educational doctorates stems from CSU's recent statewide report and from Cal Poly's local surveys. The CSU report emphasized the need for educational leaders who are grounded in relevant theory and research and who can approach problem solving on a practical, data-driven basis. The report cited CPEC in calling for more educators with doctoral-level expertise in assessment and more programs accessible to rural educators and underrepresented groups. Cal Poly surveyed several local constituent groups. Graduate students in the Educational Administration's advanced credential and master's programs expressed interested in pursuing an education doctoral degree that was accessible, affordable, and field-based. In addition, district and county superintendents were strongly supportive of such a program for their school and district administrators; this included the SLO County Superintendent representing the tri-county area (San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura). Further, the President of Cuesta Community College expressed an urgent need for access for community college leaders.

6. If the new program is currently a concentration or specialization, include a brief rationale for conversion.

The new program is not a concentration or specialization to be converted.

7. If the new program is not commonly offered as a bachelor's or master's degree, provide compelling rationale explaining how the proposed subject area constitutes a coherent, integrated degree major that has potential value for students. If the new program does not appear to conform to the CSU Board of Trustee policy calling for "broadly based programs," provide rationale.

The new program leads to a doctoral degree in educational leadership, which is a widely accepted graduate field of study at universities throughout the United States.

8. Briefly describe how the new program fits with the department/college/university strategic plans.

The University Center for Teacher Education offers post-baccalaureate teaching/service/specialist credential programs and master's degree programs with specializations in related areas. Its mission is "to prepare educational leaders and foster collaborative programs within and beyond the university aimed at serving California's diverse population," and its strategic plan focuses on meeting the educational needs of the state through partnership endeavors. The new program is a
strong fit in that it extends the continuum of educator preparation to the doctoral level, broadens partnership opportunities with K-12, community colleges, and other universities, and serves the needs of the central region of California.

The new program also fits well with the university's mission and strategic plan. The university emphasizes "undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs." In addition, the hallmark of Cal Poly is its learn by doing educational philosophy and its commitment to excellent programs that reinforce "classroom instruction with practical, 'hands-on' learning in the laboratory, the studio or out in the field." The proposed Doctor of Education degree provides a professional program necessary to the state and is grounded in a field-based approach that will prepare scholar practitioners.
Curriculum/Program Design for the Proposed Joint Doctorate in Education Leadership through Cal Poly and UCSB

Year 1--UCSB Courses Delivered at UCSB

Fall: Ed 242A (4) Organizational Theories, Ed 214A (4) Introductory Statistics, ED 221A (4) Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods

Winter: Ed 240A (4) Education Policy, Ed 214B (4) Inferential Statistics or ED 221B (4) Qualitative Interviewing

Spring: Ed 247A (4) Educational Leadership, ED 215B (4) Psychometrics or ED214C (4) Linear Models or ED221C (4) Observation and Small Group Analysis

Summer: Ed 223H (4) Leadership and Equal Educational Opportunity, ED 242C (4) Theories of Organizational Change and Development, ED 596 (2) Summer Institute, Comprehensive Exam

Year 2--Courses Delivered at Cal Poly or Field Location

Fall: ED 600 (4) Information Technology, ED 601 (4) Organizational and Management Issues

Winter: ED 602 (4) Policy, Equity, and Political Issues, ED 603 (4) Economics and Financial Issues

Spring: ED 604 (4) Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations

Summer: ED 605 (2) Summer Institute, dissertation proposal

Year 3--Research Application with Seminar Meetings at Both Campuses or Field Locations

Fall: ED 606A (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Introduction and Literature Review), defense of dissertation proposal

Winter: ED 606B (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Methodology)

Spring: ED 606C (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar (Findings and Discussion)

Summer: ED 606D (3) Applied Dissertation Research and Writing Seminar, defense of dissertation
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Program between
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo and University of California, Santa Barbara

Submitted to the
Cal Poly Academic Senate

Submitted by the
Education Leadership and Administration Program
University Center for Teacher Education

Winter Quarter, 2002

Note: This proposal falls under the new CSU/UC agreement (11/01) to offer joint doctoral programs. See www.calstate.edu/PA/oldnews/2001/EdD.shtm; www.ucop.edu/news/archives/2001/nov9art1.htm
PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

1. Doctor of Education Degree:

Doctoral degrees in the field of education are either Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s. Ph.D. programs generally emphasize theory and basic research in a specialized area of scholarship and prepare students to teach and/or conduct research in universities, other educational agencies, and research organizations. Ed.D. programs generally emphasize applied research for examining educational issues, policies, and practices and prepare students for leadership positions in K-12 and community colleges as well as faculty positions in teaching-oriented universities. Doctoral-granting universities across the nation (e.g., Columbia, University of Georgia, University of Texas) generally offer both degrees that follow these distinctions. An exception is Harvard; its School of Education has only the Ed.D.

In California, all nine UC campuses offer the Ph.D., while Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, and San Diego also have the Ed.D. In addition, large private institutions such as Stanford and USC offer both degrees, while smaller universities such as Asuza Pacific, La Verne, Pepperdine, University of the Pacific, and University of San Diego have only the Ed.D.

2. CSU Joint Doctoral Programs:

There is a long history of joint doctoral programs between CSU and UC/private California universities that covers nearly three decades.

Programs currently offered are (in alphabetical order):
*CSU Bakersfield and University of the Pacific: Ed.D. in Educational Administration
*CSU Fresno and UC Davis: Ed.D. in Educational Administration
*CSU Long Beach and Claremont Graduate School: Ph.D. in Engineering & Industrial Applied Mathematics
*CSU Los Angeles and UCLA: Ph.D. in Special Education
*San Diego State University with UC San Diego, University of San Diego, and other institutions on a variety of programs: 10 Ph.D.s in Biology, Chemistry, Clinical Psychology, Ecology, Education, Engineering, Geography, Communication Disorders, Math & Science Education, and Public Health; and 1 Ed.D. with specializations in Educational Administration, Educational Technology, and Teaching & Learning.
*San Francisco State and UC Berkeley: Ph.D. in Special Education.

In addition to Cal Poly and UC Santa Barbara, programs under discussion or development are:
CSU Hayward, San Francisco, and San Jose and UC Berkeley
CSU Northridge and UC Santa Barbara.

In 2001, the CSU sought the authority to also offer an independent Ed.D. so as to meet the increasing state demand for highly qualified professionals in K-12 and community college education. After long discussions with the UC involving California's master plan, this proposal was dropped and a new agreement between the systems on joint programs was established. The new agreement sets forth conditions by which the CSU and UC encourage, approve, and support joint programs, including funds for start-up costs and shared tuition/fee revenues based on the UC structure.
3. Purpose and Design of Program:

The purpose of the Doctor of Education degree program is to provide advanced graduate-level study of educational leadership concepts and their application to schools and school agencies. The program is deliberately designed as a collaborative endeavor among Cal Poly, UCSB, and school partners, blending theoretical and research perspectives with practice in the field. Students will study scholarly literature on leadership, acquire quantitative and qualitative research methodology skills, and engage in field-based research that explores authentic school-based issues and problems. The major goal of the program is to prepare a new generation of exemplary educational leaders who demonstrate the ability to:

(1) conduct scholarly research and effectively use extant data to make sound, data-driven decisions,
(2) critically examine current educational policies and practices from a variety of theoretical perspectives,
(3) formulate and implement effective leadership, managerial, and instructional approaches that will improve student achievement and organizational productivity, and
(4) engage in reflective praxis to assess personal and professional leadership effectiveness.

The program has several unique characteristics that make it particularly timely and relevant. First, California, despite a few large metropolitan districts, is a non-urban state. While most doctoral programs focus on urban education, this program will specialize in training leaders for mid-sized to rural school districts. Second, this tri-partite endeavor, linking research-oriented and practice-oriented universities with school partners, supports the establishment of new professional development districts (PDDs) in our local region. These will serve as living laboratories for advancing the application of research and producing new knowledge needed by the field. Third, the program will be offered in the central region of California, a geographical area that currently supports only satellite doctoral programs from private institutions such as the University of Southern California and the University of LaVerne.

4. Need for Program:

Recent evidence of the need for graduates with educational doctorates stems from CSU's 2001 statewide report and from Cal Poly's local surveys. First, the CSU report (www.calstate.edu/issues_ideas/2108EddReport.pdf) emphasizes the need for educational leaders who are grounded in relevant theory and research and who can approach problem solving on a practical, data-driven basis. The report cited CPEC in calling for more educators with doctoral-level expertise in assessment and more programs accessible to rural educators and underrepresented groups. Second, as a follow-up to the statewide report, Cal Poly surveyed constituent groups in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, including K-12 county and district superintendents, school principals, and community college administrators. About one-third of those surveyed responded, and all were strongly supportive of such a program. The particular aspects cited by both K-12 and community college educators were the need for authentic field-based curricula, accessibility in the local region, and affordability as compared to options offered by private institutions. Third, SLO County Superintendent Julian Crocker, San Luis Coastal District Superintendent Steven Ladd, and Cuesta College President Marie Rosenwasser met with President Baker, Provost Zingg, and Dean Konopak to express interest in the program for their respective administrators and teachers and to encourage Cal Poly to move forward. Fourth, faculty in Educational Administration also surveyed current graduate students in their advanced credential and master's programs as possible candidates for such a program. All expressed interested in pursuing an education doctoral degree that was applied, accessible, and affordable. Finally, UCTE faculty have heard informally from several Cal Poly staff and faculty who
have expressed professional interest in such a doctoral program and who may be viable candidates for admission.

In terms of demand and sustainability, both Cal Poly and UCSB faculty believe that there will be a large enrollment initially and that the number then will stabilize over time. At initiation, enrollment may be 12-15; after three years, enrollment may sustain at 8-10 per year. This is comparable to the existing joint doctoral program with CSU Fresno and UC Davis. That program has sustained new enrollment of 8-10 for over a decade; as of Fall 1999, 63 students were actively enrolled. In addition, local satellite programs such as through USC have drawn enrollments successfully from the local area.

5. Resources Assessment:

An analysis of faculty, classroom space, library, and computer resources has been completed. (1) The Cal Poly educational administration program currently has two tenured professors; at least one more professor will be required support the new doctoral program (a search is now underway). (2) Classroom space is sufficient; in addition to Cal Poly, courses will be offered at UCSB and at different school/district sites. (3) Additional library resources may be required as a complement the UCSB holdings; these will be determined as new Cal Poly courses are offered in the second year of the program. (4) Computer resources are sufficient at present; UCTE has a new computer lab and SMART classroom, and there is access to distance education facilities on campus and at the SLO County Office of Education.

Funding to support new faculty and possible library holdings will come from two primary sources specified under the new CSU/UC agreement on joint doctoral programs: (1) a portion of funds allocated for program implementation ($2 million CSU), and (2) fees recovered from students enrolled in the program, based on the UC structure. According to the CSU Chancellor and UC President, these funds are protected from statewide budget reductions and will be allocated through a Joint Board that serves to protect the collaborating universities. Other sources may include the University Center for Teacher Education for program support and grants/contracts for research support.

6. Alignment with UCTE and University Strategic Plans:

The University Center for Teacher Education offers post-baccalaureate teaching/service/specialist credential programs and master's degree programs with specializations in related areas. Its mission is "to prepare educational leaders and foster collaborative programs within and beyond the university aimed at serving California's diverse population," and its strategic plan focuses on meeting the educational needs of the state through partnership endeavors. The new program is a strong fit in that it extends the continuum of educator preparation to the doctoral level; broadens partnership opportunities with K-12, community colleges, and other universities; and serves the needs of the central region of California.

In addition, the program fits well with Cal Poly's mission and strategic plan. The University emphasizes "undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate professional and technical programs." In addition, the hallmark of Cal Poly is its learn by doing educational philosophy and its commitment to excellent programs that reinforce "classroom instruction with practical, 'hands-on' learning in the laboratory, the studio or out in the field." The proposed Doctor of Education degree provides a professional program necessary to the state and is grounded in a field-based approach that will prepare scholar practitioners.
7. Requirements for Admission, Registration and Enrollment in the Joint Doctoral Program:

All applicants wishing to pursue the Ph.D. Program at UCSB or the Ed.D. Joint Doctoral Program (JDP) between UCSB and Cal Poly State University San Luis Obispo will be held to the same admission standards. This will ensure that students in both programs are equally well qualified to undertake the rigorous programs of study leading to the respective degrees. Successful applicants to the joint doctoral program will have met the following criteria; however, the number of applicants will likely exceed the number of spaces available and meeting minimum degree and score requirements will not guarantee admission:

- Received a master’s degree or its equivalent from a regionally accredited university prior to the quarter for which they seek admission;
- Maintained an upper-division grade point average of 3.0 or above;
- Earned Graduate Record Exam (GRE) scores that indicate sufficient ability for successful doctoral study;
- Shared research and/or professional practice goals with program faculty;
- References indicating their ability to work productively with others;
- Writing and speaking ability appropriate for doctoral study;
- Completion of all application materials;
- Screening by a joint program admissions committee composed of faculty and staff from both universities.

8. Program of Study:

Students admitted to both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. Programs will undertake a common first-year academic program that cover fundamental issues in educational leadership, organizational theory, educational policy, and qualitative and quantitative research methods will be required of all students. During summer quarters between years one and two, students also will participate in a Summer Leadership Institute. In the second year of study, students will undertake specialized seminars and field-based practica in Information Technology Issues, Organizational and Management Issues, Policy, Equity, and Political Issues, Economics and Financial Issues, and Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations. Cooperatively enrolling at, paying their fees to, and completing one year and two quarters of coursework at either university will fulfill academic residency requirements. The expected completion time for the EdD. Program is three years from the date of matriculation with a maximum time limit of four and one-half years. On the following page a Sample Program Diagram describes the progression of a student’s three years of study and research.

9. Examinations:

- All students will participate in rigorous coursework that will include appropriate examinations, evaluations, and critiques by professors who teach each course.
- Students will successfully complete a Comprehensive Exam during the Summer Quarter at the conclusion of Year One of their Program in order to continue in Year Two.
- All students will prepare and successfully defend an applied personal dissertation proposal in the first quarter of Year Three. All dissertations will require each student to successfully defend their dissertation with a formal oral defense.
2.11 Sample Program Diagram

### Year 1 - Courses Delivered at UCSB Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Induction Seminar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Induction Seminar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Induction Seminar</strong></td>
<td><strong>Induction Seminar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 242A (4)</td>
<td>ED 240A (4)</td>
<td>ED 244A (4)</td>
<td>ED 223H (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Theories</td>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership and Equal Educational Opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-AND-</td>
<td>-AND-</td>
<td>-AND-</td>
<td>ED 242C (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 214A (4)</td>
<td>ED 214B (4)</td>
<td>ED 213B (4)</td>
<td>Theories of Organizational Change and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory Statistics</td>
<td>Inferential Statistics</td>
<td>Psychometrics</td>
<td>ED 596 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-OR-</td>
<td>-OR-</td>
<td>-OR-</td>
<td>Summer Institute at UCSB and PDD Research Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 221A (4)</td>
<td>ED 211B (4)</td>
<td>ED 214C (4)</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods</td>
<td>Qualitative Interviewing</td>
<td>Linear Models for Data Analysis</td>
<td>Selection of Ph.D. or Ed.D. Program Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observation and Small Group Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UC-Supervised Research in Professional Development Districts**
Concurrent Enrollment at UCSB (0 Unit Load - No UC Fees)

### Year 2 - Courses Delivered at Cal Poly Campus or Field Location TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 600 (4)</td>
<td>ED 602 (4)</td>
<td>ED 604 (4)</td>
<td>ED 605 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>Policy, Equity, and Political Issues Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>Leadership Issues in Learning Organizations Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>Summer Institute/Session at Cal Poly and PDD Research Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 601 (4)</td>
<td>ED 603 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational and Management Issues Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td>Economics and Financial Issues Seminar and Practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CSU-Supervised Research in Professional Development Districts**
Concurrent Enrollment at CSU (0 Unit Load - No CSU Fees)

### Year 3 - Research Application with Seminar Meetings at Both Campuses or Field Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>WINTER</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
<th>SUMMER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
<td>CSU Residency Fees Paid to CSU</td>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
<td>UC Residency Fees Paid to UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED 606A (3)</td>
<td>ED 606B (3)</td>
<td>ED 606C (3)</td>
<td>ED 606D (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral Defense During Summer Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction and Literature Review Chapters Due</td>
<td>Methodology Chapter Due</td>
<td>Findings and Discussion Chapters Due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joint CSU/UC Supervised Research in PDD**
Concurrent Enrollment at UC

**Joint CSU/UC Supervised Research in PDD**
Concurrent Enrollment at CSU
1. To examine and assess the quality of the applied dissertation and its relevance to educational practice;
2. To evaluate the ability of students to present their work in a scholarly manner;
3. To provide an opportunity to share the work with the campus communities.

10. Applied Dissertation:

For most candidates, the applied dissertation will flow from research work conducted, as part of a cohort work group, in Professional Development Districts (PDDs). These K12 or Community College districts, whose relationship with the JD program will be defined by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs), will, with program faculty, have identified areas of inquiry, which will serve as the basis these research efforts. Within the context of this inquiry area, each candidate will develop an individual applied dissertation topic, which integrates theory and practice. There may be instances when an individual candidate’s career track is not compatible with assignment to a professional development district work group, such as a Cal Poly staff member. In such cases, accommodations will be made that allow the completion of an applied dissertation and which reflect the same standards as a PDD-based inquiry.

During the candidates first year in the program, they will attend an induction seminar during which they will be introduced to the concept, goals, objectives and expectations for field based research in PDDs. As the year progresses research projects will be selected and matched with work groups. During the summer institute following the first year of the program, the work groups, or individual candidates area of inquiry will be defined, and time lines and areas of research will be identified.

During the second year of the program, students will not only be developing and refining their area of inquiry, they will also be using PDDs as “laboratories” for the five-seminar practica they will be enrolled in. This is an important link since it further immerses the candidate in the culture of the PDD and will there by materially contribute to their applied dissertation work.

By the end of the second summer institute (between their 2nd and 3rd years) students will have selected a specific area of inquiry for their applied Dissertation. The proposal will reflect a clear theoretical framework, substantive collection of original data, critical analysis of the data, and direct and specific discussion of the implications of the findings derived from the data for educational practice. No later than the middle of the third year, students will have developed a formal proposal, consisting of the first three chapters, for their applied dissertation, and will schedule and oral defense. Successful students will be advance to candidacy.

The student dissertation committee will be composed of three-tenure track (CSU) or Ladder (UC) Faculty. One of these committee members will serve as chair (usually the candidates research advisor). Both campuses must be represented on the committee. Additional members, such as PPD staff, may serve on the committee with the same voting rights and responsibilities as faculty.

It is expected that students will complete their dissertations by the end of the third year. At that point, a formal oral defense will be scheduled. Assuming a satisfactory defense, candidates will submit the final manuscript for printing and binding, and two copies will be submitted to each of the campus libraries. The Ed.D. Degree will be awarded jointly by the UC and the CSU in the names of both cooperating institutions.
11. Teaching and Advisement:

Seminars and practica will be staffed by Tenure track (CSU), Ladder (UC) faculty, or adjunct faculty who possess similar academic and professional qualifications. There are currently 8 Ladder faculty at UCSB, two tenure-track faculty at Cal Poly, and one PDD adjunct faculty (Dr. Julian Crocker, San Luis Obispo County Superintendent of Schools), who will constitute the initial core faculty. Cal Poly’s UCTE is now searching for a third faculty member and will need to hire one additional faculty member during the course of the first cohort. Teaching and advisement load and responsibility for Cal Poly faculty will mirror UC practice.

Students will select a program advisor during their first year of course work. Although the program advisor and the dissertation adviser may be different faculty members, it is expected that, in most case, they will be the same person. Advisors may be faculty members at either campus. (See applied dissertation narrative for a description of composition and roles of dissertation committee members.)

12. Program Assessment:

A Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Board will have oversight responsibility for the program. The board will consist of representatives or designees from the respective Campus president’s offices, and the dean’s offices, the chairs or coordinators of the Education Leadership programs from the two campuses, the Program co-directors (one from each campus) and the K-16 Liaison. Among this group’s responsibilities, will be that of program evaluation. Evaluation components will include:

- Regular faculty review and feedback;
- School level program review;
- All evaluation procedures outlined by the UCSB Graduate Council and Cal Poly’s academic Senate;
- Internal self-evaluation and annual written reports of progress submitted to respective Deans by co directors. (These reports will be reviewed and forwarded to the Program Planning and Evaluation Board for review and recommendations.)

Every five years the Program Planning and Policy committee will conduct a comprehensive review; and direction, and goals of the program will be adjusted accordingly. It is also expected that evaluations by other agencies (e.g.: CPEC, WASC.) will also be conducted on a periodic basis.

13. Timeline for Approval and Implementation:

When the development team began the actual drafting of the proposal early in 2001, the goal was to admit the first cohort of students in Fall Quarter 2002. With that goal in mind and the encouragement of leadership on both campuses, the team has worked very hard to make this goal and timeline a reality. Encouragement and support for the program and the timeline came via development grants from both system administrations. Most recently, the agreement between the two systems to develop and support Joint Ed.D programs and expedite their approval has suggested that this initial timeline, while unlikely, may still be possible.

With this in mind the UCTE is now recruiting for a Program Director position (contingent upon program funding). However, in order for recruitment of students to take place and the minimum
infrastructure to be put in place, may be unrealistic to expect to admit students Fall 2002 unless the program is approved on campus and at the system level by mid-March 2002. While UC Santa Barbara and the UC system administration are moving very rapidly as are we, the development team recently concluded that admitting a cohort for Fall 2002 may not be achievable. After looking at alternatives such as mid-year admission, it was decided that Fall Quarter 2003 is the most workable target for the first cohort to begin taking coursework.

With the working target date likely to be Fall 2003, what follows is a draft implementation time-line:

**Fall 2002**
- Program approval and system for start-up funding costs;
- Appointment of JDP Co-Directors and support staff;
- Develop recruitment materials and beginning student recruitment;
- Begin process of identifying PDDs and drafting MOU language;
- Form Planning, Policy, and Evaluation Board

**Winter 2003**
- Work through administrative issues across the two campuses;
- Distribute recruitment materials, publicize program;
- Continue development of PDD program;
- Set up admissions screening committee;
- Confirm precise curriculum, identify faculty teaching coursework;
- Schedule Fall 2003 courses and locations;
- Work on details of Summer Leadership Institute.

**Spring 2003**
- Screen and interview applicants, and notify accepted candidates;
- Schedule and conduct meeting with successful applicants;
- Review progress with PPE Board;
- Meet with PDDs to begin process of identifying research issues;
- Complete preparations for Summer Leadership Institute.
April 8, 2002

TO: Academic Senate

FR: Bonnie Konopak, Dean
    Rita King, Educational Administration
    Ken Palmer, Educational Administration
    University Center for Teacher Education

RE: Joint Ed.D. program resolution

Attached please find our response to four questions raised by the Academic Senate at its March 5, 2002 meeting. These include:

1. Appropriateness:
   As a professional degree that focuses on translating theory/research into practice, the proposed education doctorate is closely aligned to the missions and goals of UCTE and Cal Poly: preparing K-14 leaders to address critical issues and problems through a field-based, "learning by doing" approach.

2. Need:
   The proposed education doctorate meets the increasingly complex and challenging demands facing K-14 administrators: preparing K-14 leaders to consider different theoretical perspectives; to use data to make sound, data-driven decisions; and to formulate, implement, and evaluate effective leadership approaches.

3. Demand/sustainability:
   Based on results of surveys and focused interviews with current and potential K-14 administrators, there is a demand for a practice-oriented program; further, given the number of positions available, normal attrition, and steadily increasing "baby boomer" retirements, this demand will continue.

4. Funding:
   There is support for the program through funding allocated by the newly created UC/CSU Joint Doctoral Program Board and on-going student enrollment based on UC fees and marginal costs. In addition, staffing flexibility will minimize the impact on the UCTE given any possible enrollment fluctuations.
Proposed Joint Ed.D. Program
Response to the Academic Senate
Spring 2002

APPROPRIATENESS

As a professional degree focusing on translating theory/research into practice, the proposed education doctorate is closely aligned to the missions and goals of UCTE and Cal Poly.

The purpose of the proposed Doctor of Education degree program is to provide advanced graduate-level study of educational leadership concepts and their application to schools and school agencies. The program is deliberately designed as a collaborative endeavor among Cal Poly, UCSB, and school partners, blending theoretical and research perspectives with practical application to address authentic problems. As such, there is a strong fit with the missions and goals of UCTE and Cal Poly.

UCTE's mission is "to prepare educational leaders and foster collaborative programs within and beyond the university aimed at serving California's diverse population," and its strategic plan focuses on meeting the educational needs of the state through partnership endeavors. The new program extends this mission from our current blended undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and masters programs to the doctoral level and broadens partnership opportunities with K-12, community colleges, and other universities. In addition to future tenure-track hires, our current faculty is well prepared to offer this program, with broad professional experience as administrators in schools/districts/county offices and with academic experiences in teaching graduate courses and advising doctoral students at other universities.

Cal Poly's mission is "to discover, integrate, articulate, and apply knowledge. This it does by emphasizing teaching; engaging in research; participating in the various communities... with which it pursues common interests; and where appropriate, providing students with the unique experience of direct involvement with the actual challenges of their disciplines." Its hallmark learn by doing educational philosophy is demonstrated through programs that reinforce classroom instruction "with practical, hands-on learning in the laboratory, the studio or out in the field." The proposed degree fits well with the Cal Poly mission; it is grounded in a field-based approach that utilizes applied research in professional development districts to frame and solve authentic educational problems.

NEED

The proposed education doctorate meets the increasingly complex and challenging demands facing K-14 administrators in the region and state.

Reflecting national concerns, California will continue to experience radical changes in public education over the next decade and beyond. These changes include, among others, a growing school-age population but a declining educator population; greater diversity in students' cultural, ethnic, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds; increased attention to standards and standardized achievement measures; a growing reliance on technology for instruction and operations; and a decrease in budgetary support. National and state reports have recognized these conditions and have emphasized the preparation and support of administrators to lead and manage effectively. For example, President Bush's recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA, 2002), No Child Left Behind, addresses school administrators for the first time. Given the impact of school leadership on student achievement, the focus is on recruiting and retaining quality administrators and on providing funding for their professional development.

In California, a Joint Legislative Committee currently is formulating the Master Plan--Kindergarten through University (SCR 29, Alpert), which expands the existing Master Plan for Higher Education to include K-12 education and its interfaces with higher education. In particular, the Committee has focused on the important relationship between school leadership and student performance and has recommended advanced graduate training to help administrators meet tomorrow's challenges:
California public and private colleges and universities currently do not offer sufficient numbers of doctorate programs to K-12 and community college personnel who want to seek this degree to better meet the needs of their students and institutions, as well as satisfy their desire to be well educated and current in their field. California relies on private, independent colleges and universities for about 70 percent of its doctorate-holders in K-12 education. Of particular concern is California's lack of investment to current and future leaders' access to high quality, affordable, and applied education doctorate programs which would enhance their performance and, in turn, that of their institutions and students.

In a recent report, CPEC (2000) agreed with the Joint Legislative Committee's concerns. It noted that the most affordable doctoral programs are at UC campuses but that these are the least accessible around the state. In contrast, programs offered by independent institutions, particularly at off-site locations, may be more accessible but also can cost four-to five times the amount of a state institution. These factors are barriers to potential candidates for an Ed.D.: working professionals who already hold leadership positions and who continue fulltime employment. This concern is particularly reflected in the central coast region. The closest doctoral-degree institution is UCSB, which currently offers only the Ph.D. in educational leadership, a program intended to prepare professionals for higher education and research positions. Independent institutions, such as USC and University of LaVerne, sometimes offer their Ed.D. programs off-site but these are rarely available in this area, are costly, do not include attention to long-term integration of course- and field-work, and do not always provide advising and other professional support to ensure candidates complete the program.

**PROGRAM DEMAND/SUSTAINABILITY**

There is a demand for the education doctorate as indicated by surveys and interviews with current and potential administrators in the region and, given the number of K-14 positions available, normal attrition, and steadily increasing "baby boomer" retirements, this demand will continue.

To examine the demand for an education doctorate in the central coast region, different methodologies were employed. All focused on the following points (adapted to each audience): (a) need for program, (b) personal interest, (c) interest for other administrators in location/reporting to respondent, and (d) program qualities necessary to attract candidates and to produce leaders prepared for administrative challenges. These included:

*Survey questionnaires to K-12 school/district/county administrators and community college presidents in SLO and northern Santa Barbara Counties (B. Konopak, Spring 2001)
*Survey questionnaires for students enrolled in Cal Poly education administration programs at different times in the past decade (R. King, K. Palmer)
*Focus group interview with SLO/Santa Barbara County Superintendents (CP/UCSB Planning Team, June 2001)
*Focus group interview with SLO/Santa Barbara/Ventura County Superintendents (UCSB, October 2001)
*Meetings with Marie Rosenwasser, President, Cuesta College (CP/UCSB Planning Team, Summer/Fall 2001)

The results of these questionnaires and interviews indicated an overwhelming positive response to an education doctorate, particularly with qualities of accessibility, affordability, and practice-orientation.

While we anticipate drawing students from K-12 classrooms, community colleges, and university staff, we expect that most students will come from the ranks of current and prospective school administrator in our K-12 schools and districts. Consequently, we looked to the number of K-12 administrative positions in the region, both current and projected, and the rate of turnover, both normal attrition and retirements.

First, we used the joint doctoral program between CSU Fresno and UC Davis as a model for planning. While some differences exist between the Fresno/Davis program and our proposal, that program has been in operation for about 10 years, and their experience served as a useful tool in estimating enrollment. The CPEC report noted that the Central Valley (Fresno/Davis service area) employs 885 K-12 school administrators. From the Central Valley’s pool, the Fresno/Davis program reports that annually it gets over 500 inquiries, receives between 35 and 55 completed applications, and maintains an enrollment of over 60 students. In extrapolating from the Fresno/Davis model, our Central Coast service area has 480 K-12 administrators; therefore, annually we might expect a qualified applicant pool of 25, new enrollment of 8-12, and a continuing enrollment of 30-35 students.
In addition, state demographics suggest that as many as half of the administrative positions in K-12 schools will turn over in the next five-eight years as a result of retirements. Consequently, new and replacement hires will require advanced study and degrees. K-12 enrollment also is projected to continue to grow in several of the largest school districts in our service area including Lompoc, Santa Maria, and Paso Robles, thereby creating new positions and potentially new interest in a program. Further, Cuesta College has a very active and vocal proponent of this proposal, citing an acute need for advanced education management training for current and prospective, replacement and new hire administrative staff. Finally, anecdotal data suggest the demand is high: (1) principal and superintendent groups regularly raise the issue of program availability (K. Palmer--superintendents; R. King--assistant superintendents and principals); (2) Cal Poly and UCSB faculty average a phone call or e-mail weekly from prospective students in K-12 inquiring about the status of the program; and (3) Cal Poly faculty receive inquiries from Cal Poly staff who are interested in such an advanced degree.

**PROGRAM FUNDING/SUPPORT**
*There is support for the program through funding allocated by the newly created UC/CSU Joint Doctoral Program Board and on-going student enrollment based on UC fees and marginal costs. In addition, staffing flexibility will minimize the impact on the UCTE given any possible enrollment fluctuations.***

For Cal Poly, the new program will require coordination; 28 teaching/supervision units (four 4-unit seminars/practicums, two 3-unit dissertation seminars that include dissertation advising, and one 2-unit summer seminar); dissertation committee service; administrative assistance; library holdings; and operating support. Annual costs are estimated at about $147,000 based on the following model (derived from workloads at UCSB and Fresno/Davis):

- one full-time faculty: $90,000=$75,000+ 20% benefits
- part-time faculty: $12,000=8 wtu's @$1,500/wtu
- committee service: $18,000=1.0 wtu/student @$1,500/wtu x 12 students
- part-time staff: $16,000=(inc benefits)
- library support: $6,000
- operating: $5,000
- total: $147,000

Additional administrative overhead is being negotiated with the Provost's Office. If estimated at about 20%, this would add $29,400, for a total of $176,400.

For program implementation, the UC/CSU Joint Doctoral Program Board will allocate $4 million ($2 million each from UC and CSU) to fund three phases of new programs: planning (maximum $30,000), development (maximum $250,000), and implementation for the first two years (no maximum established). The RFP was just issued, and the Cal Poly/UCSB planning team is developing a detailed two-year budget, including (but not limited to) the above costs, that will be reviewed by campus administrators.

For program continuation, permanent funding will derive from UC fees (about $1700/quarter) and marginal costs (about $9,500/year). These funds are to be allocated directly to the new program and will be apportioned to Cal Poly and UCSB according to each institution's level of responsibility, about 40/60. Therefore, on-going enrollment of 28 students would be expected in order to cover costs. Because this includes new enrollees and continuing students (over three-four years), having a stable program of at least 28 students is reasonable. Overall revenue is estimated at about $182,000:

\[ \text{\$1700 fee/quarter x 4 quarters = } \text{\$6,800 x 28 students = } \text{\$190,400} \]
\[ \text{\$9,500 marginal cost/year x 28 students = } \text{\$266,000} \]
\[ \text{total: } \text{\$456,400} \]
\[ \text{40% for Cal Poly = } \text{\$182,560} \]

In addition to permanent funding, there is some flexibility in terms of staffing our regular master's and credential programs in educational administration. According to the proposal, UCTE will offer annually 20 units of coursework during the academic year, a 2-unit institute during the summer, and dissertation advisement throughout the program. The new faculty member would have responsibility for a majority of the coursework, part-time program coordination, and some advising. With any fluctuations in enrollment, this professor would assume
teaching responsibilities in the master's and credential programs (Education Administration currently uses lecturers equivalent to approximately 1.0 FTE and also contributes to the MA graduate program core). In addition, we currently require the summer institute for our advanced administrative credential candidates and would integrate the two groups under one instructor. Further, we anticipate dissertation advisement will be staffed and reimbursed based on individual student credit generation, which would accommodate any enrollment differences.
WHEREAS, In the last several years Extended Studies has significantly increased and changed its roles and emphases; and

WHEREAS, It is important that both the current and future constituents of Extended Studies be made aware of these changes; and

WHEREAS, Under the reorganization, Extended Studies is now composed of several program areas charged with implementing continuing education and university outreach activities; therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That the Academic Senate of Cal Poly endorse the change of name of Extended Studies to Cal Poly Continuing Education.