



*Doctoral Program in  
Educational  
Leadership*

**HANDBOOK** 2013-2014

Office of Doctoral Programs  
[www.csun.edu/educ/doctorate](http://www.csun.edu/educ/doctorate)

## Table of Contents

1.	Program Goals .....	1
	Mission .....	1
	Vision.....	1
	Student Learning Outcomes.....	1
	Candidate Dispositions .....	2
2.	Program Features and Course of Study .....	3
	Curriculum Overview .....	3
	Courses of Study .....	4
	Program Features.....	5
	The cohort model. ....	5
	The scholar-practitioner approach. ....	5
	Signature pedagogy.....	5
	Field-based inquiry. ....	6
	Networking with area professionals.....	6
	Saturday doctoral seminars. ....	7
	E-portfolio.....	7
	Career development. ....	7
3.	Required Research, Examinations and Hearings .....	8
	Signature Assignments .....	8
	Qualifying Examination/Advance to Candidacy .....	8
	Overview.....	8
	Signature assignment review. ....	9
	Written Examination Part A.....	9
	Written Examination Part B.....	9
	Evaluation. ....	9
	Dissertation Proposal Hearing .....	10
	Final Dissertation Defense .....	10
4.	The Dissertation.....	12
	Overview .....	12
	Dissertation Unit Credit Hours .....	13
	Dissertation Subject, Scope, and Site .....	13
	Subject.....	13
	Scope.....	14
	Site. ....	14
	Dissertation Chapter Guidelines and Related Formatting .....	15

	Arrangement, structure and content (Appendix I).....	15
	Chapter I: Statement of the Problem.....	16
	Chapter II: Review of the Literature.....	16
	Chapter III: Methodology.....	18
	Chapter IV: Results or Findings.....	18
	Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusions.....	19
	Writing and format.....	20
	Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval.....	20
	Dissertation Format and Submission Requirements.....	21
5.	Roles and Responsibilities .....	23
	Doctoral Candidates.....	23
	Faculty .....	24
	Program Advisor .....	25
	Dissertation Chair.....	25
	Dissertation Committee Members .....	26
	Mentors.....	27
	Credential Office .....	28
	Library .....	28
	Graduate Studies, Research and International Programs .....	28
	Office of Financial Aid.....	29
6.	Program Policies and Regulations .....	30
	Transfer of Credit.....	30
	Tier II Credential as Part of the Doctoral Program (PreK-12 Cohort only).....	30
	Enrollment.....	30
	Attendance.....	32
	Leaves of absence.....	32
	Withdrawal.....	32
	Grade Requirements.....	32
	Incompletes .....	33
	Academic Probation and Disqualification: University Policy .....	33
	Retention in the Program: ELPS Department Policy .....	33
	Academic and Ethical Standards.....	34
	Academic integrity.....	34
	Ethical standards.....	35
	Grievance Procedures .....	36
	Time Limit for Completion of Degree .....	36
	Graduation.....	36
7.	Appendices.....	37
	Appendix A: Signature Assignment Specification .....	37

Appendix B: Signature Assignment Rubric.....	39
Appendix C: Qualifying Examination Rubric.....	41
Appendix D: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Format.....	43
Appendix E: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Rubric.....	44
Appendix F: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Form.....	45
Appendix G: Dissertation Defense .....	46
Appendix H: Dissertation Defense Rubric .....	47
Appendix I: Dissertation Defense Form.....	48
Appendix J: Dissertation Committee Appointment Process .....	49
Appendix K: Mentor Assignment Form.....	50
Appendix L: Request for Academic Leave of Absence.....	51

## **1. Program Goals**

### **Mission**

The Doctor of Education degree offered by California State University, Northridge is focused on preparing administrative leaders for California public elementary and secondary schools and community colleges based on the knowledge and skills needed by administrators to be effective leaders in public schools and community colleges.

### **Vision**

The vision of the California State University, Northridge Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership is to create a network of PreK-12 school and community college administrators prepared to effect profound change in teaching and learning that contributes to improved student achievement in our schools and colleges.

The program's scholar-practitioners will lead through:

- collaboration
- action research
- cultural proficiency
- systemic reform

### **Student Learning Outcomes**

Student Learning Outcomes in the Doctoral Program incorporate and build upon the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELS), the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders (PreK-12) and the AACC Competencies for Community College Leaders.

The candidates for the California State University, Northridge (CSUN) Doctorate in Educational Leadership have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to lead profound change in teaching and learning in PreK-12 schools and community colleges by:

1. Planning systemic reform and managing the change process in collaboration with fellow educators and other stakeholders, based on a shared vision of learning.
2. Guiding and supporting staff in nurturing a school, district, or community college culture and program conducive to the effective instruction of all students and to the professional growth of all employees.
3. Using data and technology effectively to assess student achievement, evaluate staff and programs, and plan and implement accountability systems.
4. Becoming critical consumers of educational research and producers of action research who apply the lessons of research to student, school/district, or community college improvement.

5. Promoting culturally proficient policies and practices that recognize and value difference and ensure equity.
6. Managing fiscal, physical, and human resources to ensure an effective, safe learning and working environment.
7. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources at the local, state, and federal level.
8. Modeling ethical practice, strong skills in communication and collaboration, and the development of leadership capacity in oneself and others.
9. Understanding, navigating, responding to, and influencing the larger policy environment and the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context of education.

### **Candidate Dispositions**

In addition to key knowledge and skills, effective educational leadership calls for certain dispositions. Dispositions are personal attributes, beliefs, values, and inclinations or orientations that are evident in a leader's actions, demeanor, and approach to problems.

The candidates for the CSUN Doctorate in Educational Leadership demonstrate that they value and are committed to:

1. **Collaboration and networking** with colleagues and stakeholders for the improvement of student achievement in PK-12 schools and community colleges. Candidates not only have knowledge and skills in how to collaborate, but show an inclination towards teamwork and shared or distributed leadership, with a willingness to listen to stakeholders, share decision-making, and nurture leadership in others. In addition, candidates show a disposition to play an active, positive role in regional networks during and after their doctoral training for school and community college reform.
2. **Action research and the use of research literature** in educational problem-solving and decision-making. Candidates not only have knowledge and skills in how to do research, but show an inclination to use data, consult the literature, engage in applied research and/or encourage action research among staff members in order to improve educational policy and practice.
3. **Cultural proficiency** in working with diverse candidates, staff, and stakeholders and in promoting equity-based policies and practices. Candidates not only have knowledge and skills in how to work effectively in diverse environments and promote equitable practices, but ascribe value and are responsive to linguistic, cultural, and racial diversity in their ways of thinking, communicating, and leading educational institutions.
4. **Systemic reform using systems thinking** as a change agent, with an interest in the big picture and large-scale improvement. Candidates not only have knowledge and skills in how to lead systemic reform, but see themselves and others as change agents and are inclined to look at problems and solutions systemically rather than as isolated instances, with a view to scaling up promising practices.

## 2. Program Features and Course of Study

### Curriculum Overview

The Doctoral Program faculty, in collaboration with our PK12 school and community college partners, has drawn from research as well as what we know about best practice to design a challenging and relevant curriculum, tailored to the needs of separate PK12 school and community college cohorts. This two-strand approach allows for courses that can specifically address the issues, needs, and interests distinctive to each level of educational leadership, such as promoting instructional leadership for the elimination of achievement gaps in PK12 schools and for the retention and achievement of diverse community college students. Candidates take courses with colleagues who are working in organizations much like their own, learning from each other as well as professors and mentors in the field.

The Program of Study is 60 units in length and is designed to be completed in three calendar years, including summers. The course of study is offered as a cohort program with a fixed order for all candidates. All courses are required; however, several courses are targeted only for the PK12 cohorts and others are targeted only for the community college cohorts. In their second year, candidates select either Applied Quantitative Methods II or Applied Qualitative Methods II, depending upon the nature of their dissertation. There is no foreign language requirement for the CSUN Ed.D. Program.

Classes normally are held one evening a week on the CSUN campus during the fall and spring semesters and sometimes two evenings a week in the summer semester. In addition, candidates participate in online activities; attend several Saturday Doctoral Seminars each semester; conduct field-based inquiry at schools/districts or colleges; and do independent research for a signature assignment in most courses.

All candidates complete a dissertation based on a review of the literature and independent research on a problem related to educational leadership, student achievement, or school/community college improvement. Candidates are assisted in planning, researching and writing the dissertation through research methods courses, Doctoral Saturday Seminars, and meetings with the Dissertation Chair and Committee. They present a dissertation proposal to their Dissertation Committee at the end of Year II and their final dissertation at the end of Year III, if ready. Candidates are strongly encouraged to plan ahead to finish the dissertation within three years, but have up to seven years from initial enrollment date in the program to complete it, if necessary (see CSU/CSUN doctoral fee policies).

## **Courses of Study**

- ELPS 700. The Art of Collaborative Leadership (3)
- ELPS 705. Organizational Complexity and Change (3)
- ELPS 710. Curricular and Instructional Leadership for Systemic Reform (6)
- ELPS 715. Leading Change through Cultural Competence (3)
- ELPS 720. Postsecondary Finance/Enrollment Management (3) (community college only)
- ELPS 725. Instructional Assessment and Program Evaluation (3)
- ELPS 730. Public Policy in Education (3)
- ELPS 740. Entrepreneurship in Education (3)
- ELPS 745. The Science of Administration (3)
- ELPS 750. The Ethical Dimensions of Leadership (3)
- ELPS 755. Human Relations in Educational Organizations (3)
- ELPS 760. Field-based Inquiry I (3)
- ELPS 765. Field-based Inquiry II (3) (Prek-12 only)
- ELPS 770. Applied Quantitative Inquiry I (3)
- ELPS 775. Applied Quantitative Inquiry II\* (3)
- ELPS 780. Applied Qualitative Inquiry I (3)
- ELPS 785. Applied Qualitative Inquiry II\* (3)
- ELPS 789. Dissertation Seminar (12)

*\* Choose only one, either ELPS 775 or ELPS 785*

## **Program Features**

### **The cohort model.**

The Doctoral Program utilizes a cohort model, in which a group of candidates moves through the program together, taking all classes in sequence as a group. Our program's cohort approach is unique in offering two separate cohort strands, PK12 School Leadership and Community College Leadership, with distinct versions of core courses for each cohort and a small number of courses taken only by PK12 school or by Community College Leadership candidates, respectively. This two-strand approach allows for courses that can specifically address the issues, needs, and interests that are distinctive to each level of educational leadership. In addition:

- Cohorts offer mutual academic, emotional, and logistical support and provide opportunities for members to learn from and study with one another. The camaraderie that develops helps with stressful times in the program. Study groups, team projects and other experiences within the cohort nurture the skills and dispositions of collaboration that are critical to educational leadership.
- Cohorts establish personal and professional ties that often last beyond the Doctoral Program itself. Such networks are valuable for career development, professional growth and support, as well as future collaborative projects and initiatives across sites, districts, or colleges.
- The cohort experience facilitates and reinforces everyone's timely progress through the program. The group carries with it the expectation that all but the occasional candidate will complete the program successfully, including all program benchmarks.

### **The scholar-practitioner approach.**

The scholar-practitioner model is the framework that guides teaching and learning in the program. This means that our program is based on a balance between lessons from research and scholarly literature, on the one hand, and best practices from the field, on the other—ideally bridging the gap between research and practice for the benefit of candidate learning and educational institutions they eventually lead. Under this model, each side can significantly inform the other, with candidates using the literature to contextualize and critically reflect on their practice, and using their experience as practitioners to challenge and contribute to research findings. Professors and mentors guide candidates in studying important educational problems through understanding and critiquing education scholarship, designing and conducting their own field-based inquiries, and working with practitioners to implement and assess interventions in a continuous cycle of action planning for improvement. The goal of this approach is to enhance educational practice and to effect profound change in PK12 school and community college student achievement and reform of educational organizations.

### **Signature pedagogy.**

To better prepare PK12 school and community college administrators, the Doctoral Program at CSUN is an intellectually rigorous, application-oriented program, built around the

craft knowledge and the research about teaching, learning, and leading. It has a clear mission and focus and is centered on common goals. It recognizes the changing knowledge base about educational administration, the need for high standards and expectations, and the importance of professional ethics and dispositions. It is designed to prepare scholar-practitioner change agents who impact student learning at PK12 schools and community colleges. The program advances knowledge of and capacity for effective leadership practice in important ways for our students.

Our Doctoral Program Signature Pedagogy is reflected in classes that are grounded in real-life problems of practice as a springboard for critical inquiry and systems thinking. Case-based learning begins with an actual scenario or dilemma and examines options for addressing the problem through consulting the relevant literature, applying appropriate theoretical perspectives, gathering additional data, sharing pertinent professional expertise, and assessing alternatives. Working individually and in teams with the professor as facilitator, candidates develop new directions for inquiry and construct cases based on their own institutional issues and settings. Building on their own leadership experience, candidates identify with problems that are posed and define the problems they wish to investigate in order to better understand their work, their organizations, and the broader context of PK12 school and community college education.

By stressing a systems perspective, we emphasize that a problem does not exist in a vacuum, but is a part of a larger system of interconnected parts that come together in a specific context and rely on a feedback loop to impact change. Rather than isolating narrow problems for study, the emphasis on systems thinking in doctoral courses helps leaders to hone their analytical and problem-solving skills as generalists who can see the “big picture” and its interrelationships in context.

Problem solving through the use of case-based learning with systems thinking as our signature pedagogy helps to define a unique doctoral culture at CSUN in a community of scholar-practitioners.

### **Field-based inquiry.**

Field-based inquiry facilitates the nexus of best practice with scholarly investigation. The PK12 cohort completes two field inquiry courses, and the Community College cohort completes one field inquiry course. Candidates are guided in designing and conducting an intensive, field-based inquiry related to organizational efforts to improve student achievement in PK12 schools or community colleges. Using the principles and methods of action research, they identify a problem, collect and analyze data, and engage in action planning based on the data in a cycle of continuous improvement. They may work independently or in groups, in consultation with professors and mentors, culminating in presentation of their findings. Through this process, candidates develop or enhance leadership skills in action research, collaborative problem solving, and systematic program planning, evaluation.

### **Networking with area professionals.**

Networking with area professionals is a key component of our program, accomplished in courses and seminars, as well as through field-based inquiry, professional conferences,

Revised 5/15/2013

mentorship, and various program requirements. Candidates enjoy access to leaders in our local school districts and community colleges, and representatives on the Doctoral Program Advisory Board. Both formal and informal networking opportunities help candidates to develop and expand their professional horizons, preparing them well for the next challenges of their career.

### **Saturday doctoral seminars.**

Doctoral Saturday Seminars are scheduled each semester to supplement weekday courses with additional content learning, skill development, various workshop activities, guiding candidates through the stages of the dissertation process and other program components. They also provide time for team planning, collegial sharing, and peer editing for courses such as ELPS 760: Field Based Inquiry I and ELPS 789: Dissertation Seminar. Examples of topics for these seminars include: academic writing, human subject application, formulating research questions, statistical analysis with SPSS software, grant writing, and introduction to the cultural competence for educational leaders and many more. All candidates are expected to attend all seminars.

### **E-portfolio.**

The required components for each e-portfolio:

1. The Ed.D. Program courses completed.
2. The Ed.D. Program benchmarks:
  - a. Passing the Written Parts A and B of Qualifying Examination.
  - b. Passing the Dissertation Proposal Hearing.
  - c. Successful Final Dissertation Defense.
3. Signature Assignment (SA) for each course.
4. Written Parts A and B of Qualifying Examination.
5. Dissertation.

Possible optional components, such as, but not limited to:

6. Personal statement (Statement of Purpose in the Ed.D. program).
7. Current resume including current contact information (email, phone # and address).
8. Conference participation and/or presentations.
9. Manuscript/publication drafts.
10. Additional noteworthy course work/projects.
11. Professional work samples.

### **Career development.**

Currently, at the local, state and national levels, there is a shortage of experienced administrators who are prepared for advanced positions in PK12 schools and community colleges. A doctoral degree is required or preferred for many higher level positions. The CSUN Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership not only prepares candidates with the knowledge and skills needed for higher level administrative positions, but it connects candidates with a

network of experienced leaders committed to profound educational change. Candidates draw upon this network of professors, mentors, program partners, and colleagues to expand their employment prospects to make a difference in student achievement. They also work on career development in selected courses.

### **3. Required Research, Examinations and Hearings**

#### **Signature Assignments**

A major feature of the CSU Northridge Doctoral Program is a series of signature assignments (Appendix A) which reflect the pedagogy we have adopted that guides our instructional strategies. In almost all of the required courses in the curriculum, there is a signature assignment that characterizes the problem solving emphasis of the program. Each is a case-based or problem-based approach to learning. It is an assignment that fosters the deep, rich, conversations about interactions and practices among candidates and their faculty. Our doctoral candidates bring extensive knowledge of administrative practice and professional education to advanced study. This knowledge of practice becomes a base upon which to build their inquiry. They can identify with problems that are posed and define the issues and problems that should be investigated. These concerns emanate from their own study and observation of practice in the field.

The signature assignments are characterized by a systems thinking approach to problem-posing and problem-solving. This perspective emphasizes that a problem does not exist in a vacuum, but is a part of a larger system of interconnected parts that come together in a specific context and rely on a feedback to impact change. Therefore, signature assignments are designed to foster disciplined inquiry into leadership practice in a systemic context. Our classes also are designed as inquiry seminars in which candidates actively engage in the learning process. The pedagogy is built on the principles of adult learning, in which candidates interact with professors more as colleagues and members of a learning community rather than passive recipients of knowledge. In all instances, candidates can bring their own experience to the signature assignment and what they want to achieve for their own organizations as they read, study, research, and problem-solve. Hence, we have created a community in which faculty and candidates continually engage in research and ongoing conversations about pressing issues in the field. Through signature assignments, candidates examine cases of leadership practice, use problems of practice as the starting point to conduct research and inquiry, pose leadership dilemmas, construct their own cases, respond to cases posed by others, and test their theories against practice as they examine and reflect on the problem.

#### **Qualifying Examination/Advance to Candidacy**

##### **Overview.**

The Qualifying Examination is taken in Year II, spring semester. The purpose of the examination is to demonstrate substantial progress in meeting the Student Learning Outcomes and other core expectations of the program. By passing the Qualifying Examination, a candidate is advanced to Candidacy because he/she has demonstrated the readiness and competence needed

to complete remaining courses successfully and undertake dissertation-level research and writing.

There are two sections to the Qualifying Examination: 1) signature assignment reviews, and 2) written exam that consists of two parts. Part A is an analysis of a case study, and Part B is a critique of a research paper. The case study and research paper will be disseminated to students via email. The examination will be administered on two consecutive weekends in early spring semester.

### **Signature assignment review.**

The Qualifying Examination Committee reviews the evaluations (Appendix B) and grades of signature assignments from the doctoral courses taken in Year I and the fall of Year II to verify the satisfactory completion of the assignments (B or above).

### **Written Examination Part A.**

An analysis of a case study: Critical analysis of educational issues and leadership challenges in the case, applying lessons learned in content courses and appropriate relevant literature. Candidates write a response of up to 8-10 pages, double-spaced plus references. This is a take-home exam over a 3-day weekend. Each student must work independently and submit the analysis of the case study before midnight of the third day.

### **Written Examination Part B.**

A critique of a research paper: Critical review of the author's research tools and methods for investigating the research questions and any recommendations the student may have for further research. Candidates write an essay of up to 3-5 pages, double-spaced plus references. This is also a take-home exam over a 3-day weekend. Each student must work independently and submit the critique of the research paper before midnight of the third day.

### **Evaluation.**

Each candidate's written qualifying examination is evaluated by at least two members of the faculty. The Committee verifies satisfactory signature assignments and uses the criteria and standards on the Qualifying Exam Rubric (Appendix C) to score the case analysis and the research critique on a pass, revise and resubmit, or fail basis. Candidates must obtain a score of at least 2 (acceptable) on all rubric rating criteria to pass the exam and be advanced to Candidacy.

If a candidate receives a revise and resubmit or fails any section or part of the qualifying examination, the candidate must work with the Dissertation Chair to address the deficiencies noted in each rubric section(s) of the Qualifying Exam Rubric. The candidate may then submit the revised Exam as per the timeframe set by the Qualifying Exam Committee Chair. If a candidate fails on the second attempt/revision, the candidate's resubmission Exam is read by a third reader as designated by the Director of Doctoral Programs. If the third reader agrees with

the failure at the second attempt, the candidate will be referred to the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies (ELPS) Retention Committee and may be dismissed from the program.

### **Dissertation Proposal Hearing**

The written proposal is typically the first three chapters of the dissertation in draft form, which constitute the foundation for the dissertation study. Once the written dissertation proposal and IRB application (if necessary) has been approved tentatively by the Dissertation Chair, candidates provide copies of the written proposal to the committee at least two weeks before the Dissertation Proposal Hearing. Candidates may then coordinate the scheduled date for the Proposal Hearing with the chair and committee. The dissertation chair contacts the Office of Doctoral Programs and schedules the Dissertation Proposal Hearing for the candidate.

The Dissertation Proposal Hearing is a meeting with the Dissertation Committee in which candidates orally present highlights of their proposal, “explain” their plans for the dissertation study, and receive feedback from the committee. The focus of the hearing is on the research questions, literature, and proposed research methodology. The discussion is not so much an assessment as an opportunity for committee members to make suggestions for approaches to the topic, bibliography, pitfalls to be avoided, etc. This meeting is not open to the public (Appendix D).

Evaluation of the Dissertation Proposal is a responsibility of the candidate’s Dissertation Committee. After reviewing the written proposal and the candidate’s Oral Dissertation Proposal Hearing according to the Dissertation Proposal Hearing Rubric (Appendix E), the Dissertation Committee either approves the proposal or recommends further work needed to meet Doctoral Program standards. Candidates must obtain a score of at least 1 (acceptable) on all rating criteria to pass the hearing and be permitted to continue to the next stage in the dissertation process. Specifically, candidates must have both IRB approval from the University and Proposal Hearing approval from their Dissertation Committee before engaging in formal data collection for their study (Appendix F). Failure to obtain these two approvals before starting data collection may result in academic warning or dismissal.

Candidates may have a total of two Proposal Hearings. If approval is not granted after the second time, the candidate is referred to the ELPS Retention Committee by the Dissertation Chair and may be dismissed from the program.

### **Final Dissertation Defense**

The Final Dissertation Defense (Appendix G) is a required meeting between the candidate and his/her full Dissertation Committee, in which the candidate orally presents highlights of the final dissertation before a community of scholar-practitioners, and defends the work by responding to committee questions and concerns. No Final Dissertation Defense is

scheduled until the Dissertation Chair and committee members have determined that, in their judgment, the dissertation is acceptable and thus warrants a final defense.

Candidates intending to defend the final dissertation must coordinate the scheduled date with the chair and committee. The dissertation chair contacts the Office of Doctoral Programs and schedules the dissertation defense for the candidate. Scheduling begins after copies of the final dissertation have been distributed to members of the Dissertation Committee. The candidate is responsible for distributing copies of the dissertation for the final defense at least four weeks before it is to take place, and for notifying the Dissertation Chair and Office of Doctoral Programs when all members have received their copies.

The Final Dissertation Defense is an important event demonstrating sustained student and faculty effort and critical thinking have gone into the research project. 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 candidate.
2. A closed question and answer period involving all members of the Dissertation Committee.

The first part of the Final Dissertation Defense is scheduled and announced as a public seminar to which all candidates, faculty, and guests, are invited. Following the seminar, the Dissertation Chair adjourns the session and the candidate continues to respond to questions from committee members.

The evaluation of the Final Dissertation Defense is the responsibility of the candidate's Dissertation Committee. After reviewing the candidate's Final Dissertation Defense according to the Final Dissertation Defense Rubric (Appendix H), the Dissertation Committee either approves the defense or recommends further work needed to meet Doctoral Program standards. Candidates must obtain a score of at least 1 (acceptable) on all rating criteria to pass the final defense and be permitted to graduate.

Following the successful defense, the candidate submits any required written revisions to the Dissertation Chair for final approval.

Candidates may defend the final dissertation a total of two times. If approval of the defense is not granted after the second time, the candidate is referred by the Dissertation Chair to the ELPS Retention Committee and may be dismissed from the program.

## 4. The Dissertation

### Overview

A written doctoral dissertation is the major benchmark required in CSUN's doctoral program. All candidates complete a dissertation based on a review of the literature and original research on a problem of practice related to educational leadership, student achievement, and school/community college improvement. The primary goal of the dissertation is to generate applied knowledge that contributes to the understanding and improvement of educational practices, policies, or reforms. The dissertation is a contribution to the field that demonstrates the candidate's scholarship, research skills, and insight into a particular problem. With its successful completion, we welcome the candidate into the community of scholar-practitioners who are dedicated to profound educational change.

The doctoral dissertation at CSUN is a significant scholarly work that uses rigorous research methods in the study of educational problems and practices and the application of problem-solving strategies. The dissertation is expected to be based on one or more theoretical frameworks and to include a comprehensive review of relevant literature. The dissertation typically involves collection of empirical data, qualitative and/or quantitative analysis of these data, interpretation of the findings, discussion of their significance and implications, and recommendations of important areas for action as well as further study.

Dissertation topics address significant problems related to educational leadership, student achievement, and systemic reform in PK12 schools/districts or community colleges. Topics should be of compelling personal interest to the candidate and represent systemic challenges at schools, districts, or community colleges. Faculty and mentors assist candidates in refining their topic into researchable, manageable questions from the start of the program.

In general, a dissertation for the CSUN Doctoral Program should:

- Contribute to professional knowledge in the field and the improvement of PK12 schools/districts or community colleges, as well as candidate's professional growth.
- Represent the candidate's original investigation and writing, done in a spirit of authentic inquiry (not preconceived conclusions).
- Address a clear, significant topic in PK12 school or community college education in a systematic, rigorous manner.
- Place the study in the context of previous research and relevant theory.
- Use appropriate applied research methodology (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) and action research approaches and techniques.
- Make an argument throughout well-supported by evidence.

## **Dissertation Unit Credit Hours**

All candidates enroll in a minimum of 12 units (two per semester in years II and III) of ELPS 789: Dissertation Seminar study as they conduct their research, prepare, and defend their dissertation. Candidates typically present a dissertation proposal to their committee at the end of Year II and their final dissertation at the end of Year III, if ready. They are strongly encouraged to finish the dissertation within three years, but have up to seven years from initial enrollment date in the program to complete it, if necessary.

## **Dissertation Subject, Scope, and Site**

### **Subject.**

Dissertations in the CSUN Doctoral Program should be:

- rooted in a problem of practice or policy in PK12 schools/districts or community colleges or related settings;
- on a topic of compelling personal interest to you;
- on a topic that has potential for promoting profound change in student achievement, teaching and learning, and/or leadership for systemic; school/college improvement, in keeping with the Doctoral Program mission and vision;
- based on original research, using either data you have collected or analysis of secondary (preexisting) data;
- empirical; not primarily historical or theoretical in nature;
- big enough to be significant but small enough to be focused and manageable; and
- feasible in terms of time, resources, access, permission, etc.

The dissertation in this program is generally a work of independent scholarship in the traditional five-chapter format. The dissertation proposal is a draft of the first three chapters (Statement of the Problem, Review of the Literature, Methodology). The final dissertation is a revision of these chapters, plus Chapters IV and V (Results/Findings, Discussion and Conclusions), references, and appendices. While final dissertations in this program will generally run between 100 and 135 pages (before appendices and references), each dissertation will be advised and assessed on its own merits by the Dissertation Chair and Dissertation Committee.

Some students will have shared research interests and may even share aspects of their studies, such as a common research site, quantitative data set, subjects, preexisting instrument(s), or some literature reviewed. However, all students are expected to do independent work on devising their own research questions, literature review, research design, data collection, data analysis, and writing.

The following are broad guidelines on the scope of work normally expected in data collection and analysis (to be further explained in research courses). Dissertation Chairs and Dissertation Committees may have additional expectations.

### **Scope.**

#### ***Quantitative studies.***

- Design of study needs to be carefully planned and sufficient to warrant valid and reliable inferences.
- You may develop your own instrument(s) or use existing validated instrument(s), in discussion with your chair/committee.
- Sample size should be large enough to be representative of the population of interest, appropriate to the research question, appropriate to the type of analysis conducted, and (for survey studies) to create reliable constructs.
- It is appropriate to analyze secondary data sets (from existing district, postsecondary, state, or national databases) using multiple analytic techniques.
- Developmental studies are acceptable (developing and testing an instrument).

#### ***Qualitative studies.***

- These will generally involve extensive time for data collection in the field (observations, interviews, focus groups, etc.) at schools, district offices, community organizations, etc. in addition to other methods.
- Fieldwork must be documented in writing for data analysis, through field notes, interview transcriptions or logs, video logs, cultural behavior mapping, etc. The analysis process should also be documented through an audit trail, including coding lists, data displays, analytical memos, etc.
- Sample size is relatively small compared to quantitative studies to allow for in-depth investigation.
- The sample size or data collection must be approved by your Dissertation Chair and Dissertation Committee.

#### ***Mixed method studies.***

A reasonable combination of parts of each of quantitative and qualitative above.

### **Site.**

Each candidate should carefully consider the site of his/her study, especially for qualitative studies involving extensive interpersonal contact or any study involving people he/she supervises. If the candidate is an administrator considering the use of his/her own site for the study, he/she may need to discuss with his/her Dissertation Chair/Committee the following potential problem:

- conflicts with your professional role and responsibilities

- power issues or ethical issues with informants over whom you have supervisory authority
- maintaining confidentiality for students and staff under the Family Rights and Privacy Act
- difficulty getting research approval from the university (IRB) and/or the district/institution
- familiarity with the institution, leading you to take too much for granted rather than question and investigate at deeper levels
- some faculty may be reluctant to take part in an anonymous survey for fear of being identifiable, or may offer only the responses they think you want to hear

In summary, many problems relating to the study site can be anticipated and reduced or eliminated in the way a study is designed or conducted, but candidates should be aware that there are inherent challenges and ethical dilemmas, especially for administrators doing studies at their own site. Studies done by administrators focusing on students, parents, or other stakeholders may be less problematic as there is no direct supervisory role involved. Other options for administrators are to arrange to do studies focused on teachers and staff at other sites, such as the institutions of the candidate's colleagues (including those in the doctoral program), or to have colleagues from other sites assist the candidate with interviews and observations of his/her own staff. Candidate should consult with the chair, committee, and colleagues to decide on a site that is workable as well as meaningful for his/her research interests and professional goals.

## **Dissertation Chapter Guidelines and Related Formatting**

**Arrangement, structure and content** <http://www.csun.edu/grip/graduatestudies/thesis/>

- Title page (use the name on your official University transcripts and remember this is counted as a silent page number).
- Copyright notice page (if included).
- Signature page.
- Preface, dedication and/or acknowledgement page (if included).
- Table of contents, with page references as follows:
  - a. List of preliminary material, beginning with signature page.
  - b. List of tables, figures, illustrations (if included).
  - c. List of chapters or sections in text, bibliography, and appendices
  - d. List of symbols (if included).
  - e. Nomenclature (if included).
- Abstract (always your last preliminary page).
- Text beginning with introduction, divided into chapters or sections (Arabic numbering begins here).
- References.
- Appendices (if included).
- Addenda (if included).

## **Chapter I: Statement of the Problem.**

This chapter makes a case for the significance of the problem, contextualizes the study, and provides an introduction to its basic components.

- Introduction: Describes the issue or problem to be studied and situates it in a broader educational or social context at the state, regional, or national levels.
- Problem Statement: Articulates a clear, significant topic in PreK-12 school or community college education in a systematic, rigorous manner.
- Purpose and Significance: Describes study purpose in a logical, explicit manner. Provides full rationale for why study is important and how it will contribute to professional knowledge and practice.
- Research Question(s) and hypotheses (if relevant): Lists research questions, briefly describes variables and definition of technical or specially used terms (if relevant).
- Theoretical/conceptual framework: Outlines theory that is tested in study or conceptual framework that informs the study (this framework may be presented in either Chapter I or II as appropriate).
- Overview of methodology: Outlines methodological type/approach, research setting, sample, instrumentation (if relevant), and methods of data collection and analysis used.
- Limitations and delimitations: Identifies potential weaknesses of the study and the scope of the study.
- Organization of the dissertation: Delineates the contents of the remaining chapters in the dissertation.

## **Chapter II: Review of the Literature.**

This chapter situates the study in the context of previous research, presents a critical synthesis of empirical literature according to relevant themes or variables, justifies how the study addresses a gap or problem in the literature, and, if not addressed in Chapter I, outlines the theoretical or conceptual framework of the study.

- Introduction: Describes the content, scope, and organization of the review as well as the strategy used in the literature search.
- Review of literature:
  - Clearly related to the problem statement, research questions and/or hypotheses.
  - Reviews primary sources that are mostly recent empirical studies from scholarly journals.
  - Logically organized by theme, subtopic, or variable from broad to narrow (funnel design).
  - Synthesizes findings across studies; compares/contrasts different research outcomes, perspectives, or methods.
  - Notes gaps, debates, or shortcomings in the literature and provides a rationale for the study.

- Summary.

### **Chapter III: Methodology.**

This chapter situates the study in a particular methodological tradition, provides a rationale for that approach, describes the research setting and sample, and describes data collection and analysis methods.

- Introduction: Restates research questions, hypotheses, and variables (if relevant). Describes organization of chapter.
- Research design or tradition: Describes research approach used with rationale for its suitability for addressing the research questions, citing appropriate methodological literature.
- Research setting/context: Describes and justifies selection of the research setting, with background information on program, school, district, or community college, such as demographics and student achievement data.
- Research sample and data sources:
  - Explains and justifies type of sample used and how participants were selected (including population, sampling frame, and sampling procedures for quantitative or mixed methods studies).
  - Describes characteristics and size of sample (all) and/or data set (quantitative/mixed methods only, if applicable).
  - Describes how the rights of participants were protected, with reference to conventions of research ethics and the IRB process.
- Instruments and Procedures:
  - Quantitative and Mixed Methods: Describes and justifies type of instrument(s), gives name/source if “off the shelf”, explains concepts measured, calculation of scores/values, pilot test if applicable, and instrument reliability and validity, with reference to appendices.
  - Qualitative: Describes and justifies any instruments used, such as interview, focus group or observation protocols, with reference to appendices.
- Treatment (if applicable): If a treatment is used, it is described clearly and in detail.
- Data collection: Describes and justifies data collection methods and procedures, including how, when, where, and by whom data were collected.
- Data analysis: Describes and justifies methods and statistical tools (if applicable) used for analysis. Discusses measures taken to enhance study validity. Summarizes results of pilot studies, if applicable.
- Role of the Researcher: Explains the role of the researcher in planning and conducting the study; makes explicit relevant researcher assumptions, beliefs, and biases (if applicable).
- Summary

### **Chapter IV: Results or Findings.**

This chapter organizes and reports the study’s main results or findings, including the presentation of relevant quantitative (statistical) and/or qualitative (narrative) data.

- Introduction: Provides a brief summary of and rationale for how data were analyzed. Describes organization of chapter according to research questions/hypotheses, theoretical/conceptual framework, or thematic scheme.
- Quantitative:
  - Measures obtained are reported clearly and accurately, following standard procedures.
  - Descriptive statistics are provided on the study sample and results prior to presenting further statistical analysis. Where appropriate, outcomes of hypothesis-testing procedures are clearly reported.
  - Results are presented in a logical manner in both statistical form (through tables and figures) and narrative form that reports and explains the statistical results. Some tables and figures may be deferred to the appendices.
  - Headings are used to guide the reader through the results according to research questions, variables, or other appropriate organizational scheme.
- Qualitative:
  - Findings build logically from the problem, research questions, and design.
  - Findings are presented in clear narrative form using plentiful quotes, stories, and “thick description”. Narrative data are connected and synthesized through substantive explanatory text and visual displays (charts), if applicable, not simply compiled.
  - Headings are used to guide the reader through the results according to research questions, themes, or other appropriate organizational scheme.
- Inconsistent, discrepant, or unexpected data are noted with discussion of possible alternative explanations.
- Summary.

## **Chapter V: Discussion and Conclusions.**

This chapter interprets and discusses the results in light of the study’s research questions, literature review, and conceptual framework, concluding with recommendations for policy and practice, such as action planning for educational improvement.

- Introduction: Provides an overview of the chapter’s organization and content.
- Summary of the study: Provides a “stand alone” description of the study to include a brief overview of the problem, purpose statement, research questions/hypotheses, methodology, and summary of major findings, with an emphasis on answering the research questions.
- Discussion: Provides an in-depth interpretation, analysis, and synthesis of the results/findings.
  - Relates the results/findings to the larger body of literature and the conceptual/theoretical framework as well as interpretive themes or patterns that emerged from analysis (qualitative). Reflects on study’s contribution to the field.

- Restates the study's limitations and discusses generalizability of the findings to broader populations or other settings and conditions (if applicable).
- Implications for policy and practice: Recommendations for change in educational policy and practice based on the results/findings. Recommendations for specific action planning and next steps, if applicable.
- Recommendations for future research: Describes topics that may need closer examination and may generate a new round of research questions for further study.
- Concluding statement: Ends the dissertation with strong, clear, concise "take-away message" for the reader.

### **Writing and format.**

The writing and format of the dissertation should conform to APA style, conventions for academic written English, and CSUN Office of Graduate Studies format requirements.

- Conforms to the 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 conventions for:
  - Grammar, usage, punctuation, and spelling.
  - In-text citations for references, direct quotations, and paraphrasing.
  - The reference list.
  - Tables and figures.
  - Headings and sub-headings.
- Writing is:
  - Scholarly (i.e., the language is accurate, balanced, specific rather than overly general, tentative regarding conclusions, grounded in previous scholarship and evidence).
  - Direct and precise.
  - Clear and comprehensible, without excessive jargon; specialized terms are used correctly.
  - Logical and coherent, with smooth transitions between sections and chapter summaries.
  - The original work of the doctoral candidate, with proper use of citations, quotations, and paraphrasing to avoid plagiarism.
- Organization:
  - Logical organization of chapters in the traditional five-chapter format.
  - Headings and subheadings identify the logical flow of the dissertation and make it easy for the reader to follow.
  - Chapters fit together coherently into an integrated "whole."
- Format: Complies with CSUN Office of Graduate Studies (<http://www.csun.edu/grip/graduatestudies/thesis/>) dissertation requirements.

### **Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval**

Like other researchers, doctoral candidates are required to go through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process at their university to ensure the protection of the rights of human research subjects and the ethical conduct of their dissertation study. Guidelines and sample documents for IRB/Human Subjects approval at CSUN, as well as a schedule of CSUN Human Subjects Committee meeting dates for consideration of applications, can be found by clicking at: <http://www.csun.edu/grip/research/humanresearch/submission2.html#forms>

### **Writing Challenges and Time Management**

Writing challenges and time constraints can be major barriers to successful completion of the dissertation. Some candidates are overwhelmed with data and do not know where to begin; others have trouble organizing their material or putting findings into words; still others suffer from lack of experience with or confidence in academic writing. Nearly everyone has trouble finding the time to sit down and write. Candidates are encouraged to set a daily or weekly schedule for writing and stick to it, using larger blocks of time when most alert for the most difficult writing tasks, such as first drafts, and smaller amounts of time when less alert for easier writing, such as editing, creating data tables, or checking references. Setting up small dissertation writing/support groups of three or four people outside of class can also be helpful; this could even be done online if in-person meetings are not feasible. Those who struggle with academic writing may need to seek additional help from workshops or professional editors. Dr. Kathleen Rowlands [kathleen.rowlands@csun.edu](mailto:kathleen.rowlands@csun.edu) will offer a Writing Mentor seminar on Monday evenings during the Academic Year.

Time management skills are critical to the successful completion of dissertations, especially for full-time working professionals in a three-year program. That is why candidates are started early on the dissertation process, beginning with the orientation; guided to maintain a strong focus on the dissertation process through the Saturday Doctoral Seminars; and held accountable for regular progress reports and chapter drafts in the Dissertation Seminars. Candidates are encouraged to use class research papers as opportunities to learn more about their dissertation topic; to make and follow a schedule for writing the proposal in Year II and the final dissertation in Year III; and to use the support network of the doctoral cohort to keep one another on track for successful completion.

### **Dissertation Format and Submission Requirements**

The university has established requirements for the formatting, binding, and submission of the final dissertation. These formatting requirements are available at <http://www.csun.edu/grip/graduatestudies/thesis>. Candidates are strongly encouraged to set up their draft chapters to comply with these requirements from the inception of writing their proposal (for example, by using 1.5 inch margins on left side for binding). The dissertation must be submitted to Graduate Evaluation Services for approval of formatting in time to meet approval deadlines (see thesis deadlines for your semester of graduation at <http://www.csun.edu/grip/graduatestudies>). Effective spring semester, 2012, CSUN now requires electronic thesis and dissertation (ETD) submissions. ETD can be accessed at <https://pisco.grid.csun.edu/ETD/Login.php> For any questions on university formatting, binding,

and submission, please contact Graduate Evaluation Services in Graduate Studies, Research and International Programs Office, University Hall 265, (818) 677-4800.

## 5. Roles and Responsibilities

### Doctoral Candidates

Doctoral study is an intense experience, with higher academic expectations and a greater time commitment than other graduate programs. In addition to leadership experience, candidates need strong academic, analytical writing, and time management skills to be successful in the program. Candidates should be interested in studying educational problems in depth, developing advanced-level knowledge and skills, and undertaking a major independent research project (the dissertation). They should also be prepared to make a major three-year time commitment, not only for classes but for intensive reading, writing, and research outside of class.

Doctoral-level work is original work that shows a broad understanding of the field, an advanced level of analysis, and a strong grounding in the literature and/or other evidence to support one's thesis and claims. Doctoral-level work is clearly and compellingly presented, with a well-organized, logical flow of ideas and information, and proper attribution of sources. The work should meet or exceed assignment guidelines and show critical engagement with course concepts, readings, activities, and practical applications.

Doctoral-level writing follows conventions for clear academic writing including correct spelling, grammar, punctuation, usage, and sentence and paragraph structure without excessive use of educational jargon. For this program, writing also should follow American Psychological Association (APA) style for citations, references, quotations, headings, tables, figures, numbers, and any other APA elements required by the professor. For concise information on APA style, please check the CSUN Library website at <http://library.csun.edu>.

- Candidates' conduct in class and toward professors, mentors, and colleagues is expected to be professional, ethical, respectful, responsible, and collegial, reflecting serious commitment to the program and to the profession of educational leadership.
- Candidates are expected to demonstrate that they value and are committed to the program's Candidate Dispositions in the areas of collaboration and networking, research for problem solving, cultural proficiency, and systems thinking as a change agent.
- Candidates are expected to be familiar with and abide by principles of academic integrity and ethical standards.
- Candidates should undertake a critical self-appraisal before they meet with advisors or mentors.
- Read and understand academic policies and procedures contained in Doctoral Handbook.
- Inform advisor of any academic difficulties, program or career changes.
- Maintain scheduled appointments with advisors and be prepared for advisement with any supporting documentation or materials which could assist the advisor.
- Provide advisors with feedback and follow through on advisor recommendations as needed.

## Faculty

Doctoral faculty must create and preserve a professional culture that is appropriate to this advanced level of study. Traditionally, doctoral programs have particular values, standards, norms, activities, and styles of interaction that are part of what is considered a “doctoral culture.” Our faculty should value and demand:

- **Intellectual rigor:** The program is intellectually rigorous and application-oriented, built around craft knowledge and the research base on teaching, learning, and leading. Topics that may have been introduced at the Master’s level now include a stronger theoretical and research-based underpinning, with more complex texts and in-depth discussions and assignments. Candidates must be able to learn to read, understand, critique, and apply quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research to address problems in PK12 schools and community colleges. Candidates must be able to plan, conduct, and report a major, independent, original study in the form of a dissertation that demonstrates their scholarship, research, and problem-solving skills.
- **High expectations:** Doctoral candidates must be expected to perform at an advanced level of scholarship in preparation for advanced leadership positions as scholar-practitioners. They are expected to do a significant amount of reading for classes; consult library and other resources beyond the required readings; and engage in original data collection and problem-based applied research in their own organizations. They are expected to meet conventional standards for doctoral-level research, writing and analysis in all courses. Candidates also must be held to high expectations in terms of the integrity of their academic work and professional behavior.
- **Collegiality:** Doctoral candidates, who in this program are often experienced administrators in their own right, learn and work as colleagues alongside their professors, mentors, and advisors as well as their fellow candidates. It is assumed that candidates interact with others in this spirit to further an atmosphere of collaborative learning and problem solving, as well as mutual support. They actively engage in class discussions, make presentations, and share their thinking and work with one another.
- **Criticism and revision:** Ongoing critical feedback is offered by professors, mentors, and fellow candidates in the spirit of collegiality, lifelong learning, and ongoing professional growth. Candidates should be expected to revise written work multiple times in response to feedback.
- **Quality research:** Many professors who serve as Core Faculty in the program have a strong publication record and have consistently presented their work at state and national professional meetings. CSUN is committed to supporting both faculty and student research as part of building a doctoral culture on campus through the establishment of research centers, student and faculty research opportunities, an increased number and variety of colloquia by visiting scholars, and expanded library resources. Faculty must commit themselves to model on-going scholarly inquiry.

- Likewise, candidates should be encouraged to write papers with colleagues or faculty that may be published in peer-reviewed journals or presented at regional or national conferences.

### **Program Advisor**

Candidates are assigned an initial Program Advisor from among the Doctoral Faculty. Advisors provide students with general information and support, as needed, to ensure successful progress through the program.

Program Advisors serve in this capacity for the first year of the program. Upon request of the student or the advisor and upon the approval of the Director of Doctoral Programs, the advisor may be changed.

In addition, the Director of Doctoral Programs also provides ongoing advising and support for all candidates, in addition to assistance with personal needs and connections to support services on campus as needed.

Advisors and students meet regularly and are generally expected to:

- Monitor student academic progress.
- Help clarify dissertation research focus.
- Help student identify a Program Mentor.
- Assist student with personal growth and career development.
- Help student with goal-setting.
- Clarify academic and institutional policies.
- Provide guidance on academic issues.
- Assist student with personal concerns.
- Develop and review student E-portfolio.
- Help student maximize educational opportunities in the Doctoral Program.
- Assist students on any appropriate issue.

### **Dissertation Chair**

By the end of Year I, the Director of Doctoral Programs appoints a Dissertation Chair for each candidate from among the program's full-time Doctoral Core Faculty (Appendix J), based on candidate requests and faculty availability, eligibility, and expertise. A candidate's Program Advisor may become their Dissertation Chair, if available and eligible, or the candidate may seek a separate person as chair. The Dissertation Chair works with the candidate throughout the dissertation process as the primary guide and "head coach" to assist them in meeting the high expectations for an independent scholarly investigation. In the early stages, the chair assists candidates with conceptualizing the problem, refining research questions, reviewing the literature, and planning the research methods. The chair reviews drafts of the Dissertation Proposal and suggests revisions. The Dissertation Chair also signs the CSUN human subjects application and ensures that requirements are met on a timely basis. Later, the chair advises

candidates on collecting, analyzing, and reporting data; reviews drafts of Chapters IV and V; and suggests revisions. The Dissertation Chair, together with the candidate, determines when the candidate is ready for the Proposal Hearing and later for the Final Dissertation Defense. The chair also consults with other committee members on a regular basis, and leads the discussion and rating of the candidate's performance at both the Proposal Hearing and Final Dissertation Defense. If minor revisions are required after the Final Dissertation Defense, the chair reviews these before signing off on the dissertation.

The Dissertation Chair plays an important role in the Final Dissertation Defense. Responsibilities include:

- Conducting the examination in a systematic fashion so that the candidate has sufficient time to present, all committee members have an opportunity to raise questions and the candidate has sufficient time to respond.
- Charging the Dissertation Committee to vote on the acceptability of the written dissertation and the Final Dissertation Defense, based on the Dissertation Defense Rubric (Appendix H).
- Ascertaining that the Final Dissertation Defense Examination Record Form is completed and signed by all members of the Dissertation Committee and the candidate. (Appendix I)
- Securing Dissertation Committee agreement on any revisions to be made to the dissertation before the dissertation is accepted officially (signature endorsements) by the committee.
- Establishing with the committee and the candidate an agreed upon deadline for the completion of the above revisions.

### **Dissertation Committee Members**

The Dissertation Chair and the Director of Doctoral Programs assist the candidate in selecting other Dissertation Committee Members (Appendix J). The Dissertation Committee normally consists of three persons including the chair. The other two shall include at least one tenured or tenure track faculty member of the CSU Northridge faculty and at least one person who primarily is affiliated with a California PK12 school/district or community college. Although the Director of Doctoral Programs appoints the committee, every effort will be made to honor candidate preferences. Upon request by the candidate and/or chair, and upon approval of the Director of Doctoral Programs, Dissertation Committee Members may be replaced.

The Dissertation Committee, under the guidance of the chair, works with the candidate and is responsible for approving the proposal and final dissertation, as well as assuring their conformity with program and university guidelines and requirements. The Dissertation Committee provides guidance to the candidate in planning, researching, and writing the dissertation. The committee is responsible for approving the written dissertation proposal, Proposal Hearing, final written dissertation, and Final Dissertation Defense, as well as assuring dissertation conformity with program and university guidelines and requirements.

The committee members are available to the candidate as secondary sources of advice and support, or “assistant coaches,” particularly in their area of research methodology or content area expertise. They serve as second and third readers for the proposal and the final dissertation. Their concerns are noted to the chair that helps facilitate a resolution of any problems noted. The committee members participate fully in the discussion and rating of the candidate’s performance at both the Proposal Hearing and the Final Dissertation Defense and may call for and review revisions. The Dissertation Chair should update Committee Members regularly throughout the dissertation process. This should be done at least twice before the Dissertation Proposal Hearing, perhaps during the fall and spring semesters of Year II during ELPS 789 (Dissertation Seminar). There also should be regular updates as the student works towards the Dissertation Defense.

## **Mentors**

In addition to a Program Advisor, all doctoral students are assigned a Mentor (Appendix K). The Mentor is a practicing educational leader whose role is to assist doctoral candidates in a variety of ways, both programmatic and professional. The mentoring component of the program is important because it aids the student in building a powerful network of educational colleagues beyond CSUN who are committed to promoting profound change in schools and colleges. The Mentor is particularly important for providing candidates with practical insights into their field-based research, current educational trends, and the candidate’s overall professional development.

Mentors are selected from among CSUN’s educational partners in schools or community colleges who have agreed to serve in this role or through specific requests from doctoral candidates themselves. Mentors agree to create a support system for candidates in the Doctoral Program by conferring with them on a regular basis with respect to current issues that impact educational leadership and administration. Mentoring relationships evolve over time and reflect the changing needs of doctoral candidates as they progress through the program. The mentoring relationship is confidential and individualized. The Mentor works closely with the Program Advisor to assist the student mature as a knowledgeable and able educational leader.

The Program Advisor assists the candidate in the selection of a Mentor. The Mentor recommendation is forwarded by the Program Advisor to the Director of Doctoral Programs for final approval. Throughout the process, attention is given to ensure that selection is a mutual process between the candidate and Mentor. Such an approach helps to ensure that there is a compatible match resulting in a professional experience is beneficial to both the candidate and the Mentor. Candidates may have one or more mentors during the course of the program.

Mentors confer with their doctoral candidate on a regular basis. Mentoring should reflect the candidate’s changing needs as s/he progresses through the program, with special emphasis on helping the candidate understand current trends and issues in educational thought, practice, legislation, and changing societal expectations. Possible activities for the Mentor include:

- Serving as a coach.
- Facilitating professional development of the candidate.

- Providing access and guidance in field-based courses and assignments.
- Helping the candidate establish professional connections and develop his/her career.
- Providing knowledge and expertise on a wide range of issues related to administrative practice.
- Acting as a role model.
- Providing moral support, guidance, counsel, and advisement.
- Working collaboratively with the program faculty to assist the candidate.
- Helping program faculty to identify and recruit potential doctoral candidates.
- Others as identified by the candidate or Mentor.

Upon request by the candidate or the Mentor and upon the approval of the Director of Doctoral Programs, the Mentor may be changed.

### **Credential Office**

Candidates who are completing the Professional Administrative (Tier II) Credential as part of the Doctoral Program may make inquiries and apply for the credential through the Credential Office on the CSUN campus. The Credential Office is located in the small Education Administration building between the Michael D. Eisner College of Education and Juniper Hall. The office's phone number is 818-677-2586 (<http://www.csun.edu/educ/cred/index.html>).

### **Library**

All of the resources of CSUN Oviatt Library are available free of charge to doctoral candidates while enrolled in the program. Among the most useful are major education journals and reference books, including those specializing in educational leadership; a large selection of electronic databases and periodicals; Interlibrary Loan for resources not found at CSUN; print and electronic Course Reserves; the Teacher Curriculum Center with PK12 school books and curriculum materials; and, of course, consultation with reference librarians in person, by phone, or online (when possible, ask for the Education Librarian). In addition the library offers quiet study carrels and group study rooms. Candidates are oriented to using the library's electronic databases and periodicals as part of the program's Saturday Doctoral Seminars. Please consult the library web site for a complete guide to library resources and services: <http://library.csun.edu>.

### **Graduate Studies, Research and International Programs**

The CSUN office of Graduate Studies, Research and International Programs oversees all graduate programs, international programs, and many research activities at the university. Candidates have access to its extensive information on grants and grant writing for PK12 schools, community colleges, and educational research and programs. Candidates also work with this office for the IRB process when writing their proposal and with the university's Thesis Advisors regarding final Dissertation Format and Submission Requirements prior to graduation. All Dissertation Submissions are through Electronic Thesis & Dissertation (ETD) submission: <https://pisco.grid.csun.edu/ETD/Login.php>. Graduate Studies is located in UN (University Hall) 265, the office's phone number is 818/677-4800. (<http://www.csun.edu/grip/graduatestudies>).

Revised 5/15/2013

**Office of Financial Aid**

As regularly enrolled students, doctoral candidates have access to the services of the CSUN Office of Financial Aid. Some candidates who are employed full time as educators and administrators may not meet the financial need criteria for some forms of aid. Located in Bayramian Hall lobby, Student Services Center, the office's phone number is 818/677-4085 (<http://www.csun.edu/finaid/>).

## 6. Program Policies and Regulations

### Transfer of Credit

No transfer of credit or waivers for courses is permitted in the Doctoral Program.

### Tier II Credential as Part of the Doctoral Program (PK12 Cohort only)

PK12 Cohort candidates who need the Professional Clear (Tier II) Administrative Services Credential meet with the Doctoral Program Director early in the Doctoral Program during ELPS 700 to create the Tier II Induction Plan. See Induction Plan, Administrative (Tier II) Credential at: [http://www.csun.edu/education/elps/courses/ELPS\\_685.pdf](http://www.csun.edu/education/elps/courses/ELPS_685.pdf). They complete the activities required in the plan while enrolled in the Doctoral Program, specifically in ELPS 700, 710, and 760/765. They must pass the doctoral Qualifying Examination and Advance to Candidacy before receiving the credential (typically at the end of Year II). Specific guidance on documentation of Tier II activities and credential application procedures are provided by the Doctoral Program Director. See also: Credential Office.

### Enrollment

Candidates must continuously enroll in the program and make satisfactory progress in all doctoral courses and examinations. Satisfactory progress is defined as follows:

- Candidates are expected to enroll in and successfully complete each course with the cohort group.
- Candidates are expected to complete all courses and examinations and Advance to Candidacy within the period specified by the Doctoral Unit.
- Candidates must pass all required Doctoral Program examinations within two attempts (i.e., Qualifying Examination, Proposal Hearing, and Final Dissertation Defense).
- Candidates are expected to maintain at least a 3.0 GPA in the program at all times. Candidates are placed on academic probation whenever their GPA falls below 3.0. If the GPA is below 3.0 for two successive semesters, candidates will be officially disqualified from the Doctoral Program upon recommendation of the Director of Doctoral Programs and in accordance with University policy.
- Candidates must have no grade lower than B on any signature assignment.

Candidates who have completed their coursework and 12 units of dissertation work and continue to use university resources, including consultation with faculty, while completing their dissertation must enroll as fulltime students each semester until all degree requirements are met. For the first semester beyond the nine semesters/three years, doctoral candidates may register for XEDU 980, Culminating Experience to complete the dissertation defense and final submission. This is a one-time only option at a reduced cost through Extended Learning. The Director of Doctoral Programs meets with all unfinished candidates to create and monitor a plan for

dissertation completion. Candidates have up to 7 years from initial enrollment date to complete and defend their dissertation (see CSU/CSUN doctoral fee policies).

**Attendance.**

The Doctoral Program requires a serious time commitment. Just as we have designed the program to accommodate the schedule of working professionals, we ask for accommodation by employers to promote candidates' regular, on-time attendance at CSUN. Classes typically meet on campus once a week for 15 weeks during the fall and spring semesters and up to two nights per week during the summer semester. There also are intensive Saturday Doctoral Seminars designed to augment regular courses and provide for other critical activities. All classes and seminars rely on candidate participation and interaction. Candidates are expected to attend all class sessions and to arrive on time. If an absence is necessary, candidates should make arrangements with the professor in advance. Excessive absences may affect course grades and result in academic warning or dismissal.

**Leaves of absence.**

Candidates should enroll in the Doctoral Program with the intention of committing to three years of study, including summers. Candidates in good standing with serious unforeseen problems that prevent their continuous enrollment, such as health or family emergencies, may take a leave of absence for two semesters. Candidate considering a leave should consult with the Program Advisor or Dissertation Chair to develop a plan and if indicated, file a Request for Academic Leave of Absence Form (Appendix L) for approval by the Director of Doctoral Programs. Candidates with leaves of absence may encounter delays completing the program since not all courses in either the PK12 school or community college option are offered each semester. All candidates, including those with leaves of absence, must complete requirements for the degree within 7 years from initial enrollment date.

**Withdrawal.**

If a candidate decides to withdraw from the Doctoral Program, he/she must notify the CSUN Director of Doctoral Programs in writing. Further, the candidate must address any grade issues with the appropriate instructor. Candidates are not permitted to "step out" the program and automatically return (see "Leaves of absence" above). If a candidate wants to be considered for readmission to the program in the future, he/she needs to contact the Office of Doctoral Programs regarding admission.

**Grade Requirements**

Candidates must maintain a minimum 3.0 GPA in the program. Candidates with course grades below a C, including C-, must repeat the course to receive credit toward the doctoral degree. This may delay completion of the program as not all courses are offered every semester. Candidates will be placed on academic probation whenever their GPA in the program falls below 3.0, in accordance with university policy. If the GPA is below 3.0 for two successive semesters, candidates will be officially disqualified from the program upon recommendation of the Doctoral

Program Committee and in accordance with university policy. Candidates also must have a grade of B or better for all signature assignments.

### **Incompletes**

Per university policy, incompletes (I) will only be given when the candidate cannot complete a course due to serious unforeseen problems, such as a long illness, and only when 1) the candidate is on track to pass the course; 2) the candidate has completed most of the required work; and 3) the remaining required work can be completed independently. The candidate should meet with the professor and file a signed Request for Incomplete form as soon as possible, and no later than the last class meeting. The required work must be completed and the Incomplete changed to a regular grade within one calendar year immediately following the end of the semester in which it was assigned; this applies whether or not candidates maintain continuous enrollment. If the work is not completed by this time, the "I" will become a grade of "F" and the candidate will have to repeat the course to receive credit toward the doctoral degree.

### **Academic Probation and Disqualification: University Policy**

Students who are disqualified from the program may appeal this decision by applying for readmission. This may require new admission materials, to be considered at the same time as those seeking admittance for the first time. In considering the readmission request, faculty will evaluate previous coursework and may recommend retaking certain courses, depending on individual circumstances. There is no guarantee that students will be readmitted.

### **Retention in the Program: ELPS Department Policy**

In addition to university policy, the ELPS Department has provisions regarding retention of candidates in its programs. If a candidate exhibits questionable progress or behavior at any time during the Doctoral Program as determined by his/her Advisor or Dissertation Chair, his/her continued participation may be in jeopardy. Examples of a candidate's demonstration of questionable progress or behavior are:

- Being on academic probation due to having a GPA below 3.0 in the program for two semesters (university policy: dismissal from program).
- Failing the Qualifying Examination, Preliminary Orals, or Final Dissertation Defense after 2 attempts at each.
- Engaging in cheating, fabrication, facilitation of academic dishonesty, plagiarism, or any other form of academic dishonesty or unacceptable student behavior as described in this handbook or Appendix C, Nondiscrimination Policy and Student Conduct, California State University Undergraduate/Graduate Catalog at any time during the program.
- Noncompliance with Doctoral Program attendance expectations.
- Violation of Ethical Standards of the Doctoral Program or unprofessional behavior in a leadership position.

- Failure to comply with any University, College, Department or Program standard or requirement.

The ELPS Department Retention Committee (RC) reviews the performance and/or conduct of candidates whose continuation in the Doctoral Program is in jeopardy, based on the submission by a doctoral faculty member of a Candidate Assessment Conference form documenting the problem. The RC, composed of at least three full-time ELPS faculty members (not including the faculty member who submitted the documentation), serves as an objective panel to hear testimony, study documents related to a candidate's performance and/or conduct, and make recommendations related to the candidate's continued participation based on the evidence submitted. The RC sends a copy of written documentation of lack of progress to the candidate and invites the candidate to submit any evidence, either in person or in writing that he/she may have on the issue within one week. If the candidate chooses to address the RC in person, he/she may be accompanied by an advocate of his/her choice.

Recommendations by the RC, in consultation with the candidate's advisor and the Director of Doctoral Programs, may include, but are not limited to, any of the following actions:

- Remove the candidate from the program.
- Counsel the candidate to withdraw from the program.
- Suspend the candidate's participation for a specified period of time.
- Monitor the candidate's participation using specific measures recommended by the committee.
- Require the candidate to engage in some intervention/remediation measures, such as counseling, mentoring, remedial instruction.
- Take other action as determined appropriate by the committee.

## **Academic and Ethical Standards**

### **Academic integrity.**

CSUN expects all candidates to adhere to the accepted norms of intellectual honesty in their academic work. Any form of cheating, plagiarism, dishonesty, or collusion in another individual's dishonesty is a fundamental violation of these norms and will face consequences.

Cheating is the use or attempted use of unauthorized aids in any exam or other academic exercise submitted for evaluation. This includes:

- data falsification or fabrication
- deceitful alteration of collected data included in a report
- copying from another person's work or having them do work for you
- unauthorized cooperation in doing assignments or during an examination
- use of purchased essays, term papers, or preparatory research for such papers
- submission of the same written work in more than one course without prior written approval from the instructor(s) involved

- dishonesty in requests for extensions on papers or make-up examinations.

Plagiarism is the deliberate act of taking the words, ideas, data, illustrative material, or statements of someone else, without full and proper acknowledgment, and presenting them as one's own. This includes appropriating material from print or electronic sources in part or in whole without proper permission, citation, and indication within quotation marks of material that is quoted verbatim. Quotation marks must be used when exact wording appears in an author's text. The source (Author(s), date) must be cited not only when quoting an author directly (in which case the page number is needed) but when incorporating the opinions or interpretations of other authors, or when paraphrasing the main ideas of other authors.

Collusion is assisting or attempting to assist another candidate in an act of academic dishonesty.

Doctoral candidates are expected to know how to work cooperatively in a community of scholar-practitioners and effectively utilize source material without violating the norms of intellectual honesty. Candidates have a responsibility to know the parameters of collaboration and the proper forms for quoting, attributing, summarizing, and paraphrasing. If candidates have any questions or doubts about academic integrity matters, they should consult their Program Advisor, Dissertation Chair or the Director of Doctoral Programs.

Violations of academic integrity may be grounds for failing an assignment, failing a course, or being suspended from or dismissed from the program, depending on the severity of the offence (see Section 41301, Title 5, California Code of regulations).

Faculty members who detect any form of academic dishonesty have the responsibility to take appropriate action in accordance with existing CSUN Academic Policy guidelines and ELPS Department Retention Policies. Faculty members also have the responsibility to report the incident and penalty to the Director of Doctoral Programs. Such reports will remain in candidates' files.

### **Ethical standards.**

Candidates are expected to be familiar with the ethical standards of the academy and of their profession. These are outlined in CSUN Academic Policies and in the Ethical Standards adopted by the American Educational Research Association, American Association of Community Colleges, Association of California School Administrators, and the American Association of School Administrators.

In addition, the Doctoral Program's Student Learning Objectives (SLO's) and Candidate Dispositions set clear expectations for candidates. SLO #8, "Modeling ethical practice; strong skills in communication and collaboration; and the development of leadership capacity in oneself and others," prescribes the need for ethical practice by the individual student. Further, the course description for ELPS 750: Ethical Dimensions of Educational Leadership, states that students

will “examine and analyze ethical dilemmas, apply appropriate ethical principles and recommend a decision using research-based ethical decision-making formats.”

The consequences for violation of ethical standards in the program are based on the standards of the professions, CSUN academic policies, ELPS department policies, and program and course expectations. In the event of reported violations, the ELPS Department Retention Committee, made up of three faculty members, will review each case. The review process is designed to insure that all relevant facts can be determined, including providing the candidate with full opportunity to present important information. Actions the committee may recommend, in consultation with the candidate’s Program Advisor or Dissertation Chair and the Director of Doctoral Programs, include, but are not limited to, remediation, referral, academic warning, suspension, or dismissal from the program (see Retention in the Program: ELPS Department Policy). The RC presents its findings and recommendations to the ELPS Department Chair within 2 weeks of receipt of the Candidate Assessment Conference form.

### **Grievance Procedures**

Candidates may appeal decisions of the ELPS Retention Committee to a Retention Appeals Committee, made up of the ELPS Department Chair and two faculty members selected by the Department Chair. In the event the Appeals Committee upholds the decision, the candidate may take the appeal to the university Associate Vice President of Student Affairs. All faculty members involved in providing evidence used to render a decision will receive written notification of the candidate’s appeal from the Retention Appeals Committee.

### **Time Limit for Completion of Degree**

All candidates must complete program requirements within 7 years from initial enrollment date in order to graduate. This applies in all cases, including when candidates take a leave of absence.

### **Graduation**

All candidates must successfully defend their completed dissertation and submit properly formatted copies of the dissertation to Graduate Studies, CSUN in order to graduate. Doctoral Degree candidates should apply to graduate by the deadlines set by the Graduate Studies, CSUN and plan to complete all degree requirements by the deadlines set by the Doctoral Program. All members of the doctoral cohort will be allowed to participate in Commencement (see CSU/CSUN doctoral fee policies).

## 7. Appendices

### Appendix A: Signature Assignment Specification

To better prepare PK12 and community college administrators, the Ed.D. Program at CSUN is an intellectually rigorous, application-oriented program, built around the craft knowledge and the research about teaching, learning, and leading. It has a clear mission and focus and is centered on common goals. It recognizes the changing knowledge base about educational administration, the need for high standards and expectations, and the importance of professional ethics and dispositions. It is designed to prepare scholar-practitioner change agents who impact student learning at PK12 schools and community colleges. The program advances knowledge of and capacity for effective leadership practice in important ways for our students.

#### Purpose

One feature of the CSU Northridge Ed.D. Program is a series of Signature Assignments which reflect the pedagogy we have adopted that guides our instructional strategies. In all required courses in the curriculum, there is a Signature Assignment that characterizes the program. Each is a case-based or problem-based approach to learning. It is an assignment that fosters the deep, rich, conversations about interactions and practices among candidates and their faculty. Our doctoral candidates bring extensive knowledge of administrative practice and professional education to advanced study. This knowledge of practice becomes a base upon which to build their inquiry. They can identify with problems that are posed and define the issues and problems that should be investigated. These concerns emanate from their own study and observation of practice in the field.

Furthermore, the Signature Assignments are characterized by a systems thinking approach to problem-posing and problem-solving. This perspective emphasizes that a problem does not exist in a vacuum, but is a part of a larger system of interconnected parts that come together in a specific context and rely on a feedback to impact change. Therefore, Signature Assignments are designed to foster disciplined inquiry into leadership practice in a systemic context. Our classes also are designed as inquiry seminars in which candidates actively engage in the learning process. The pedagogy is built on the principles of adult learning, in which candidates interact with professors more as colleagues and members of a learning community rather than passive recipients of knowledge. In all instances, candidates can bring their own experience to the Signature Assignment and what they want to achieve for their own organizations as they read, study, research, and problem-solve.

Hence, we have created a community in which faculty and candidates engage in research and ongoing conversations about pressing issues in the field. Through Signature Assignments, candidates can examine cases of leadership practice, use problems of practice as the starting point to conduct research and inquiry, pose leadership dilemmas, construct their own cases, respond to cases posed by others, and test their theories against practice as they examine and reflect on the problem.

### **Signature assignment specifications**

- There is one Signature Assignment for each required course with the topic selected by the instructor.
- A Signature Assignment can be undertaken by an individual student or in teams at the discretion of the instructor.
- A Signature Assignment can be required for a single course or across multiple courses; they can cross a year or a semester as determined by the instructor(s).
- In all cases, each instructor must post a course grade of each student's Signature Assignment even if assigned across courses or done in teams.

### **Special assignment assessment**

A rubric must be completed by each instructor for each Signature Assignment identifying course number, relevant Doctoral Program Student Learning Outcome addressed, and grade for the Signature Assignment. Ultimately, each student will have a Signature Assignment for each of the Ed.D. Program Student Learning Outcomes. For both formative and summative purposes the following Signature Assignment Rubric will be completed by the instructor. Comments may be attached. The instructor identifies The Signature Assignment targeted Student Learning Outcome (s) as identified in the course outline. The instructor gives the grade for the Signature Assignment (SA). The instructor places the Signature Assignment Rubric with grade and comments (which is password protected so that only the instructor can make changes) in student's e-portfolio.

#### **Assessment**

##### ***Formative:***

- The instructor identifies the student's strengths or weakness.
- The student and the instructor identify any required remediation.
- The instructor verifies when the remediation is complete and enters the SA Rubric in the student e-portfolio.

##### ***Summative:***

- Each student uploads all Signature Assignments to their e-portfolio on Taskstream. The e portfolio contains all scored Signature Assignment Rubrics to be reviewed by the Qualifying Exam Committee.
- The Qualifying Exam Committee verifies that all Signature Assignments are present and have a grade of "B" (B- is not acceptable) or above.
- Completed Signature Assignments comprise the first half of the Qualifying Exam.
- All Signature Assignments must be passed prior to being approved for receiving the degree.

## Appendix B: Signature Assignment Rubric

Course # \_\_\_\_\_ Program SLO #(s) for this SA \_\_\_\_\_ GRADE \_\_\_\_\_

CRITERIA	0 Does not meet standard for doctoral level work	1 Meets standard for doctoral work	2 Exemplary doctoral level work
Addresses Program SLO#			
Addresses Program SLO#			
Addresses Program SLO#			
Responds to all assignment guidelines & guiding questions			
Shows in-depth understanding of topic and its implications for leadership and systemic reform			
Meaningfully applies course concepts and readings to analysis			
Appropriately uses the research literature, leadership strategies, and/or research methods, as required			
Shows critical engagement with/reflection on topic			
Clear, well-organized presentation using conventions of academic writing at doctoral level			
Correct use of APA style for citations, references, headings, etc., as required by instructor			

**INSTRUCTOR** \_\_\_\_\_

**DATE** \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

### Appendix C: Qualifying Examination Rubric

	<b>0</b> <b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Revise and Resubmit</b>	<b>2</b> <b>Acceptable</b>
<b>Knowledge of Educational Leadership &amp; Problem/Topic</b>	Part A: Presents inadequate knowledge of a major educational problem/topic related to leadership, best practices, and/or the contexts and educational underpinnings of educational leadership. Inadequate understanding of connections among research, theory, and practice.	Part A: Displays some knowledge of a major educational problem/topic related to leadership, best practices, and/or the contexts and educational underpinnings of educational leadership. Demonstrates average understanding of connections among research, theory, and practice.	Part A: Displays broad knowledge of a major educational problem/topic related to leadership, best practices, and/or the contexts and educational underpinnings of educational leadership. Demonstrates strong understanding of connections among research, theory, and practice.
<b>Critical Analysis &amp; Use of Literature</b>	Part A: Insufficient evidence of critical thinking regarding educational reform. Lack of clarity in analysis; inadequate or inappropriate use of research literature. Unclear or poorly organized integration and application of course material from content courses to problem.	Part A: Demonstrates adequate thinking regarding educational reform and ability to clearly analyze, critique, and evaluate the problem, using appropriate research literature. There is some, but not complete evidence, of course integration and application of course materials from content courses to problems.	Part A: Demonstrates critical thinking regarding educational reform and ability to clearly analyze, critique, and evaluate the problem, using appropriate research literature. Displays ability to draw on content course material to integrate and apply what has been learned in clear, well-organized manner.
<b>Understanding and Application of Research Methods</b>	Part B: Does not demonstrate clear understanding of the research process or offer appropriate recommendations for further research on the problem/topic. Does not appropriately apply material from research methods courses.	Part B: Demonstrates general understanding of the research process. Offers, but does not fully discuss appropriate recommendations for further research on the problem/topic. There is some application of material from research methods courses.	Part B: Demonstrates clear understanding of the research process and offers appropriate recommendations for further research on the problem/topic. Appropriately applies material from research methods courses.
<b>Writing</b>	The writing does not follow academic conventions consistently and is not well organized. The transitions and logical flow are poorly developed and prevent the reader from following the argument.	The writing generally follows some conventions for academic written English and communicates necessary information with average clarity, precision, and coherence. Writing is generally well-organized, yet appropriate transitions and logical flow for a coherent argument can be further developed.	The writing generally follows conventions for academic written English and communicates essential information with clarity, precision, and coherence. Writing is well-organized with appropriate transitions and logical flow for a coherent argument.
<b>Style and Format</b>	Does not follow APA style consistently; many errors. Does not meet Qualifying Exam guidelines for 8-10 (Part A) and 3-5 (Part B) double-spaced pages plus references.	Generally follows APA style; above average number of errors. Generally meets Qualifying Exam guidelines for 8-10 (Part A) and 3-5 (Part B) double-spaced pages plus references.	Generally follows APA style; small number of errors. Meets Qualifying Exam guidelines for 8-10 (Part A) and 3-5 (Part B) double-spaced pages plus references.

**Scoring Levels:** In order to pass the Qualifying Exam, candidates must achieve a score of 2, “Acceptable,” in all parts of the rubric. Candidates who receive at least one score of “1” on any criterion will have to Revise and Resubmit their exams within one week of completion of Part B. Candidates who receive at least one score of “0” on any criterion must retake the exam. Candidates who fail the exam a second time will not advance to candidacy.

## **Appendix D: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Format**

The Hearing is not open to public.

The Hearing lasts one to one and a half hours.

### **Suggested format**

The Committee Members meet at the start of the Hearing without the student to discuss general considerations.

**The student** presents a 20 to 30 minute PowerPoint presentation to the Committee.

Each Committee Member has opportunity to ask questions.

All Committee Members participate in a general discussion with the student.

**The student** leaves the room.

The Committee Members review the Dissertation Proposal Rubric specifications (as a guide) and agree on a Pass or Fail grade.

The Committee Members give recommendations to the Chair for revision, future directions, or any other suggestions.

**The student returns**, and the Chair indicates a Pass or Fail grade as well as general thoughts from the Committee Members.

The Dissertation Hearing Approval Form is completed and signed by the committee and sent to the Director of Doctoral Programs.

### Appendix E: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Rubric

	<b>0</b> <b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Acceptable</b>
<b>Overall Conceptualization</b>	The investigation lacks originality and critical thinking. The purpose and significance are unclear. Academic merit of the research is not well developed. Parts do not fit together logically.	The investigation demonstrates originality and critical thinking. The design and conceptualization of the study evidence a creative, unique approach to the topic. The purpose and significance are reasonable. Academic merit of the research is provided. Parts fit together in a coherent whole.
<b>Introduction</b>	The study rationale is not fully developed. The introduction does not provide sufficient evidence to support and justify the need for the study, or does not sufficiently introduce the study's components.	The introduction makes a strong case for the significance of the study and has clear capacity to affect educational practice and contribute to the research literature. Broader context is well-delineated. Study components are clearly and succinctly introduced.
<b>Literature Review</b>	The literature review is incomplete and provides partial coverage with limited empirical studies. The review lacks synthesis of the literature, logical organization, or rationale for study addressing gap in literature.	The chapter situates the study in the context of previous research, presents a critical synthesis of empirical literature according to relevant themes, or variables, justifies how the study addresses a gap or problem in the literature, and outlines the theoretical or conceptual framework of the study
<b>Methodology</b>	The chapter lacks rationale for methodological approach. Descriptions of sample and setting are insufficient, and plans for research methods are inappropriate or unclear.	The chapter situates the study in a particular methodological tradition, provides a rationale for that approach, clearly describes the research setting and sample, and clearly describes data collection and analysis methods, including validity and ethics issues.
<b>Style and Format</b>	The dissertation does not follow APA style or CSUN Graduate Studies format requirements.	The dissertation consistently follows APA style and CSUN format requirements and models the language and conventions used in scholarly literature. Potential for professional publication.
<b>Writing</b>	The writing does not follow academic conventions and is not well organized. The transitions and logical flow are poorly developed and prevent the reader from following the argument.	The writing follows conventions for academic written English and communicates essential information with clarity, precision, and coherence. Writing is well-organized with appropriate transitions and logical flow for a coherent argument.

#### Scoring Levels

Dissertations that do not meet standards as outlined in scoring level 1, "Acceptable," in each area are considered deficient, will not be accepted, and will receive a grade of "No Credit."

**Appendix F: Dissertation Proposal Hearing Form**

Instructions: Each doctoral candidate completes Section I and submits this form to his/her Dissertation Chair before the hearing. The Dissertation Chair and Committee members complete Section II and submit this form to the Director of Doctoral Programs who completes Section III, files this form and sends a copy to the doctoral candidate.

**SECTION I.** To be completed by the doctoral candidate (please type).

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID #: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Year you were enrolled in the doctoral program: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Your specialization:  PreK-12 Leadership  Community College Leadership  
 Your dissertation title: \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION II.** To be completed by the Dissertation Chair and Committee members.

Date the proposal was approved: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Dissertation Chair (print)	Signature
_____	_____
_____	_____

Name of Dissertation Committee members (print)	Signature
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Remarks:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION III.** To be completed by the Director of Doctoral Programs.

The Dissertation Proposal Hearing has been conducted and the dissertation proposal is approved.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_

## **Appendix G: Dissertation Defense**

The Dissertation Defense is open to public.

The Dissertation Defense lasts approximately two hours.

### **Suggested format**

The Committee Members meet at the start of the Dissertation Defense, in private and without the student, to discuss general considerations.

The student gives a thirty-minute PowerPoint presentation of the dissertation to the Committee Members and others in attendance.

Following the presentation, about fifteen minutes will be allowed for questions to the student from non-Committee Members in attendance (option of the Dissertation Chair).

The Dissertation Chair will thank the non-Committee Members and ask them to leave.

All Committee Members will participate in a general question/discussion session with the student.

The Dissertation Chair asks the student to leave the room.

The Committee Members review the Dissertation Defense Rubric specifications (as a guide) and agree on a Pass or Fail grade.

The Committee Members give recommendations to the Chair for revision or any other suggestions.

The student returns, and the Dissertation Chair indicates a Pass or Fail grade as well as general thoughts from the Committee Members.

The Dissertation Defense Approval Form is signed by the chair at this session with an indication of when the student will be completely finished and ready to upload the final Dissertation through ETD to the Office of Graduate Studies.

When the Dissertation Chair approves and all Dissertation Committee Members have signed the Signature Page, the student uploads the final Dissertation through ETD to the Office of Graduate Studies. The “hard copy” of the Signature Page must be hand-delivered to UH 265, Office of Graduate Studies AFTER final upload.

## Appendix H: Dissertation Defense Rubric

	<b>0</b> <b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>1</b> <b>Acceptable</b>
<b>Overall Conceptualization</b>	The investigation lacks originality and critical thinking. The purpose and significance are unclear. Academic merit of the research is not well developed. Parts do not fit together logically.	The investigation demonstrates originality and critical thinking. The design and conceptualization of the study evidence a creative, unique approach to the topic. The purpose and significance are reasonable. Academic merit of the research is provided. Parts fit together in a coherent whole.
<b>Abstract</b>	Abstract does not provide the necessary description to understand the goals, scope, and implications of the study.	Abstract provides a concise description of the study, including statement of the problem, methodology, and summary of findings and implications.
<b>Introduction</b>	The study rationale is not fully developed. The introduction does not provide sufficient evidence to support and justify the need for the study, or does not sufficiently introduce the study's components.	The chapter makes a case for the significance of the problem, contextualizes the study, and provides an introduction to its basic components.
<b>Literature Review</b>	The literature review is incomplete and provides partial coverage with limited empirical studies. The review lacks synthesis of the literature, logical organization, or rationale for study addressing gap in literature.	The chapter situates the study in the context of previous research, presents a critical synthesis of empirical literature according to relevant themes, or variables, justifies how the study addresses a gap or problem in the literature, and outlines the theoretical or conceptual framework of the study where appropriate.
<b>Methodology</b>	The chapter lacks rationale for methodological approach. Descriptions of sample and setting are insufficient, and plans for research methods are inappropriate or unclear.	The chapter situates the study in a particular methodological tradition, provides a rationale for that approach, clearly describes the research setting and sample, and clearly describes data collection and analysis methods, including validity and ethics issues. Statistical analyses are appropriate and accurate.
<b>Results/Findings</b>	The results/findings of the study are not clearly or sufficiently discussed with appropriate data. Findings are poorly organized and statistical analyses (if used) are not appropriate or accurate.	The chapter organizes and reports the study's main results/findings, including the clear presentation of relevant quantitative (statistical) and /or qualitative (narrative) data.
<b>Discussion/Conclusions</b>	The discussion, conclusions and recommendations are not clearly explained or substantiated by the results/findings. The connections to the purpose of the study and relevance to the existing body of knowledge are not clear.	The chapter clearly interprets and discusses the results in light of the study's research questions, literature review, and conceptual framework, concluding with recommendations for policy and practice that are grounded in the results/findings.
<b>Style and Format</b>	The dissertation does not follow APA style or CSUN Graduate Studies format requirements.	The style and format of the dissertation proposal conform to APA style and CSUN Graduate Studies format requirements.
<b>Writing</b>	The writing does not follow academic conventions and is not well organized. The transitions and logical flow are poorly developed and prevent the reader from following the argument.	The writing follows conventions for academic written English and communicates essential information with clarity, precision, and coherence. Writing is well-organized with appropriate transitions and logical flow for a coherent argument.

### Scoring Levels

Dissertations that do not meet standards as outlined in scoring level 1, "Acceptable," in each area are considered deficient, will not be accepted, and will receive a grade of "No Credit."

Revised 5/15/2013

**Appendix I: Dissertation Defense Form****Section I. To be completed by the candidate**

Name (PRINT) \_\_\_\_\_ Student ID # \_\_\_\_\_

Year you were enrolled in the doctoral program: \_\_\_\_\_

Your specialization:  PreK-12 Leadership  Community College LeadershipDissertation title: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_**Section II. To be verified by the Dissertation Chair**

A Dissertation Defense has been held and the student may move forward to complete the dissertation as specified by the Dissertation Committee (this form does not replace the Dissertation Signature Page):

Dissertation Committee Members (PRINT)	Signature
Dissertation Chair (PRINT)	Signature

**Date:** \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Anticipated date of final submission to the Office of Graduate Studies: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

**Major suggestions:**

## **Appendix J: Dissertation Committee Appointment Process**

The Dissertation Committee normally consists of three persons. The Chair must be a member of the Doctoral Core Faculty. The other two shall include at least one tenured or tenure track faculty member of the CSU Northridge faculty and at least one person who primarily is affiliated with a California preK-12 school/district or community college. Although the Director of Doctoral Programs appoints the committee, every effort will be made to honor candidate preferences.

### **Dissertation Chair selection process**

- By the end of year one, the Candidate, working with a Program Advisor, identifies a dissertation topic and possible research question.
- The Candidates interacts with potential Dissertation Chairs among the EdD Core Faculty.
- The Candidate sends an e-mail to the Director of Doctoral Programs with the names of two faculty members (in priority order) who have agreed to be considered as the Dissertation Chair.
- The Director of Doctoral Programs discusses the recommendation with the faculty members and Candidate as appropriate.
- When a final Dissertation Chair is identified, the Director notifies the Candidate and Dissertation Chair and posts an Approval Form in the Candidate's official file.

### **Dissertation Committee Member selection process**

- The Candidate and the Dissertation Chair identify and agree upon appropriate other members of the Dissertation Committee.
- The Dissertation Chair sends an e-mail to the Director of Doctoral Programs with the names of the recommended Dissertation Committee Members.
- The Director discusses the recommendations with the Dissertation Chair and the recommended members as appropriate.
- When the final Dissertation Committee Members are identified, the Director notifies the Candidate and Dissertation Chair and posts the names on the Approval Form in the Candidate's official file.
- A resume for any member of the Dissertation Committee who is not a tenured or tenure track faculty member at CSUN must be uploaded in pdf format by the Candidate, while completing the Planning Form through the ETD process.

## Appendix K: Mentor Assignment Form

**Candidate** \_\_\_\_\_ **cohort** \_\_\_\_\_

**Mentor** \_\_\_\_\_ **position** \_\_\_\_\_

**Doctoral advisor** \_\_\_\_\_

### Assignment of Mentors & Mentor Roles

Mentors are identified from among the educational partners who have agreed to serve in this role. The doctoral advisor approves the candidate's choice of mentor. Attention will be given through a process of mutual selection to making a compatible match of candidates and mentors, so that the experience will be beneficial. Candidates may have one or more mentors during the course of the program. Upon request by the candidate or the mentor and upon the approval of the Program Director, the mentor may be changed.

Mentors agree to create a support system for candidates in the Doctoral Program by conferring with the candidate on a regular basis with respect to their professional development. Mentoring should reflect the candidate's changing needs as s/he progresses through the program, with an emphasis on field-based projects. Possible roles for the mentors include:

- Serving as a coach.
- Facilitating professional development of the candidate.
- Providing access and guidance in field-based courses and assignments.
- Helping the candidate establish professional connections and develop his/her career.
- Providing knowledge and expertise on a wide range of issues related to administrative practice.
- Acting as a role model.
- Providing moral support, guidance, counsel, and advisement.
- Serving on Dissertation Committees, if qualified.
- Working collaboratively with the Doctoral Program to assist the candidate.

**Candidate Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

**Mentor Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

**Edd Advisor Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

## Appendix L: Request for Academic Leave of Absence

### Policies on leaves

Candidates should enroll in the Doctoral Program with the intention of committing to three years of study, including summers. Candidates in good standing with serious unforeseen problems that prevent their continuous enrollment, such as health or family emergencies, may take a leave of absence for two semesters. Candidate considering a leave should consult with his/her advisor or Dissertation Committee Chair to develop a plan and if indicated, file this form. Candidates with leaves of absence may encounter delays completing the program since not all courses in either the PreK-12 or Community College Leadership Program are offered each semester. All candidates, including those with leaves of absence, must complete requirements for the degree within 7 years from initial enrollment date.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Cohort:       P-12 School Leadership       Community College Leadership

Began program: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

Beginning to leave (only one semester's leave per sheet):

Fall       Spring       Summer      of 20\_\_\_\_\_

Reasons for request (you may attach a letter if you prefer):

\_\_\_\_\_

Student signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

<input type="checkbox"/> Leave recommended	<input type="checkbox"/> Leave not recommended
Signature of advisor or Dissertation Chair _____ Date ___/___/___	

<input type="checkbox"/> Leave granted	<input type="checkbox"/> Leave denied
Signature of Program Director _____ Date ___/___/___	