Review Process for Proposals for
CSU and UC JOINT DEGREE PROGRAMS

**Doctoral Program Proposal Resources**

- CSU Ed.D. Programs
  http://www.calstate.edu/app/EdD/
- UC-CSU Joint Doctoral Programs
- Joint Doctorates with Independent Institutions

Proposals for new doctoral degree programs to be offered jointly by CSU and UC* should follow the guidelines in the *Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs* approved by the CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board on June 21, 2001 (http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf)

*Professional Doctorate Degrees* There are separate CCGA guidelines for the professional doctorate, i.e., applied doctorate. This degree is designed to prepare individuals for professional practice rather than scholarly research and study. Examples of applied doctorates include: Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.), Doctorate of Physical Therapy (D.P.T.), Doctorate in Optometry (O.D.), and the Doctorate of Audiology (Au.D.). Please refer to Appendix I in the CCGA Handbook.

**Permission to Negotiate**
The CSU campus and UC campus request their respective system offices for “permission to negotiate.” An expression of interest in and the rationale for a joint doctoral program is submitted by the CSU campus to the Academic Program Planning office at the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and by the UC campus to the Academic Affairs Division at the UC Office of the President. The initial expression of interest contains an indication of program need and supporting evidence of the requesting department’s ability to offer the appropriate instruction. Approved requests to negotiate allow the campuses to develop a joint doctoral program proposal.

**Planning**
Before the joint doctoral proposal may be submitted to the CSU and UC system offices, the proposals require approvals from the:

1. relevant disciplinary Deans at the CSU and UC campuses
2. Graduate Council at the UC campus
3. divisional Academic Senate at the UC campus
4. CSU campus academic senate, curriculum committees, and all other requirements that apply at that CSU campus.
5. President at the CSU campus and the Chancellor at the UC campus

**Systemwide Review**
The final proposal is sent to the Provost and Executive Vice President—Academic & Health Affairs, UC Office of the President, and to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Office, CSU Office of the Chancellor (c/o Academic Program Planning). The Provost requests systemwide review by the (UC) Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). CCGA conducts a preliminary review to determine whether or not to proceed with a full review of the proposal, or whether the Committee wishes to obtain additional information. The CSU Office of Academic Program Planning (APP) and CCGA consult regarding preliminary findings of the program reviews. If CCGA or the CSU Office of the Chancellor requires more information, the proposal is sent back to the campuses for revision. If CCGA agrees to move forward with a full review and the CSU Office of the Chancellor concurs, the UC Office of the President sends the proposal to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for concurrence (CPEC). CPEC will complete its review within 60 days of receipt of the document.
Proposals for Implementation of New Degree Major Programs

**Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)**
CSU partners (except San Diego State University) need to request approval for a new program at the doctoral level from the regional accrediting agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The CSU request is an application to the Substantive Change Committee of WASC. The WASC Commission acts on substantive change proposals at its February and June meetings.

**Joint Graduate Board**
Joint Graduate Board, which has final authority on the inter-system doctoral review process, requires a minimum of six votes of the CSU members and six of the UC members. The Board’s action is communicated to the CSU and UC chief academic officers.

Proposals for new graduate degree programs require approvals from the:

1. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)
2. CSU Chancellor’s Office Academic Program Planning (APP)
3. California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)
4. Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Office, CSU Office of the Chancellor
5. Provost and Executive Vice President—Academic & Health Affairs, UC Office of the President
6. Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) authorizing the CSU campus to offer a program at the doctoral level

References
- Handbook for the Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs
  [http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf](http://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/jointdochandbook.pdf)
- CCGA Handbook [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html)
GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING JOINT DOCTORAL PROGRAMS WITH INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS

These procedures are based on documents developed by the CSU and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) staff, including coded memorandum AP 69-68. They have been updated to reflect changes in system terminology and practice.

Obtaining formal approval for a doctoral program to be offered jointly by a CSU campus and an independent institution proceeds in four stages: (A) initiating discussions; (B) requesting and obtaining permission to negotiate; (C) developing the implementation proposal; (D) obtaining CPEC and WASC approvals.

1 “Independent institutions” are defined in California law as “nonpublic higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.” It is expected that the partnering institution will be accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

A. Initial Discussions

1. Interest in developing a joint doctoral program is ascertained, typically at the department/faculty level. An ad hoc joint planning committee, with members from both the CSU campus and the independent institution, is usually formed.
2. The cooperating academic units at both institutions follow their customary procedures for proceeding to formal negotiations.
3. The graduate dean or assistant/associate vice president for academic programs at the CSU campus communicates informally with the Office of Academic Program Planning in the Office of the Chancellor.

B. Permission to Negotiate

4. The CSU campus president addresses a request for “permission to negotiate a joint doctoral program” to the Chancellor, with a copy to Academic Program Planning. (See Page 115 for a description of the contents of this document.)
5. Academic Program Planning may communicate with the CSU campus about the desirability and appropriateness of the proposed program and the evidence of need and feasibility. Revisions of the documentation may be requested.
6. When review of the request is satisfactorily completed, the Chancellor sends a letter granting permission to negotiate to the CSU campus and sends a copy of the letter to the chief executive officer of the partner institution.
7. The chief executive officer of the partnering institution sends a letter to the executive director of CPEC, stating that formal negotiations to establish a joint doctoral program have begun.
8. In the next scheduled update of the CSU campus’s Academic Plan, the CSU Board of Trustees approves the projection of the proposed joint doctoral program.
C. Development of the Program Implementation Proposal

9. The ad hoc joint committee drafts a formal program implementation proposal. *(See Pages 116-120 for a description of the contents of this document.)*

10. The proposal is submitted through local university administrative channels to the CSU Chancellor and to the chief executive officer of the independent institution.

11. The CSU campus sends four copies of the proposal to the Office of Academic Program Planning, which reviews the proposal with the assistance of external reviewers with expertise in the discipline.

12. Academic Program Planning may request revision of the proposal. Copies of the revised proposal are prepared and sent to Academic Program Planning.

D. CPEC and WASC Approval

13. Academic Program Planning submits the program implementation proposal to CPEC staff.

14. CPEC staff, in consultation with Academic Program Planning and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, convenes an ad hoc CPEC joint graduate board to review and provide advice on the proposal. Representatives of the proposing institutions may be invited to meet with the ad hoc CPEC joint graduate board. The proposing institutions may be asked to provide additional information or clarification before final action is taken on behalf of CPEC.

15. CPEC staff notifies the CSU and the independent institution of action taken on the proposal.

16. Following CPEC approval, the Chancellor sends a letter granting full approval to award the degree to the CSU campus and sends a copy of the letter to the chief executive officer of the partner institution.

17. The participating institutions ensure that all necessary WASC approvals are obtained. *(See the WASC Substantive Change Manual 2001 (http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ccga/reports.html), especially Section III.C.5.)*
CONTENT: REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO NEGOTIATE

Expression of interest in the joint doctoral program

Rationale for the program

- Indications of need for the program
- Supporting evidence of the requesting academic units’ ability to offer doctoral instruction
  - Faculty: degrees, honors, grants, professional and other relevant experience, publications and other matters pertinent to judging qualifications to guide advanced graduate work. Curriculum vitae for faculty members from both participating institutions are usually submitted.
  - Academic units: experience with graduate study, degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, year in which each graduate degree program was authorized.
  - Instructional and research facilities: description of facilities available to accommodate joint doctoral candidates.

CONTENT: PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL

Implementation proposals for joint doctoral programs with independent institutions must include the following elements:

Basic Information

1. The names of the institutions that will be awarding the degree
2. The full and exact designation of the degree to be awarded (e.g., Ph.D. in Chemistry)
3. The names of the departments, divisions, or other units of the campuses that will have primary responsibility for administering the program
4. The names and titles of the individuals primarily responsible for drafting the proposal

Timelines

1. The anticipated date that the program will be implemented
2. A timetable for the development of the program, including enrollment projections for the first five years

Program Rationale, Aims and Objectives

1. The rationale for proposing a joint program
2. The aims and objectives of the program
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Justification for the Program

1. A description of how the proposed program is related to existing programs on the participating campuses, especially to closely related master's and doctoral programs
2. A list of similar doctoral programs offered or projected by California institutions (state clearly how the proposed program differs from the existing programs listed)
3. A summary of the evidence of student demand for the proposed program
4. A summary of the employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program and the professional uses of the proposed program
5. A summary of the importance of the program to the discipline and to meeting the needs of society

Information About Participating Institutions and Departments

1. A description of the relationship of doctoral degree programs to the missions of the participating institutions
2. The number, variety, and longevity of the doctoral programs currently being offered and the degree completion rates for previous or current joint doctoral programs
3. A brief review of the historical development of the field and departmental strength in the field, including the experience of the participating academic units with graduate education (degrees offered, number of degrees awarded, and year in which each graduate degree program was authorized)
4. A description of how the proposed program is expected to draw support from existing programs, departments, and faculty

Information About Participating Faculty Members

1. A description of the relationship of the program to the research and professional interests of the faculty
2. A description of how the faculty expertise and resources at one participating institution complement the faculty expertise and resources at the other participating institution and create synergies
3. The criteria for choosing faculty members for participation in the program
4. Copies of faculty vitae, including rank, appointment status, highest degree earned, date and field of highest degree, professional experience, publications, and other information demonstrating faculty commitment to research and ability to chair dissertation committees
Information About Resources

1. A brief review of existing financial, physical and information resources supporting the program, including research support within the institution, library support appropriate for doctoral degree work, physical facilities, and stability and sufficiency of financial resources
2. A description of the ability of the institutions to provide graduate student support, including teaching or research assistantships, fellowship eligibility, and financial aid
3. A summary of resource requirements for each participating institution by year for the first five years, including:
   a. FTE faculty
   b. library acquisitions
   c. computing costs 
   d. equipment
   e. space and other capital facilities (including rented facilities, where applicable)
   f. other operating costs
4. A description of the intended method of funding the additional costs (including fee structures, internal reallocation, and external resources) and effects of the method of funding on existing programs

Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree

The statement should include all of the following elements that are applicable:

1. Undergraduate—and, if appropriate, postbaccalaureate and master’s level—preparation for admission; other admissions requirements; and provisions, if any, for conditional admission of selected applicants who do not meet all the requirements for admission
2. Criteria for continuation in the program
3. Unit requirements
4. Specific fields of emphasis
5. Required and recommended courses, including catalog descriptions of present and proposed courses
6. Foreign language requirements, if any
7. Other activities required of students (e.g., laboratory rotations, internships)
8. Field examinations, written and/or oral
9. Qualifying examinations, written and/or oral
10. Dissertation
11. Final examination
12. Other demonstration of student competence, if any
13. Special preparation for careers in teaching
14. Sample program
15. Normative time from matriculation to degree, normative time for pre-candidacy and candidacy periods, and incentives to support expeditious time-to-degree
16. Special arrangements for delivery of instruction, where applicable
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Provisions for Joint Decision-Making and Administration of the Program

1. Administrative support at each participating campus and mechanisms for coordination
2. Assistance for faculty, staff and students in meeting the unique demands of the proposed joint program (e.g., travel among participating institutions, distance learning expenses, relocation expenses)
3. Rules for determining registration and fee payment obligations, especially when students are receiving instructional services simultaneously from more than one participating institution
4. Comprehensive support services for students (e.g., housing, health care, child care, access to information resources) at multiple institutions
5. Mechanisms to ensure the involvement of each participating institution in admission decisions, curricular coordination and modification, advisory committees, and dissertation committees
6. Any other relevant features of the relationship between the partnering institutions in the development and implementation of the proposed joint degree program

Assessment and Accreditation

1. A description of the review process that will be used to evaluate the proposed program, including an assessment plan
2. A description of the provision for meeting accreditation requirements, where applicable
California State University Ed.D. in Educational Leadership
Degree Implementation Proposal Template

Campuses are asked to submit to Academic Program Planning (APP) proposals following this template, which is also available at http://www.calstate.edu/app/Ed.D./. Please submit six hard copies via US mail (CSU Academic Program Planning 401 Golden Shore Long Beach, CA 90802-4210) and one Word version via email to APP@calstate.edu. This form is to be used only for programs that are to be offered solely by a CSU campus or CSU campuses jointly. Further Ed.D. program planning resources are available at http://www.calstate.edu/app/Ed.D./. Questions may be directed to: Christine Mallon, Dean, Academic Program Planning, at (562) 951-4672 or APP@calstate.edu.

This format was designed to streamline WASC and CSU proposal review processes as much as possible, with the intention to facilitate preparation and electronic submission of the WASC Substantive Change Proposal.

**Important:**
- Please retain the CEPC criteria designations, which appear in bold in the proposal headlines.
- Elements in common with the WASC Substantive Change Proposal are featured in italics.

**I. Overview**

A. Name of degree program proposed—“Ed.D. in Educational Leadership”

B. Initial date of offering

C. *Projected number of students and type of student the program is designed to serve (adult learners; full-time or part-time employed students)*

D. *Timeframe for course delivery (e.g. accelerated program, weekends only, traditional format)*

E. *Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements*

F. The names of the departments, divisions, or other units of the campus(es) that will have primary responsibility for administering the program

G. The names and titles of the individuals primarily responsible for drafting the proposal
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II. Program Rationale
   A. The rationale for proposing the program, including:
   B. Description of how the program philosophy, design, and pedagogical methods suit the target student population
   C. Justification for introducing the program at this time

III. Summary of Employment Prospects and Workforce Demand
   A. Fit with the campus’ mission and strategic goals (CPEC—Appropriateness to Institutional and Segmental Mission)
   B. A list of similar doctoral programs offered or projected by California institutions (state clearly how the proposed program differs from the existing programs listed) (CPEC—Number of Existing and Proposed Programs in the Field)
   C. A summary of the employment prospects for graduates of the proposed program and the professional uses of the proposed program (CPEC—Societal Needs)
   D. Regional need for program, as identified by partners. What local needs do partners intend to address through the help of program graduates? (CPEC—Societal Needs) and (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)
   [Note: Proposals will need to indicate the ways in which the curriculum has been designed in response to California Education Code California Education Code Section 66040.3, which authorized the CSU to offer the Doctor of Education degree as specified in that law.]

IV. Student Demand
   The case for student demand can be made stronger by summarizing the enrollments in related community college certificate programs, and related master’s programs on the campus or in the service area.

   Enrollment Projections
   A. Enrollment projections for the first five years
   B. Evidence used to support enrollment projections and to support the conclusion that interest in the program is sufficient to sustain it at expected levels beyond the first cohort—summary only, not the full study. (CPEC—Student Demand)
   C. Explain how the program will provide for the continuing participation of students who do not complete their degree requirements within three years.
V. Program Context and History

A. A description of how the proposed program relates to existing programs on the participating campuses, especially to closely related master’s and doctoral programs.

B. The number, variety, and longevity of the doctoral programs currently being offered, including student enrollment data and degree completion and non-completion rates for previous or current joint doctoral program—three to five years of data should be provided.

C. If the campus is a partner in an existing joint Ed.D. program:
   Indicate whether the joint doctoral program(s) will continue;
   1. Submit a copy of the proposal to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program, including provisions for teaching out the program. Follow the instructions provided in Coded Memo AA-2006-42, available at http://www.calstate.edu/AcadAff/codedmemos/AA-2006-42.pdf
   3. Submit a copy of the Chancellor’s permission to discontinue the joint Ed.D. program.

VI. Partnership with Public Elementary and Secondary Schools and/or Community Colleges (CPEC—Societal Needs)

A. A list of public school districts, schools and/or community colleges that are partnering with the campus(es) in the development and operation of the proposed program.

B. Consistent with California Education Code Sections 66040-66040.7, the role of school district, school, and/or college partners in program design, candidate recruitment and admissions, teaching, and program assessment and evaluation.

C. Other involvement of school districts, schools and/or colleges in the program.

D. Listing of the P-14 personnel participating in partnership meetings.

VII. Information About Participating Department(s) or other CSU Campuses (if applicable)

A. A description of how the proposed program is expected to draw support from existing programs, departments, and faculty.

B. Provisions for partnership among participating departments.

C. Letters committing to partnership.

VIII. Governance Structure for the Program (consistent with systemwide requirements as detailed in California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and EO 991)

A. Membership and responsibilities of groups, boards, and committees.

B. Participation, as appropriate, by program faculty; other faculty; administrators at the department, college, and university levels; regional public school and college educators; students in the program; and alumni of the program.

C. Program bylaws or a statement affirming that bylaws are being developed.

D. A description of how the governance structure complies with the provisions of California Education Code Sections 66040.3(b) and allows for substantial and meaningful participation by P-12 and community college partners.
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IX. Faculty

A. A listing of program faculty and their research and professional interests related to the program (P-12, community college, adult learning, research methods, etc.)

B. The criteria for choosing core doctoral faculty, affiliated doctoral faculty, and other faculty members for participation in the program\(^1\)

C. *Number and type of faculty allocated to support the program in terms of developing the curriculum, delivering instruction to students, supervising internships and dissertations, and evaluating educational effectiveness*

D. *Faculty background and experience to engage in doctoral-level instruction. Include copies of abbreviated faculty vitae (or summaries of 3-5 pages addressing an overview of the key credentials, publications; if applicable, for primary faculty responsible for the program, include prior experience supervising dissertation work).*

E. *Strong proposals will demonstrate with specific numbers that as the program admits new cohorts, there will be enough faculty headcount to undertake dissertation supervisions, examination committee responsibilities, and teaching assignments. Please include formal campus commitments to faculty expansion, based on careful planning.*

F. If more than one campus is participating, provide a description of how the faculty expertise and resources at one participating campus complement the faculty expertise and resources at the other participating campus(es).

X. Resources (CPEC—Total Costs for the Program)

During the December 2006 meeting of the CSU Executive Council, fiscal issues related to the Ed.D. programs were addressed, and it is expected that proposals will reflect the system’s recommended guidelines for fiscal planning, which were presented in that meeting. A brief review of existing financial, physical and information resources supporting the program, including research support within the institution, library support appropriate for doctoral degree work, physical facilities, and stability and sufficiency of financial resources.

A. A summary of resource requirements for each participating institution by year for the first five years, including:
   1. FTE faculty
   2. library acquisitions
   3. computing costs
   4. equipment
   5. space and other capital facilities (including rented facilities, where applicable) other operating costs

B. A description of the intended method of funding the additional costs (including fee structures, internal reallocation, and external resources) and effects of the method of funding on existing programs. Note: Section 66040.5(a) of the California Education Code states:

   *Enrollment in these [Ed.D.] programs shall not alter the California State University’s ratio of graduate instruction to total enrollment, and shall not come at the expense of enrollment growth in university undergraduate programs.*

C. The financial structuring of the programs should address the specific issue of the cost associated with students who lag in completing the dissertation.

D. Where the campus plans to expand faculty resources, provide documentation of the campus commitment to and specific budgetary resources for acquiring additional faculty with the appropriate credentials experience (including recent scholarship and publications and doctoral dissertation advising).

---

\(^1\) The criteria must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. The criteria applicable to a full-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with the university may differ from the criteria applicable to a part-time faculty member whose primary affiliation is with a P-12 institution or a community college. The criteria may also vary with the type of participation in the program.
XI. Admission Requirements

A. Admission criteria, including: undergraduate, master’s-level, and, if appropriate, other postbaccalaureate preparation for admission; other admission requirements; and provisions, if any, for conditional admission of selected applicants who do not meet all the requirements for admission.

B. Identify the type of student targeted and qualifications required for the program.

C. Credit policies, including:
   1. The number of credits that students may transfer in to the program
   2. The distribution of credits allowed or required at the master’s, doctoral, and combined doctoral and master’s levels.

D. Academic residence requirements

XII. Detailed Statement of Requirements for the Degree

The statement should include all of the following elements that are applicable to the proposed program:

A. Unit requirements
B. Criteria for continuation in the program
C. Criteria for satisfactory progress
D. Academic disqualification
E. Foreign language requirements, if any
F. Field experiences, if any
G. Internships and monitoring procedures—if internships are required
H. Field examinations, written and/or oral, if any
I. Written qualifying examinations
J. Dissertation proposal
K. Dissertation examination
L. Dissertation
M. Final examination oral defense of dissertation
N. Other demonstration of student competence, if any
O. Special requirements for graduation or distinctive elements of the program

2 All requirements must incorporate pertinent systemwide standards. Please see http://www.calstate.edu/APP/EdD/.
XIII. Curriculum

A. Listing of core courses, identifying those that are required
B. Listing of specialization courses, identifying those that are required
C. Listing of additional recommended courses
D. Total number of units required
E. Length of the program for the typical student to complete all degree requirements
F. Draft catalog description of the program
G. Draft catalog descriptions of existing and proposed courses
H. For each Ed.D. specialization, a matrix demonstrating how the core and specialization courses ensure coverage of core curricular elements. Please use the matrix template enclosed at the end of this packet.
I. Sample schedule of courses for a full cycle of the program.
J. Provisions for accommodating the enrollment of professionals who are working full time
K. Provisions, as appropriate, for students in the program to complete requirements for the Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential (Tier II)

XIV. Assessment and Accountability (CPEC—Maintenance and Improvement of Quality)

Programs will need to develop formal assessment plans and should not rely on regular 5-year program review cycles or NCATE accreditation to provide insight about how well students are learning or how well the program meets its objectives. While program goals and student-learning outcomes goals should both be assessed, it is recommended that a clear distinction be drawn between the two. Program goals should drive program assessment, and core concepts should drive the curriculum and its assessment. Both should be related, so that the curriculum carries out the program goals.

Dissertation goals should be included among student learning goals, with outcomes assessed using a dissertation-evaluation rubric. Embedded assessment, conducted in courses, can reveal how well students are achieving the stated learning outcomes, and are a valuable tool for improving curriculum and pedagogy. Indicate how regularly planned analysis of assessments will allow faculty to adjust the program, as appropriate, to support learning effectiveness.

Assessment Plan

A. Include School/College and Ed.D. Program Mission Statements
B. List of programs outcomes goals (most broad)
C. Student-learning outcomes (SLOs) for the proposed program (narrower, identifying what students know and can do)
D. Curricular map articulating the alignment between program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes
E. Criteria used to assess success of meeting program goals (Identification of the performance criteria used to assess the effectiveness of the program.)
F. Include a matrix that shows assessment criteria for student-learning outcomes. (Assessment matrix describing the achievement of the program’s student learning outcomes)
G. Indicate how the results of the assessment will be used to achieve program improvement (the assessment “feedback loop”); and that specifies the schedule for review of assessment reports by the Faculty Group, Executive Committee, and Advisory Board.
H. Provisions for conducting systemwide Ed.D. program evaluation and reporting as required by California Education Code Section 66040.7. The proposal should explain the processes in place that will allow the program to report these performance criteria, as required by California Education Code Section 66040.7(d):
   1. How graduates of the programs have affected elementary and secondary school and community college reform efforts
   2. How CSU Ed.D. graduates have positively affected student achievement in elementary and secondary school and community college settings.
XV. Student Support Services

A. A description of the ability of the institutions to provide graduate student support, including teaching or research assistantships, fellowship eligibility, financial aid, and research funding, if any.

B. Advising, mentoring, and cohort interaction, including a description of how timely and appropriate interactions between students and faculty, and among students will be assured. This is especially relevant for online programs.

C. Specify the arrangements that have been made to identify and assist students who struggle in meeting academic requirements and for those who fall behind their cohort.

D. Ed.D. program student handbook or a plan to create and distribute a program student handbook, as required by Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 40511

XVI. Doctoral Culture (CPEC—Advancement of Knowledge)

Proposals should explain where support for doctoral students and faculty currently exists and how the campus will enhance a sense of graduate community and an environment supportive of doctoral-level study. Plans may be addressed from the faculty perspective, as well as from the student viewpoint.

A. Description of how a doctoral-level culture will be established to support the proposed program, including such elements as doctoral level course requirements, nature of the research environment, balance between applied and research components of the degree, and description of dissertation. (Note: Greater rigor will be represented for doctoral courses than in syllabi at the master's level. Ed.D. syllabi should be designed to align course objectives, content, assignments, texts, and exams with learning outcomes at both the program and course levels. The number and intellectual rigor of required readings and student assignments will be appropriate for doctoral study.)

B. Support/resources for faculty to develop a doctoral culture, engage in research, and if applicable, receive an orientation in order to chair dissertation committees.

C. Support services available for doctoral students, such as financial aid, professional placement, and research opportunities.

XVII. Special Provisions for Administration of a Multi-Campus Program (if applicable)

A. Administrative support at each participating campus and mechanisms for program coordination

B. Assistance for faculty, staff and students in meeting the unique demands of the proposed joint program (e.g., travel among participating campuses, distance learning expenses, relocation expenses)

C. Rules for determining registration and fee payment obligations, especially when students are receiving instructional services simultaneously from more than one participating campus

D. Comprehensive support services for students (e.g., child care, access to information resources) at multiple campuses

E. Mechanisms to ensure the involvement of each participating campus in admission decisions, curricular coordination and modification, advisory committees, and dissertation committees

F. Any other relevant features of the relationship between the partnering campuses in the development and implementation of the proposed degree program

XVIII. Accreditation

If the proposed program is within a school or related to other programs accredited by a professional accrediting agency, please list the agency, the year accredited, and include in the appendix a copy of the most recent accreditation evaluation. This pertains only to those participating departments that have relevant accreditation.
### Core Concepts and Curriculum Matrix

**Indicating Inclusion of Core Curricular Elements in Proposed Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership**

*Please submit one form each Ed.D. specialization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number and Title</th>
<th>Systemic educational reform</th>
<th>Visionary educational leadership</th>
<th>Complexity and organizations</th>
<th>Collaborative management</th>
<th>Diversity and equity</th>
<th>Educational policy environments</th>
<th>Educational accountability</th>
<th>School and campus cultures</th>
<th>Curriculum &amp; instructional reforms</th>
<th>Human resource development</th>
<th>Student development and learning</th>
<th>Community &amp; governmental relations</th>
<th>Resources and fiscal planning</th>
<th>Assessment and evaluation</th>
<th>Applied quantitative inquiry</th>
<th>Applied qualitative inquiry</th>
<th>Data-driven decision-making</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Professional practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate:  
I = Element is introduced  
R = Element is reinforced  
A = Element is addressed at an advanced level
Joint Doctoral Degree Programs

Policy
The CSU is authorized to offer joint doctoral degrees only with the University of California and with independent institutions of higher education in California. Joint doctoral degrees shall not be offered with out-of-state, out-of-country partners, nor with for-profit partners in California.

California Education Code section 66010.4(b)
The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as provided in subdivision (c) and pursuant to Section 66904. The doctoral degree may also be awarded jointly with one or more independent institutions of higher education, provided that the proposed doctoral program is approved by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

California Education Code section 66010(b)
As used in this part, “independent institutions of higher education” are those nonprofit higher education institutions that grant undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, or both, and that are formed as nonprofit corporations in this state and are accredited by an agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.

Procedures
CSU and Independent Institutions Joint Doctoral Programs

CSU and UC Joint Doctoral Programs
CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs

Flow Chart CSU and UC Joint Degree Programs

Handbook for Creation of CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs
http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdochandbook030502.htm

CSU/UC Joint Doctoral Programs—Review Criteria
http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/uccsu/jointdochandbook030502.htm#6