

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

ACADEMIC SENATE

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

REPORT TO

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

AP-012-190

Program Review – EdD Educational Leadership

Academic Programs Committee

Date: xx/xx/2020

Executive Committee
Received and Forwarded

Date: 03/11/2020

Academic Senate

Date: 03/18/2020
First Reading

BACKGROUND:

As part of the university's five-year planning cycle for all programs, a self-study was prepared by the EdD program in Educational Leadership in AY18-19. Dr. Elizabeth Murakami from the University of North Texas and Dr. Anna Ortiz from Cal State Long Beach visited the campus on April 23, 2019 as external reviewers and submitted a report. Both the Department (10/8/2019) and the Dean (10/11/2019) prepared written responses. Additionally, the Department submitted an action plan addressing the findings of the program review. The Academic Programs Committee has reviewed these documents and consulted with Department Chair Alford, Dean Passe, and Associate Dean Gilli-Elewy.

RESOURCES RECOMMENDED:

Dr. Jeff Passe, Dean, College of Education and Integrative Studies
 Dr. Hend Gilli-Elewy, Associate Dean, College of Education and Integrative Studies
 Dr. Betty Alford, Department Chair, EdD Educational Leadership
 EdD, Educational Leadership Program Review Self-Study
 EdD, Educational Leadership Program Review External Review Report
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Dean's Response
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Department's Response
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Department's Action Plan

RESOURCES CONSULTED:

Dr. Jeff Passe, Dean, College of Education and Integrative Studies
 Dr. Hend Gilli-Elewy, Associate Dean, College of Education and Integrative Studies
 Dr. Betty Alford, Department Chair, EdD Educational Leadership
 EdD, Educational Leadership Program Review Self-Study
 EdD, Educational Leadership Program Review External Review Report
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Dean's Response
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Department's Response
 EdD, Educational Leadership Review Department's Action Plan

DISCUSSION and RECOMMENDATION:

The external reviewer commended the Department (1) the positive changes the program has gone through; (2) the strength of the curriculum and hybrid model of delivery; and (3) the knowledge and experience of the faculty.

The external reviewers recommended (1) that the Department review Assessment and outcomes data; (2) evaluation of the workload of the Co-Directors; (3) increased transparency in budgeting; (4) student support for diverse dissertation topics; (5) a recruiting plan to increase the number and diversity of the tenure-track faculty. This last item is a common concern across the university, consistent with ongoing efforts to increase tenure density in all departments and programs.

The external reviewers supported the action plan submitted by the Department and stated that it reflected the findings in the self-study and on-site review. Attached to this document is a response from Department Chair Alford, when asked to comment on the program review. She echoed the statements in the review and concurs with the reviewers.

Overall, the review is extremely positive, indicating that the Department has a strong commitment to the quality of students' education and experience at Cal Poly Pomona.

The Academic Programs Committee commends the Department of Liberal Studies and the Dean's Office on a quality program, and the thoughtful review of ways to improve teaching effectiveness and scholarly activity.

ATTACHMENT – Response from Department Chair Alford

**Summary of Important Highlights from the Educational Leadership
Doctoral Program’s Self-Study Report for the Academic Senate**

The Self-Study and External Review of the Educational Leadership Doctoral Program provided a strong validation of the strengths of the program with the external reviewers noting the program coherence and quality of the curriculum and faculty, the level of student support, and quality of the program’s leadership by the program directors and the doctoral council. Positive comments included, “We hope that it is clear that we found many examples of excellence in this program. I (Ortiz) am very familiar with almost every EDD program in the CSU system, and I can attest to the excellent organization, student support, and scholarly rigor in this program.” From the rating forms of the external program review, twenty-nine areas were rated as *Exemplary* for the program, five as *Satisfactory*, one as *Non-applicable*, and three as *Needs Improvement*.

The areas in the summary sheet that were rated as *Needs Improvement* related to increasing faculty for tenure-density and diversity and improving facilities to strengthen an executive setting conducive to a doctoral culture for educational leaders. Reviewers noted, “We concur with the suggestion for an additional faculty line in 2019-2020.” The doctoral council noted that although one faculty member was hired in 2019 and the department is conducting a search for an additional tenure track faculty member to begin in 2020, another faculty line is needed for 2020-2021 due to a retirement. The doctoral council concurs with the external reviewers that having tenure-track faculty is essential in continuing to strengthen the doctoral program. Currently, we are conducting a faculty search with the faculty member to begin in Fall 2020. A diverse pool of applicants applied for the position. Our College of Education and Integrative Services has also updated facilities for classes through furniture in two classrooms and a conference room. The reviewers noted strengths of the program as the recruitment materials, university courses are updated and include current topics, an active doctoral council that meets monthly, the hybrid weekend course delivery in a seminar format, and clear alignment of the syllabi with a focus on social justice issues that are reflective of the diversity of students.

The reviewers also noted that the student and alumni reflections concerning the program were very complimentary with multiple stakeholders speaking to the quality of the program and the support for success that they received. The reviewers noted that the “outcomes [of retention] are still excellent and consistent with the better programs in the CSU,” although they noted that retention of all students from the first term continues to be an area to work on through recruitment emphasizing the rigor of the program. The doctoral council recognized that some students were unable to complete the dissertation within three years due to personal issues beyond the council’s control, such as health issues and professional job changes that required additional time.

The reviewers recommended that the IRB process needs to be more fully supported, in order to provide more timely review of the IRB submissions at peak times. The reviewers also recommended that attention be provided to moving timelines for proposal defenses

earlier and scheduling courses in the third year in such a way that each student's focus on the dissertation is supported for on-time completion. In response, the doctoral council identified 1st year retention and 3-year completion rates as goals in the next 1-2 years. Concerning the schedule for the third year of classes, at the time of semester conversion, faculty designed a new synthesis course and sequencing of the research learning community seminars was changed to provide focused support in year three. The doctoral council will continue to monitor if these changes result in reaching the goal of 100% student completion of the dissertation in three years.

In summary, the external reviewers listed the top three goals that they would suggest for the program as:

- (1) increasing the university visibility and value of Cal Poly Pomona's first doctorate program through communication, full-time faculty, and student resources, especially facilities, (2) increase 1st year retention for the 3-year completion rate, and (3) foster university, community and school partnerships with districts and alumni. This may include the creation of scholarships, participation of students in conferences to present their research, and other activities that generate engagement while serving as a recruitment opportunity.

In addition, the external review team expressed concerns related to inadequate administrative support services for the program.

The doctoral council concurred with these recommendations, and they are addressed in our proposed action plan of short-term goals. For the five-year plan, the doctoral council proposed that we would foster research practice partnerships; become a member of the University Council of Educational Administration as well as maintain membership in the Carnegie Professional Education Doctorate network; strengthen our alumni network to establish scholarships; add an additional faculty member, and increase the number of doctoral students who are publishing and presenting their research.

In closing, we affirm that the self-study and external review processes were highly beneficial in furthering our analysis of key strengths and areas for improvement. The review assisted in the identification of important next steps that we have already begun to enact. We extend our thanks to the Assessment Office for their excellent leadership and coordination of the self-study process.