



Sam Houston
State University

A Member of the Texas State University System

A SELF-STUDY OF THE
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP (Ed.D.) PROGRAM

November 2019

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of Tables	6
Introduction to Sam Houston State University	8
I. Program Profile	10
A. Goals of Program	10
B. History of Program	11
C. Program Demographics	11
D. Faculty/Student Ratio	12
E. Alignment of the Program with Goals	12
F. 18 Characteristics Report	14
II. Program Administration	15
A. Administrative processes	15
B. Administrative Policies	18
C. Mentoring and Academic Advising	21
Conclusion about Admin Barriers	22
III. Curriculum	24
A. Description of Curriculum	24
B. Appropriateness of Curriculum	25
Program Comparison Activity	28

C. Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Processes.....	28
D. Accreditations.....	31
E. Quality of instruction by course.....	31
F. Quality of Online Course Offerings	37
Conclusion of Curriculum Section	37
IV. Faculty	39
A. Credentials.....	39
B. Scholarly Production.....	40
C. Teaching Load.....	45
D. Faculty Program Responsibilities	46
V. Students.....	47
A. Admission Criteria	47
B. Profile of Admitted Students	51
C. Student Funding	52
D. Program Performance Statistics.....	52
VI. Resources and Finances	57
A. Travel Funds	57
B. Graduate Assistantships	57
C. Scholarships.....	57
D. Program Budget	58

E. Clerical/Administrative Support.....	58
VII. Facilities and Equipment.....	60
A. Facilities	60
B. Technology and Technology Costs	60
VIII. Assessment Efforts	61
A. Annual program assessment reports.....	61
B. Alumni Surveys.....	62
C. Employer Surveys	62
D. Student publications and presentations.....	62
E. Student Questionnaires	63
IX. Recruitment and Marketing Efforts.....	65
A. Demand for Graduates.....	65
B. Geographical Location of Students	65
C. Marketing Recruitment Efforts and Effectiveness.....	65
D. Current Markets	66
E. Potential New Markets	66
F. Enrollment Plan for the Next 5 Years	67
G. Alumni and Donor Relations.....	67
X. Outreach	68
A. Community Engaged Learning	68

B. Professional outreach	68
XI. Summary	69
A. Strengths & Practices to Retain	69
B. Recommendations	71
Appendix A: Reviewers Guidelines	72
Appendix B: Sample Onsite Visit Itinerary.....	73
Appendix C: 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs Tables.....	74
Appendix D: Faculty CV	76
Appendix E. Student Poll.....	77
Appendix F: Course Sequence	83
Appendix G: 18 Characteristics Data for 2018-2019	84
Appendix H. Comparison of Courses to Other Programs.....	88

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Headcounts, degree conferred, and core faculty for years reviewed.....	12
Table 1.2: Faculty/Student Ratio	12
Table 2.1: Disposition Review Rubric.....	16
Table 2.2: Research Competencies	17
Table 3.1: Degree plan for EdD in Educational Leadership.....	25
Table 3.2: Research Competencies	29
Table 3.3: EDLD 7337 Course Performance.....	32
Table 3.4: EDLD 7362 Course Performance.....	33
Table 3.5: EDLD 7372 Course Performance.....	33
Table 3.6: EDLD 7365 Course Performance.....	33
Table 3.7: EDLD 7368 Course Performance.....	34
Table 3.8: EDLD 7363 Course Performance.....	34
Table 3.9: EDLD 7331 Course Performance.....	35
Table 3.10: EDLD 7370 Course Performance.....	35
Table 3.11: EDLD 7361 Course Performance.....	36
Table 3.12: EDLD 7338 Course Performance.....	36
Table 3.13: EDLD 7333 Course Performance.....	37
Table 3.14: EDLD 7332 Course Performance.....	37
Table 4.1: Faculty Scholarly Activity 2014 to 2019.....	41
Table 4.2: Publications	41
Table 4.3: External Grants	42
Table 4.4: Dissertation Count Among Faculty	46

Table 5.1: Acceptance and Enrollment Rate of HIED EdD Cohorts in Ed Ldrshp	48
Table 5.2: Acceptance and Enrollment Rate of K12 EdD Cohorts in Ed Leadership	49
Table 5.3: Program data of students by cohort.	50
Table 5.4: Enrollment headcount by diversity.....	51
Table 5.5: Percentage Full-time Students	51
Table 5.6: Average Institutional Financial Support Provided	52
Table 5.7: Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Institutional Financial Support....	52
Table 5.8: Graduation Rates	53
Table 5.9: Average Time to Degree	53
Table 5.10: 1-year retention rate for HIED cohorts.....	54
Table 5.11: 1-year retention rates for K12 cohorts.	54
Table 5.12: Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation).....	55
Table 5.13: Student Publications/Presentations.....	55
Table 8.1: 2019 Ed Leadership Doctoral Student Survey Results (n = 34)	64

Introduction to Sam Houston State University

Sam Houston State University is the oldest teacher training institution in the state of Texas with approved teacher education programs. Sam Houston State University is a member of The Texas State University System. The school was created by the Texas Legislature in 1879 as Sam Houston Normal Institute to educate teachers for the public schools of Texas. Sam Houston Normal Institute or School was created to “elevate the standard of education throughout the State, by giving thorough instruction and special training to our present and future teachers”

(<https://www.shsu.edu/academics/education/history.html>). Sam Houston Normal Institute became the first Normal Institute west of the Mississippi River and began shaping education in Texas. The baccalaureate degree was first awarded in 1919.

Sam Houston Normal College became a member of the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1922. In 1923, the institution’s name was changed to Sam Houston State Teachers College. Two years later, the college was admitted to membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) as an accredited institution of higher learning. Also in 1923, the curriculum to prepare teachers for elementary schools was expanded to prepare teachers at all levels in the public schools and Sam Houston Normal Institute became Sam Houston State Teachers College. A graduate degree was authorized in 1936, and the curriculum was expanded to emphasize preparation in a variety of fields. In 1938, the Sam Houston catalog was altered to reflect a broader horizon and an expanding concept of its educational mission. Courses contributing to the preparation of those students who wished to enter the professions such as dentistry, medicine, and law were offered as

preprofessional courses. In 1965, the word *teachers* was dropped from the name of the institution and in 1969 the institution became Sam Houston State University.

Beginning in 2000, the University expanded its building program and committed resources to develop and maintain nationally-recognized academic support programs. Sam Houston State University increased the number of doctoral programs, including programs in education and psychology, and experienced a tremendous surge in enrollment and name recognition. Sam Houston State University is classified as a “Doctoral Research University” by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

The College of Education is one of eight colleges that make up the University and there are four departments directly or indirectly involved in public education contained within the College of Education. The departments are: (1) Counseling, (2) Educational Leadership (3) School of Teaching and Learning, and (4) Library Science & Technology.

Educator preparation programs within the College of Education are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) through the Texas Accountability System.

I. Program Profile

Overview. The Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership follows a cohort model and is designed to equip rural and urban educators with a knowledge base to help them meet the challenges of instructional improvement, management, and administration in 21st-century academic institutions. Prior to 2018, students were able to choose between two different areas of specializations: (a) Higher Education specialization, or (b) K-12 specialization. After 2018, the Higher Education Leadership Ed.D. program became its own doctoral program. Currently, degree candidates can work toward a Texas principal and/or superintendent certification as part of their cognate/elective choices. The doctoral degree is awarded after students achieve the following components: coursework completion, comprehensive examinations, and a major research study resulting in the presentation and defense of a dissertation.

A. Goals of Program

The doctoral program (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership provides the highest professional degree available to candidates who aspire to leadership positions in Education, primarily in K-12 settings. Graduates of the doctoral degree in Educational Leadership will have acquired the knowledge and skills to lead K-12 school systems and act in a leadership and consulting capacity in diverse educational organizations.

Program Goals

The doctoral program focuses on developing leader-scholars who are prepared to effectively lead educational organizations by:

- (a) supporting professional development for instructional improvement;

- (b) effectively allocating resources for student learning;
- (c) applying evidence-based practices in educational research and program evaluation through sound research design and interpretation;
- (d) interpreting laws applicable to the administration of K-12 schools; and
- (e) advocating for sound policies that support the success of all students.

B. History of Program

The doctoral program in educational leadership at Sam Houston State University gained approval by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board and funding approval by the state legislature in 1995. Following funding approval, the program was revised using a cohort model, approved by an outside review team, and received final approval in January of 1997. Dr. Jimmy Merchant was named the director of the doctoral program in the fall of 1996. The first students were admitted to the program in April of 1997 and began studies that June. The first four graduates of the program received their Ed.D. degrees in August 2000. Following Merchant's retirement, Dr. Beverly Irby served as the director, followed by Dr. Ted Creighton in 2002, followed by Dr. Stacey Edmonson in 2006, followed by Dr. Timothy Jones in 2010, followed by Dr. Rebecca Bustamante in 2011, followed by Dr. Julie Combs in 2012, followed by Dr. Rebecca Bustamante in 2017, and followed by Dr. Julie Combs in 2018. In 2018-2019, Dr. Julie Combs assumed the duties of the doctoral program and remains the director.

C. Program Demographics

Number of students per year, number of degrees conferred, and number of core faculty: Core Faculty are defined by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) as “full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in

the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.” Our core faculty serve in multiple programs within the department. The number of core faculty varies depending on definition. There are 15 tenure-track faculty in the department who could support the program either in a teaching role or dissertation role. Five of these carry the load in the K12 doctoral program.

Table 1.1: Headcounts, degree conferred, and core faculty for years reviewed.

Year	Headcount	Degrees conferred	Core faculty
2018-19	57	12	10
2017-18	75	16	14
2016-17	97	27	17
2015-16	95	26	14
2014-15	98	18	13
2013-14	89	13	14

D. Faculty/Student Ratio

The number of core faculty has ranged from 10 to 14 and is defined as those teaching 50% or more in the program or who direct dissertation research. The ratio of faculty to students has varied and is currently calculated as 7 to 1.

Table 1.2: Faculty/Student Ratio

Academic Year	Student-Core Faculty Ratio
2018-2019	7:1
2017-2018	9:1
2016-2017	10:1
2015-2016	8:1
2014-2015	8:1
2013-2014	8:1

E. Alignment of the Program with Goals

How does program align with university/program goals? The Ed.D. program is aligned with the university goals as it provides an “intellectually engaging and stimulating academic environment.” Through its strategic plan, SHSU will:

- Foster an intellectually engaging and stimulating academic environment.
- Adopt innovative methods to improve the quality and access to instruction.
- Adjust academic program mix to meet changing demographic characteristics and changing societal needs.
- Maintain a culture of excellence in a supportive and collegial environment.
- Place a targeted emphasis on marketing and institutional branding
- Support and promote regional economic development.
- Develop appropriate five-year plans/targets for enrollment growth and mix and its instructional and service implications.
- Make data- and outcome-based continuous improvement a part of our daily environment.
- Continue to develop physical facilities and infrastructure.

The aforementioned goals and objectives of the doctoral program are consistent with the university goals and its mission.

In addition, our courses align to the aforementioned goals. For example, our research courses provide students with the knowledge and skills to accomplish the research competencies, such as serving as an ad-hoc reviewer for an academic journal, presenting a research paper at a national or regional peer-reviewed professional conference, and submitting a faculty-reviewed research article (sole author,

collaborator, or co-author with a faculty member) to a peer-reviewed journal. In 2018-2019, our students had 8 publications and 34 presentations. These numbers tend to be under-reported due to the mechanism for collecting these data (e.g, self-report, CV reviews).

In the future, what factors will affect the demand? The identified factors that impact our program include the growing competition and the offering of online degrees by other institutions. We continue to survey the market and have discussions with our alumni to identify needs. We also gather input from an advisory board.

F. 18 Characteristics Report

The 18 Characteristics report of doctoral programs is a report required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board each year. Reports are posted at this website <https://www.shsu.edu/dept/graduate-studies/18-Characteristics.html>

The characteristics are shown in Appendix G for Texas Doctoral programs and criteria are explained in Appendix C.

II. Program Administration

A. Administrative processes

Admission processes. Prospective students submit an application to the university through ApplyTexas, pay the application fee, and open an account with BearkatLink through Graduate Admissions, where they upload required application documents. The doctoral director and an admin assistant contacts prospective students to answer questions and assist with admissions processes.

After the March 1 priority deadline, a committee screens applications (e.g., resume, GPA, personal statement, application). Selected applicants are invited for a committee interview and presentation of a research project. Using data included in the interview and presentation, the committee assesses the applicants using a scoring rubric. Accepted students are notified in writing. Prior to the start of classes, all students participate in a face to face program orientation session.

Probationary Review Procedures. Each semester, faculty provide input on each student in the form of a disposition review. When the student has completed 12 to 18 semester hours, a committee review progress and determine the candidates' status to candidacy. The committee considers each candidate's academic performance (grades) and dispositions (reports by faculty). Students can be admitted to full candidacy, placed on probation, or removed from the program. The dispositions measured in our program are shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Disposition Review Rubric

0 Not meeting expectations	1 Meets expectations	2 Exceeds expectations	Disposition Behaviors
			1. Engaged Learner (Participates in Class, Remains on-task, Minimizes disruptions)
			2. Attends Class (Absences are rare, Professor is notified, Takes responsibility for missed concepts)
			3. Observes Ethical Standards (Avoids plagiarism, contributes fair share to group work)
			4. Respects Diverse Viewpoints (Student exhibits respectful behaviors when diverse perspectives are shared)
			5. Submits Assignments by Deadlines (Student consistently turns in assignments on or before deadline)
			6. Demonstrates an Attitude of Professional Growth (Uses feedback, Seeks out resources when needed, Demonstrates independence by taking responsibility for learning needs)
			7. Academic Performance –(Student completes work at a B-level or higher and maintains at least a 3.0 GPA in doctoral classes.)

Comprehensive Examinations. After completion of required courses in the doctoral program, the candidate takes comprehensive examinations. Successful completion of the comprehensive examinations is required before the student is allowed to propose his/her dissertation research. More information about the content and procedures can be found in Section III, Curriculum, C.

Research Competencies. Students gain the needed research skills to accomplish the research competencies. These competencies are introduced to the students in the first semester and are measured during the comprehensive examination process. These outcomes are also shown in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2: Research Competencies

Complete	Competency Description. Complete both 1 and 2.
	1. Attend a doctoral dissertation proposal defense prior to beginning your own proposal defense (Name of defense attended and date)
	2. Attend a doctoral dissertation final defense prior to completing your own dissertation
	Select and complete at least TWO of these options. We encourage you to complete option 3 and 4.
	3. Present a research paper at a peer-reviewed professional RESEARCH conference
	4. Submit a faculty-reviewed research article (as sole author, collaborator, or co-author with a faculty member) to a peer-reviewed professional journal
	5. Serve as an ad-hoc reviewer for an academic journal or review proposals for a professional research conference. (Complete at least 3 reviews)
	6. Other: Using your knowledge about research, plan and/or facilitate a research conference or serve as a graduate representative of a research organization (e.g., SHSU Graduate Research Exchange, Symposium on Higher Education Leadership). List and describe your activities:

Chair selection. During the second year, students can select dissertation chairs. Each year, faculty submit a dossier to the program director who makes them available for students to review because students do not have all faculty for a class. The dossier provides an opportunity for students to learn more about each faculty members' research interests. Next, a survey is provided to students so that they can indicate their top three to four choices. The program director contacts the selected faculty members to confirm their availability and to arrive at a decision. The students and chairs are then notified in writing of chair assignments. The dean has set a cap of 10 active dissertation students per faculty member. Each faculty member is strongly encouraged to have at least 2-3 dissertation students.

Dissertation Proposal and Final Defenses Procedures. The student works with his/her dissertation chair and committee members for clearance to schedule a proposal. Proposal are scheduled at least three weeks in advance to allow the committee adequate time to read the proposal or final document. Defenses are open to the academic community and announced to students each week in announcements distributed via a Blackboard organization site.

B. Administrative Policies

The Ed.D. program follows the expectations prescribed by the university, college of education, and the Graduate School. These following policies impact our unit.

Degree Plan and Eight-Year Time Limit. This information is from the SHSU Catalog: <http://catalog.shsu.edu/graduate/academic-policies-procedures/degree-requirements-academic-guidelines/>

A degree plan details the curriculum for the specific academic program and is developed for each graduate student. All courses on the approved degree plan must be completed with a satisfactory grade to meet the requirements for the degree.

A student is required to complete master's level graduate work within a six-year period, measured from the date of initial enrollment for graduate credit in a particular degree program and **within an eight-year period for** doctoral level graduate work. The period of time a student is on an approved leave of absence will be counted as time accumulated toward that six-year or eight-year deadline for completion of the degree. Any extension of the six-year or eight-year deadline must be approved in writing by the appropriate academic dean and the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Comprehensive Exams. This information is from the SHSU Catalog:

<http://catalog.shsu.edu/graduate/academic-policies-procedures/degree-requirements-academic-guidelines/#comprehensive-examination>

Towards the end of degree plan completion, all graduate candidates must demonstrate knowledge retention by passing integrative comprehensive examinations or by other forms. The major department will establish whether comprehensive examinations are written, oral, or a combination of the two. In lieu of comprehensive exams, some programs have been granted permission to use a capstone course or portfolio submission.

The major department will organize a committee for the administration of exams. A grade of “high pass,” “pass,” or “fail” for each exam must be filed in the office of the appropriate academic dean. Should a student fail one or more examinations, a re-examination shall be permitted per departmental or college guidelines, as appropriate. A third examination may be permitted only with the approval of the appropriate academic dean and the department. Students should consult the major department for specific guidelines regarding comprehensive examinations. Students must be enrolled in the University the semester in which the comprehensive exams are administered.

Academic Honesty. This information is from the SHSU Catalog: The Graduate Faculty of Sam Houston State University expects students to conduct academic work with integrity and honesty. Acts of academic dishonesty will not be tolerated and can result in the failure of a course and dismissal from the University.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating on a test, plagiarism, collusion (the unauthorized collaboration with another person in preparing

work offered for credit), the abuse of resource materials, and misrepresentation of credentials or accomplishments.

Scholastic Expectations. This information is from the SHSU Catalog: A minimum grade point average of 3.0 (on a 4.0 scale) is required in all coursework taken for graduate credit. All grades earned in courses taken for graduate credit will be utilized in computing the grade point average. If a course is repeated, the highest earned grade will be used for computing the grade point average. A grade earned at another institution may not be used to remove a grade deficiency earned in residence at Sam Houston State University. Semester hours of credit earned at another institution are not utilized in computing the student's Sam Houston State University overall grade point average. Only those transferred courses from accredited institutions in which a grade of "A" or "B" was earned and which are accepted toward an official degree program may be applied toward a degree (see Transfer of Credit).

Academic Probation and Suspension. This information is from the SHSU Catalog: In order to achieve and remain in academic good standing at Sam Houston State University, a graduate student must maintain an overall grade point average of at least 3.0 on all graduate coursework attempted.

A 3.0 overall grade point average is the absolute minimum required for graduation. A graduate student who falls below a 3.0 overall grade point average at the close of any semester during which one or more semester credit hours are attempted will be placed on probation. If an enrolled student on probation fails to achieve a minimum 3.0 overall grade point average at the close of the next semester or summer school following the starting of the probation, the student will be terminated.

A student who earns a grade of "C" in any course (repeated or distinct course) within the academic program may have his/her graduate status reviewed by a committee of the department or college graduate faculty. The committee will recommend an appropriate remediation for the student. A student who earns **two** grades of "C" in distinct or repeated courses within their academic program *will be terminated from graduate studies*. A graduate student who earns a grade of "F" in any graduate course *will be terminated from graduate studies*. Those students who earn a **second or subsequent grade** of "C" or a grade of "F" in any combination of courses within their academic program during the semester or summer session of their anticipated graduation will be terminated from graduate studies and will not be eligible to graduate in that term. The appropriate academic dean may place on probation, retain on probation, or terminate any student deficient in grade points without regard to the regulations previously stated.

University Academic Policy Manual. Sam Houston State University's [Academic Policy Manual](#) provide specific information pertaining to the educational mission of the university and student conduct.

C. Mentoring and Academic Advising

Advisors. Who monitors student progress? The doctoral director serves as the academic advisor for all students during the coursework phase of the program. The doctoral director meets with each student to develop a degree plan and then provides approval for registration of specific classes each semester. During the program, the director monitors students' progress in their coursework and checks grades each semester. When the student applies to defend the dissertation proposal, the director

reviews the degree plan and comprehensive exam status. After the student has selected a dissertation chair, these dissertation advisors monitor the students' progress with their research projects. In the final semester, the director facilitates and approves clearance for graduation.

Mentoring. The director assigns faculty and experienced students to serve as mentors to incoming students. These are announced at the first reception and emails are sent by the director reminding faculty and students of these contacts.

Advising Resources. An advising resource is the Blackboard Organization site for doctoral students and faculty. This platform allows the doctoral director and support staff to provide resources in a course shell, available to all. Students receive weekly updates about defenses, procedures for graduation, resources for research, and postings for scholarships and jobs.

Conclusion about Admin Barriers

Since the last self-study review, concerns about dissertation support have been addressed by the program, college, and Graduate School. There no longer exists a burdensome review process for graduates. The library thesis clerk is supportive to students in regards to the dissertation template and provides assistance to graduates.

Since the last report when strengths were noted in the ability to decentralize processes to meet student needs, the university has reversed course. Now the focus is on centralizing functions in the university. Before, few decisions were centralized. The college graduate associate dean communicates with doctoral directors in a monthly meeting.

Institutional Barriers. We continue to address institutional barriers such as systems used in enrollment management. Concerns center around the time from an application is started by a student to the time an advisor can see the application. Right now, the delay is around 2-4 weeks. Application data can also be misleading in any student who starts an application is counted, yet programs have no control over these applicants as they are managed by enrollment management. The program initiates contact with applicants after their submission is complete (transcripts, fee, all materials). We have streamlined the process to remove barriers for candidates (such as not requiring recommendation letters, removing the GRE requirement). We also operate with a traditional doctoral selection process (by committee, by interview). We review applications after a deadline (March 1) and some applicants might have applied the summer prior or the fall prior and not receive word until the spring. Administration has expressed concern that these applications are “sitting” without action.

Another barrier has been the transition to CPOS compliance (course program of study, relating to financial aid) and ensuring degree plans match what the catalog says. Currently, Degree Works is used to manage the student degree completion. With the help of a graduate assistant, the degree plan of each student is analyzed at least once every semester. The process has been time consuming, but appears to be a problem that we are solving. Both of these processes (student advising, enrollment) take considerable time, and yet the university recently removed several of these positions from our college and program level. Having enough help to manage the functions of enrollment, recruiting, and student services remains to be seen as an ongoing challenge.

III. Curriculum

A. Description of Curriculum

Program. The program consists of 60 hours divided across four program domains: (a) leadership, (b) research, (c) cognate specialization, and (d) dissertation. The requirements include a prescribed curriculum of required and elective courses and each a major research project resulting in the presentation and defense of a dissertation. A sample sequence is located in Appendix F.

Assessment Points: Probation Review, Comprehensive Exams, Dissertation. After the completion of 12 to 18 semester hours (two to three semesters) of doctoral level coursework in the program, each student is reviewed for the probation period. (See Table 2.1). Students are also assessed during comprehensive exams, dissertation proposal defenses, and final defenses.

Comprehensive Exams and Research Competencies. After courses have been completed, students take the comprehensive examinations. Upon successful completion of the exams, students are given permission to prepare for the defense of their dissertation proposal. See Table 3.2, which outlines the research competencies.

Dissertation Proposal and Final Defenses. Students demonstrate their knowledge and application of skills gained in the program in the form of their dissertation research projects. Some dissertations are written in a traditional five-chapter dissertation (with an in-depth review of the literature.) Others choose a journal-ready approach with two to three journal articles. A committee of at least three faculty (dissertation committee) assess this final research project.

B. Appropriateness of Curriculum

Table 3.1: Degree plan for EdD in Educational Leadership

Title		Hours
Ed.D. in Educational Leadership		
Leadership Core		
EDLD 7337	Academic Writing & Research	3
EDLD 7331	Leadership Theory/Application	3
EDLD 7111	Doctoral Studies in Ed Ldrship (can sub for EDLD 7088)	3
EDLD 7333	Societal Factors Affecting Ed	3
EDLD 7370	Education Policy and Ethics	3
EDLD 7338	Organztnl Behavr & Thry in Edu	3
EDLD 7361	Program Evaluation in Educ	3
EDLD 7332	Instr Theory/Applications (can sub for EDAD 6383)	3
Research Tools		
EDLD 7362	Methods Of Educ Research	3
EDLD 7372	Qualitative Methodology	3
EDLD 7365	Applied Stats I for Ed Leaders	3
EDLD 7368	Applied Stats II for Ed Leadrs	3
EDLD 7363	Proposal Development	3
Cognate		
EDAD 6380	Exec Ldrshp- Superintendents	3
EDAD 6382	Human Resource Management	3
EDAD 6381	Dist Business & Financial Mgt	3
EDAD 6384	Superintendent Practicum	3
Dissertation		
EDLD 8033	Dissertation	9
Total Hours		60
Course List		

[EDLD 8033](#) must be taken at least three times for a minimum total of nine hours. Once enrolled in this course, the student must enroll in it until graduation.

Content by course description. List all courses and their catalog descriptions:

Leadership Core

EDLD 7331. Leadership Theory/Application. 3 Hours.

Students examine the many leadership theories, models, and processes with emphasis on the results of the applications of various theories, models, and processes to educational leadership. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

EDLD 7111. Doctoral Studies in Ed Ldrship. 1 Hour.

Students explore research in educational leadership, topics of interest to doctoral students in educational leadership, and research tools related to the doctoral program. Will be repeated with a different topic for a total of three credits.

EDLD 7333. Societal Factors Affecting Ed. 3 Hours.

Graduate students examine the political, economic, and cultural factors affecting public school education and instructional leadership today. This course is designed to provide instructional leaders with insight and background into the life styles, values, and aspirations of various cultural groups as related to the leadership process.

EDLD 7370. Education Policy and Ethics. 3 Hours.

Students are provided opportunities to study how educational policy is developed through micro and macro political elements, to examine ethical and value issues confronting educational leaders, and to demonstrate how individual values drive ethical behavior and ethical decisions. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

EDLD 7338. Organizational Behavior & Theory in Edu. 3 Hours.

This study of organizational theory and behavior is an integration and application of behavioral science knowledge and is built upon contributions from a number of behavioral disciplines. The prominent areas are psychology, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and political science. Contributions of the psychologists have been mainly at the individual or micro level, while the latter disciplines have contributed to our understanding of macro concepts, group processes and organization. All leaders who work in organizations will find this course helpful in understanding and guiding the behavior of others in the work place.

EDLD 7361. Program Evaluation in Educ. 3 Hours.

Students study educational problem solving and accountability and their relationship to needs assessment techniques, evaluation methodologies, and decision-making processes.

EDLD 7332. Instructional Theory/Applications. 3 Hours.

Students engage in a systematic study of existing research on key factors influencing instructional effectiveness and on models for school restructuring. The relationship of instruction and school effectiveness is explored in depth. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

Research Tools**EDLD 7337. Academic Writing & Research. 3 Hours.**

Students develop the skills and strategies for academic literacy, including critical reading and clear writing. Students utilize scientific writing styles and complete a written review of research literature.

EDLD 7362. Methods Of Educ Research. 3 Hours.

Students study quantitative research with emphasis upon an understanding of statistical concepts and procedures necessary to create and implement effective educational research. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

EDLD 7372. Qualitative Methodology. 3 Hours.

Students study qualitative research methodology within an educational leadership problems-based contextual framework with an emphasis placed on qualitative research techniques through lecture, discussion, readings, and field-based research projects using the methods learned. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

EDLD 7365. Applied Stats I for Ed Leaders. 3 Hours.

This course is designed to familiarize doctoral students with the logic and dynamics of the research process in education and provide students with the opportunity to develop skills in posing research questions, designing studies, collecting and examining data, and interpreting and reporting research results in educational leadership.

EDLD 7368. Applied Stats II for Ed Leaders. 3 Hours.

Doctoral students compute and interpret multivariate statistics to analyze quantitative data used in educational settings. A strong focus is placed on the use of statistical software to analyze data and written presentation results. The curricula for this course include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and ongoing student engagement in research related to professional practice.

EDLD 7363. Proposal Development. 3 Hours.

Students apply fundamental concepts and tools of research to educational problems. Each student prepares a proposal for the dissertation. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.

EDLD 8033. Dissertation. 1-3 Hours.

The completion of an approved dissertation which will contribute to Instructional Leadership. Minimum of 9 hours total required. Field-based projects will be emphasized. May be repeated. Variable Credit (1-3).

Prerequisite: Admission to the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership; completion of required Leadership Core and Research Component coursework and successful completion of comprehensive exam.

Cognate Area (Superintendent)- Students have a choice of cognate area**EDAD 6380. Exec Ldrshp- Superintendents. 3 Hours.**

This course provides candidates with the skills to assume the role of the contemporary superintendent. This course consists of topics, content, and independent inquiry that address the specific and unique leadership needs of districts.

EDAD 6381. Dist Business & Financial Mgt. 3 Hours.

This course provides candidates with the skills to understand basic district accounting and budgetary functions as well as the management of district facilities. This course deals with basic concepts of management of campus activity funds, personnel accounting, instructional budgetary functions, translating student academic needs into the budget, public finance; problems in local, state, and federal support of education and state financial systems with emphasis on Texas; local taxation; budgeting; financing capital items; and fiscal management.

EDAD 6382. Human Resource Management. 3 Hours.

Students study the administrator's role in recruiting and retaining adequate staff. Such topics as recruitment, salary policy, tenure, leaves, contractual obligations, evaluation systems, and academic freedom are considered.

EDAD 6384. Superintendent Practicum. 3 Hours.

Students are provided specific opportunities, independent inquiry, and experiences that are necessary for the dispositional and affective elements of the superintendency as candidates learn to manage organizational behavior and district performance.

Program Comparison Activity

In Appendix H, we compare the Sam Houston State University (SHSU) degree plan and course descriptions with three K-12 Educational Leadership doctoral programs: Stephen F. Austin University (SFA), Lamar University (LU), and the University of Louisiana at Lafayette (UL-LA). A cross comparison is provided where possible. Three of the programs are 60 hours with SFA requiring 66 hours. SHSU requires 12 hours of electives; SFA requires 9. The others are unclear in their elective requirements.

All four programs offer courses in Research Methods, dissertation proposal, and dissertation. Three of the programs including SHSU offer courses in Qualitative, Stats 1, and Academic Writing. None of the programs offer the Stats II course except for SHSU.

Three of the programs including SHSU offer courses in leadership theory, educational policy, organization behavior, program evaluation. LU has a program that is difficult to match with ours. We are most similar to SFA and UL-LA.

C. Comprehensive Exams and Dissertation Processes

Comprehensive Exams. After completion of required courses in the doctoral program, the candidate takes comprehensive examinations. Successful completion of the comprehensive examinations is required before the student is allowed to enroll for dissertation credit. The director works with those not passing; students are given remediation and one additional attempt. If a student fails a second attempt, a faculty

committee would meet to make a decision about the student's continued status as a student.

The purposes of the comprehensive examinations are:

- To evaluate the student's knowledge base as related to the objectives of the program.
- To provide the student with an opportunity to demonstrate the ability to apply that knowledge base in the solution of leadership problems.
- To provide a culminating or closure activity that integrates the knowledge gained, the skills developed, and the problem solving process experienced in a field-based doctoral program.
- To provide feedback to the faculty for the evaluation of the doctoral program.

Procedures for the comprehensive examinations:

Typically, the exams are given right before or during the semester of the proposal class (EDLD 7363). The first part of the written examination (Part I) consists of the application of knowledge in educational leadership. Students are required to review the leadership core courses and apply several concepts to practice. In Part II of the exams, students document their research skills and reflect about their research competencies. Part III are the research competencies (see Table 3.2). The doctoral faculty evaluate the examinations (blind review) and determine the outcome for the exam (Pass/ Fail).

Table 3.2: Research Competencies

Complete	Competency Description. Complete both 1 and 2.
	1. Attend a doctoral dissertation proposal defense prior to beginning your own proposal defense (Name of defense attended and date)

	2. Attend a doctoral dissertation final defense prior to completing your own dissertation
	Select and complete at least TWO of these options. We encourage you to complete option 3 and 4.
	3. Present a research paper at a peer-reviewed professional RESEARCH conference
	4. Submit a faculty-reviewed research article (as sole author, collaborator, or co-author with a faculty member) to a peer-reviewed professional journal
	5. Serve as an ad-hoc reviewer for an academic journal or review proposals for a professional research conference. (Complete at least 3 reviews)
	6. Other: Using your knowledge about research, plan and/or facilitate a research conference or serve as a graduate representative of a research organization (e.g., SHSU Graduate Research Exchange, Symposium on Higher Education Leadership). List and describe your activities:

Doctoral Dissertation

The dissertation is the final student product of the program. The dissertation defense meetings (proposal and final) are used to assess the student's knowledge and application of theory, research competencies, written and oral expression, and knowledge base in the discipline.

Dissertation Committee. A dissertation committee is composed of at least three members with graduate-faculty status. The student selects a dissertation chair with guidance from the director and/or chair of the department. The student selects the other committee members with guidance from the dissertation chair.

Proposal. The student works with his/her dissertation chair and committee members to develop the proposal for the initial defense. Our faculty require the students to complete the first three chapters of a five-chapter dissertation for proposal. The proposal is submitted to the dissertation committee following the timelines outlined by

departmental practice (currently committees receive the document 3 weeks in advance of the defense date). Students can begin their data collection and analysis after the proposal is accepted and IRB grants approval.

Final defense. Candidates should be in regular contact with committee members throughout the dissertation process. Candidates should allow committee members ample time to review draft versions of the dissertation. The candidate should submit the completed dissertation to the dissertation committee at least three weeks prior to the scheduled defense. Upon successful completion of the defense, the candidate works with the library thesis check to adhere to university submission guidelines. Finally, a routing sheet documents the approval of the chair, dean of the college, dean of the Graduate School, and the library.

D. Accreditations

The programs in the College of Education are accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Accreditation is also granted through the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Accreditation received through CAEP and SACS assists the doctoral program in monitoring and sustaining state, federal, and institutional standards of quality educational standards. The department is active at the national levels and holds an institutional membership in the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) and the International Council of Professors of Educational Leadership (ICPEL).

E. Quality of instruction by course

Information from the student survey that relates to curriculum quality are as follows:

	Strong Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree
4. Courses offered are reasonably rigorous for a doctoral program of study.	24	9		1	
5. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) the knowledge and skills for doing independent research.	31	3			
6. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) some knowledge and skills for furthering my professional career.	27	7			

A few qualitative comments from the student survey mentioned the Ethics course and the Research methods courses as not being the same as other courses offered. We should look more at these courses.

Course Quality

IDEA scores are listed for the excellent teacher category, excellent course category, and overall summary of course. IDEA scores range from 1-5 with 5 being the highest. The university average IDEA score is 4.0. Data are analyzed by excellent course score (highest to lowest score) and by performance in recent years, **2018 and 2019**, as noted in red.

Research Tools Courses: 18 hours

Table 3.3: EDLD 7337 Course Performance

EDLD 7331 Academic Writing (first course) Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance is rated as excellent (4.9 to 5.0). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as excellent.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	5.0
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	5.0
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.9
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.8
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.8
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.9

Table 3.4: EDLD 7362 Course Performance

EDLD 7362 Research Methods Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from below average to excellent (2.7 to 4.7). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as excellent to below average.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.7	4.8
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	4.7	4.7
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	4.8	4.6	4.5
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	4.1	4.2	4.2
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	3.6	3.8	3.8
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	3.7	3.4	3.6
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	3.6	3.3	3.3
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	2.1	2.7	2.8

Table 3.5: EDLD 7372 Course Performance

EDLD 7372 Qualitative Methods Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from average to excellent (3.0 to 5.0). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as excellent to average.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	5.0
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.8
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.9
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.8	4.8
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.8	4.8
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.8	4.8
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	4.9	4.7	4.6
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	4.8	4.7	4.6
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	4.7	4.6	4.6
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	4.3	4.4	4.4
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	3.3	3.5	3.5
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	3.3	3.5	3.6
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	3.8	3.4	3.8
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	3.2	3.0	3.2

Table 3.6: EDLD 7365 Course Performance

EDLD 7365 Stats 1 Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course is performing above average to excellent (4.0 to 5.0). The course name was changed in Spring 2016

from COUN 7373 to EDLD 7365. Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as above average to excellent.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	5.0
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.9
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.7	4.7
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	4.9	4.7	4.7
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.7	4.6
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	4.7	4.6	4.6
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.9	4.6	4.8
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.6	4.3
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	4.5	4.4	4.5
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	4.5	4.4	4.4
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	4.3	4.3	4.2
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.2	4.2	4.2
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.2	4.3
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.2	4.3
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	3.9	4.0	4.1

Table 3.7: EDLD 7368 Course Performance

EDLD 7368 Stats 2 Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course is performing from average to excellent (3.2 to 5.0). The course mostly performs in 4.0 to 5.0 range. The course name was changed in Summer 2017 from COUN 7374 to EDLD 7368. Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as excellent.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.9
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.8	4.8
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	4.9	4.8	4.8
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.9	4.4	4.4
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.4	4.6
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	4.2	4.2	4.1
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	3.4	3.2	3.4

Table 3.8: EDLD 7363 Course Performance

EDLD 7363 Proposal Development (last course as cohort) Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course is performing average to excellent (3.3 to 4.9). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as above average to average. Course title was changed in 2016 to reflect that it was a proposal course.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	4.9	4.9	4.8
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.8
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	4.6	4.8	4.8
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.8	4.8
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	4.8	4.8	4.8
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.6	4.5
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	4.6	4.6	4.8
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	4.5	4.6	4.3
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	4.3	4.5	4.6
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	4.4	4.4	4.5
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	4.7	4.4	4.3
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	4.2	4.2	4.2
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.3	4.2	4.3
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	3.5	3.3	3.8

Content Courses- 18 hours

Table 3.9: EDLD 7331 Course Performance

EDLD 7331 Leadership Theory- (first course) Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course is performing above average to excellent (3.5 to 4.9). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as average.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.9	4.8
2015 Summer	Dept faculty	4.6	4.7	4.7
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	4.4	4.5	4.5
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	4.4	4.5	4.4
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	4.9	4.5	4.5
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	4.1	4.4	4.3
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	4.6	4.3	4.3
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	3.4	3.8	3.4
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	3.7	3.5	3.8

Table 3.10: EDLD 7370 Course Performance

EDLD 7370 Policy, Ethics, Law Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from low average to above average (3.2 to 4.6). Recent cohorts (in red) rated the course as above average to low average. Recommendation: Examine the course.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	4.7	4.6	4.6
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.6	4.7
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	4.7	4.5	4.4
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.4	4.4
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	4.0	4.2	4.2
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	3.9	3.9	3.9
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	3.5	3.7	3.7
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	3.2	3.2	3.4

Table 3.11: EDLD 7361 Course Performance

EDLD 7361 Program Evaluation (application course) Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from average to excellent (4.1 to 5.0). Recent cohorts rated the course as above average to excellent. This course is credited for Community Engagement based on the program evaluation project students do for organizations.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	5.0
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	4.8	4.8
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.9	4.7	4.8
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	4.9	4.7	4.7
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	4.6	4.8
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.6	4.6
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	4.7	4.4	4.4
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	4.5	4.4	4.5
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	4.4	4.3	4.4
2015 Spring	Dept faculty	4.0	4.3	4.3
2016 Spring	Dept faculty	4.1	3.7	3.6

Table 3.12: EDLD 7338 Course Performance

EDLD 7338 Organizational Behavior Theories Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from below average to excellent (2.3 to 4.8). Recent cohorts rated the course as slightly above average. **Recommendation: Review content in this course.**

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2013 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	4.8	4.9
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	4.8	4.8	4.6
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	4.8	4.7	4.7

2015 Summer	Dept faculty	4.8	4.7	4.7
2017 Summer	Dept faculty	5.0	4.6	4.7
2019 Summer	Dept faculty	4.5	4.5	4.4
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	4.4	4.3	4.2
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	3.2	3.2	3.2
2018 Summer	Dept faculty	1.9	2.3	2.6

Table 3.13: EDLD 7333 Course Performance

EDLD 7333 Societal Factors Sorted by Excellent Course column. This course is performing above average to excellent (4.5 to 5.0) and shows somewhat consistent performance.

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2018 Fall	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2015 Fall	Dept faculty	4.7	4.9	4.9
2014 Fall	Dept faculty	4.8	4.6	4.6
2017 Fall	Dept faculty	4.7	4.5	4.5

Table 3.14: EDLD 7332 Course Performance

EDLD 7332 Instructional Theory (substituted for Supt Instruction course) Sorted by Excellent Course column. The course performance ranges from average to excellent. Recent cohorts rated the course as above average to excellent (3.5 to 5.0).

Yr/Sem	Professor	Excellent Teacher (raw)	Excellent Course (raw)	Overall (raw)
2018 Spring	Dept faculty	5.0	5.0	4.9
2019 Spring	Dept faculty	4.0	4.0	4.0
2017 Spring	Dept faculty	4.6	4.7	4.7
2014 Spring	Dept faculty	3.4	3.5	3.6

F. Quality of Online Course Offerings

Not applicable. Program courses are offered face to face.

Conclusion of Curriculum Section

Due to a growing interest in higher education leadership, a doctoral program was approved in higher educational leadership in 2017. Students moved from the EdD in

Educational Leadership to focus on that program. Essentially, our program was divided into two programs, each with a unique focus.

Comprehensive exams were updated as a result of the last self study six years ago. The exams were revised into a take-home exam focused on leadership application and the completion of research competencies. The comprehensive exam process should be reviewed to determine its alignment to program outcomes.

During the past six years, no courses have been added or removed to the Educational Leadership doctoral program. Course name and number changes have occurred, but none of these impacted content. Courses appear to be performing well with the exception of a few instances.

Since the last self-study, a committee met to review the time to completion data for students, particularly in regards to their dissertations. The committee put together a course map of curriculum content for each of the research classes to assist students with dissertation development.

IV. Faculty

A. Credentials

Faculty members in the Doctor of Educational Leadership program are involved in research, teaching, and service. Students in our program are advised and taught by leaders in their fields. In 2018-19, there were 8 core faculty members. Currently we have 5 faculty this year and rely on other leadership faculty in the department to teach classes and chair dissertations. Several department faculty teach a course each year and support student dissertations. Additional information can be found in the CVs for each faculty member.

1. Faculty Degrees

Julie P. Combs, Ed.D. - Professor and Director of Doctoral Studies
 Ed.D., Educational Administration, Texas A&M University –Commerce
 M.Ed., Educational Administration, Texas A&M University-Commerce
 B.S., Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University
 Certifications as Texas teacher, Mid-Management and Superintendent

Fred C. Lunenburg, Ph.D. – Full professor, Merchant Professor of Education
 Ph.D., Educational Administration, University of Ottawa, Canada
 M.A., Educational Administration, Seton Hall University
 B.S., Economics & Business Administration, Wagner College

Cynthia Martinez-Garcia, Ed.D. - Associate Professor
 Ed.D., Educational Leadership, Texas &M University, Corpus Christi
 M.Ed., Educational Administration, Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi
 B.S., Interdisciplinary Studies, Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi
 Certifications as a Texas Principal and Superintendent

George W. Moore, Ph.D. – Full Professor
 Ph.D., Educational Administration, University of Oklahoma
 M.Ed., Educational Administration, University of Central Oklahoma
 B.S., Biology Education, University of Central Oklahoma

John R. Slate, Ph.D. –Full Professor
 Ph.D., Psychology, University of Tennessee
 M.A., School Psychology, University of Tennessee
 B.A., Psychology, Eastern Illinois University

Support Faculty

Susan Troncoso Skidmore, Ph.D. – Associate Professor

Ph.D., Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University

M.Ed., Curriculum and Instruction, Texas A&M University

B.A., Biology, Texas A & M University

Anthony Harris, EdD- Full Professor

EdD Counseling -Texas A&M - Commerce

M.S. College Counseling -Univ of Southern Mississippi

B.A. Spanish -Univ of Southern Mississippi

Stacey Edmonson, Ed.D. – Full Professor and Dean of the College

Ed.D., Educational Administration, Texas A&M University-Commerce

M.Ed., Educational Administration, Texas A&M University- Commerce

B.A., English, Texas A&M University

Certifications as TX teacher, Mid-Management, Superintendent

Paul Eaton, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor

Ph.D., Educational Leadership & Research, Louisiana State University

M.Ed., Educational Research, Louisiana State University

M.Ed., Counseling & Personnel Services, Univ of Maryland College Park

B.A., English, History, Leadership Studies, Univ of Minnesota Twin Cities

Matthew Fuller, Ph.D.-Associate Professor

Ph.D., Educational Administration and Foundations, Illinois State Uni

Post-Masters Certificate in College Teaching, Texas A&M University

M.S., Educational Administration & Human Resource Dev, Texas A&M

B.A., Biology, Texas A&M University

Peggy Holzweiss, Ph.D. – Associate Professor

Ph.D., Higher Education Administration, Texas A&M University

Post-Master's Certificate in College Teaching, Texas A&M University

M.S., Student Affairs Adm in Higher Education, Texas A&M University

B.S., Psychology, Texas A&M University

Ricardo Montelongo, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor

Ph.D., Higher Education, Indiana University

M.S., Educational Administration – Student Affairs Admin, Texas A&M

B.S., Psychology, Texas A&M University

B. Scholarly Production

2. Tabular summary of peer reviewed pubs for the period under review:

Our faculty members are productive and engaged in on-going scholarship. This section reflects selected faculty presentations, publications, and grant awards, for a more exhaustive listing of faculty scholarship and service please refer to the curriculum vitae (CV). We have published in top-ranked journals such as *Educational*

Administration Quarterly, Educational Leadership, Journal of School Administration Research and Development, Education and Urban Society, Community College Journal of Research and Practice, and Journal of Educational Policy Planning and Administration.

Table 4.1: Faculty Scholarly Activity 2014 to 2019

Activity	Combs	Lunen- burg	Martinez Garcia	Moore	Slate	Total
Books	1	11	--	3	2	17
Book Chapters	1	8	2	1	5	17
Articles	25	15	40	54	63	197
External Grants- In Progress	--	--	1	--	--	1
Academic Conference Presentations	37	10	8	12	41	108
Other Scholarly Presentations or Publications	1	1	--	1	2	5

Table 4.2: Publications

For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries filed/patents issued per core faculty member.

Academic Year	Average Number of Publications per Core Faculty
2016-2017	13.8
2017-2018	13.4
2018-2019	7

3. Grant Funding

Funded- none

Not Funded- none

In Progress-

Cynthia Martinez-Garcia. *Understanding the Role of School Leaders Play in Promoting Student Mathematics Achievement within Texas K-12 Rural Elementary Schools: A Dynamic Systems Approach.* Institute on

Education Sciences: Education Research Grants. Role: Co-Principal Investigator and School Leader Consultant.

Table 4.3: External Grants

For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external funds per faculty, and total external funds per program per academic year.

Academic Year	Avg. Number of Core Faculty Receiving External Funds	Average External Grants \$ per Core Faculty	Total External Grants \$
2016-2017	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	5,428.00	76,000.00
2018-2019	0	0	0

4. Academic Conference Presentations

In the six-year period, we made 108 research presentations at international, national, regional, and state conferences. We have a presence at educational leadership conferences and research conferences (e.g., UCEA, TCPEA, ICPEL, AERA, SERA). We share research, collaborate with other professors, and mentor students at these events.

5. Artistic endeavors

Not applicable.

6. Faculty Awards

Cynthia Martinez-Garcia- 2019 Outstanding Service Award, College of Education, Sam Houston State University.

John R. Slate- 2016 Outstanding Research Award, College of Education, Sam Houston State University

Fred C. Lunenburg- 2014 Invited Visiting Lecturer at the Oxford Round Table at Oriel College at the University of Oxford, UK.

Julie P. Combs- 2018 Teaching Excellence Award, College of Education, Sam Houston State University.

2017 Research Excellence Award, College of Education, Sam Houston State University.

2017 Researcher of the Year, Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA).

7. Service to the Profession at state, regional, and national level

In addition to high productivity levels, our faculty members serve in numerous officer positions and as editors of journals.

Cynthia Martinez-Garcia- 2017-2020. Executive Board member, President, & President-elect. Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA)

Julie P. Combs- 2014, Treasurer, Professors of Education Research SIG, American Educational Research Association (AERA)
2015- 2018, Secretary, Board Member, Southwest Educational Research Association (SERA)
2019, Executive Board Member. Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA)

George W. Moore- 2019, Board Member, Southwest Educational Research Association (SERA)

John R. Slate- Co-editor of journal *Research in the Schools* journal

8. Professional Experience: University and K12 School Experience

Julie P Combs

Sam Houston State University, Department of Educational Leadership
Professor 2015-current,
Acting Chair of the Educational Department 2017-2019
Director of Doctoral Studies in Educational Leadership, 2012-2017, 2018-current
Associate Professor-2010-2015
Assistant Professor- 2005-2010

Texas A&M University-Commerce, Department of Educational Leadership
Assistant Professor of Educational Administration 2002-2005

Coppell ISD, Principal, Assistant Principal

Fred C. Lunenburg

Sam Houston State University, Department of Educational Leadership
Professor and Merchant Scholar 1997-Present

College of Education, Southern Utah University
Professor and Dean 1995-1997

Department of Administration and Higher Education University of Louisville
Professor 1993-1995

Associate Professor (1987-1993); promoted to Professor, with Tenure 1993;
Intern Dean, 1994-1995; Acting Chair, 1994-1995.

Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola University
Chicago

Assistant Professor 1982-1987

Elkhorn, WI, Superintendent

Oshkosh, WI, Principal

St Paul, MN, Assistant Principal

Cynthia Martinez-Garcia

Sam Houston State University, Department of Educational Leadership

Associate Professor 2014- present

Master's of Education in Administration Program Coordinator/Advisor 2013-2019

Assistant Department Chair, 2015-2017

Assistant Professor 2008-2014

Corpus Christi ISD, Assistant Principal

George W. Moore

Sam Houston State University, Department of Educational Leadership

Professor, 2018-current

Associate Professor, 2012-2018

Assistant Professor 2006-2012

Midwest City-Del City, OK: Science Coordinator

University of Oklahoma, Research Associate at K20 Center

John R. Slate

Sam Houston State University, Department of Educational Leadership

08/2007 to Present

Professor, 2007 to present

Texas A&M University-Kingsville. Department of Educational Leadership &
Counseling

Professor and Chair, 2006-2007

University of Missouri, Kansas City, MO. Educational Research and Psychology
Visiting Clinical Professor, 2003-2006

Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, Kansas City, MO.

Manager, Research and Evaluation, 2002 - 2003

University of Texas at El Paso, TX. Department of Educational Leadership and Foundations. Professor, 1999-2002

Valdosta State University, Valdosta, GA, Department of Educational Leadership Professor, 1996 - 1999

Arkansas State University, Jonesboro, AR. Department of Counselor Education and Psychology. Professor, 1987 - 1995

Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC.
Assistant Professor of Psychology, School Psychology Coordinator, 1984 -1987

C. Teaching Load

The teaching load at Sam Houston State University is 12 credit hours, equivalent to 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE), Fall and Spring. To support scholarly research, 0.25 is allowed for research each semester. Tenured/tenure-track faculty members on the normative nine-hour teaching load have 0.75 FTE for teaching (typically nine hours) and a 0.25 FTE for research. Faculty who teach a doctoral class in a given semester have the following load: 0.50 FTE doctoral class, 0.25 FTE master's class, 0.25 Research.

For the dissertation students, we do not carry these students as part of our load. The weighting of the doctoral classes at 0.50 FTE is intended to compensate for working with doctoral students. After three students graduate, we are allowed to request a .25 course release in fall or spring and these are capped at two releases per year.

Diversity

Of our current core faculty members, four are White and one is Hispanic. Two are women; three are men. More information can be found in the 18 Characteristics report, located in Appendix G.

D. Faculty Program Responsibilities

Faculty members are responsible for teaching, research, and service. In addition, doctoral faculty members participate in doctoral committees and serve as chairs of dissertations. The doctoral faculty is involved in student selection, probationary reviews, hiring, and numerous other committees. For example, Dr. Moore administers the comprehensive exam process.

1. Dissertation count among faculty

What is the dissertation/thesis supervision count per faculty member during the period under review? (2014-2019)

Table 4.4: Dissertation Count Among Faculty

Faculty	Chairing-current load	Chaired & graduated in past 6 years
Combs	9	14
Lunenburg	3	---
Moore	9	14
Martinez-Garcia	2	4
Slate	10	47

V. Students

A. Admission Criteria

From the catalog: <http://catalog.shsu.edu/graduate/college-departments/education/educational-leadership/educational-leadership-edd/#admissiontext>

Admission to the doctoral program in Educational Leadership is competitive. Applicants are encouraged to take the time to submit ALL required materials and prepare a high-quality personal statement for admission consideration.

The Educational Leadership program utilizes a cohort model where individuals are admitted as a group, called a cohort. Cohort members take their courses together and follow the same course degree plan for core courses. Cognates (electives) vary. Some students complete the superintendent certification as their cognate area. A select number of applicants (about 12) are admitted to each cohort once per year.

Applicants seeking admission to the doctoral program in Educational Leadership must submit the following to the Office of Graduate Admissions:

1. Graduate Admission Application
2. Application fee (\$45)
3. Official transcript from the baccalaureate degree granting institution
4. Official transcript(s) showing receipt of a master's degree in a related field from an accredited institution
5. Resume (describing education, work history, leadership experiences, and listing at least 3 professional references)
6. Application Essay. Not to exceed 1,800 words. Please, address these specific questions in an essay:
 - a) What are some highlights of your professional career?
 - b) What are some experiences that demonstrate your **leadership** strengths?
 - c) What are your professional goals?
 - d) What reasons do you have for pursuing a Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership (K-12) at Sam Houston State University?

Note: Applicants selected after the initial screening will be invited for an interview. Applicants should hold a master's degree in a related field, and the student's graduate GPA should be 3.5 or higher. In addition, three years of full-time professional experience in a school or agency is preferred.

After the March 1 priority deadline a committee of faculty review applications.

Selected applicants are invited for an interview and presentation of a research project.

Using data included in the interview and presentation, the interview committee assesses the applicants using a scoring rubric.

Numbers of Applicants & Application Yield

Table 5.1 shows enrollment rates for spring cohorts with students focused on the HIED cognate area. The HIED became its own doctoral program beginning in Spring 2018. Students from previous cohorts with the HIED cognate were given the choice to change degree plans.

The number of accepted applicants can be misleading in Table 5.1. Applicant data include individuals applying for an incorrect degree or carrying over an application from year to year. We try to take every applicant who has scores above average in the selection process. Our cohort sizes are generally 10-15 students.

Table 5.1: Acceptance and Enrollment Rate of HIED EdD Cohorts in Ed Ldrshp

Spring	Applicants	Accepted	Enrolled	% Applicants Accepted	% Accepted Enrolled
Spring 2019	-	-	-	-	-
Spring 2018	-	-	-	-	-
Spring 2017	21	12	10	57%	83%
Spring 2016	19	10	8	53%	80%
Spring 2015	27	11	11	41%	100%
Spring 2014	28	10	10	36%	100%

Table 5.2 shows summer cohorts, which are students focused on the K12 leadership area. A large majority of students accepted enroll in the program. The

program acceptance rate is about 50 to 60%. We try to take every applicant who has high scores above average in the selection process. **Our cohort sizes are generally 10-15 students and we have increased the size each year.**

Table 5.2: Acceptance and Enrollment Rate of K12 EdD Cohorts in Ed Leadership

Summer	Applicants	Accepted	Enrolled	% Applicants Accepted	% Accepted Enrolled
Summer 2019	42	14	14	33%	100%
Summer 2018	31	16	15	52%	94%
Summer 2017	21	14	13	67%	93%
Summer 2016	22	12	12	55%	100%
Summer 2015	30	10	10	33%	100%
Summer 2014	24	14	12	58%	86%

As shown in Table 5.3, program data have been collected at the program level. Faculty have accepted 41 cohorts of students totaling 452 since the program began in 1997. Faculty have graduated over 330, representing a 74% completion rate. About 14% of admitted students withdrew from the program after being accepted. Reasons vary such as relocation, family, work-life balance, job, and academic concerns. Completion rates remain above national norms (56.6%) and students with all but dissertation are at an all-time program low of 10 students. Currently enrolled in the program classes are 38 students. Program enrollment varies from 35 to 55 students in a semester.

Table 5.3: Program data of students by cohort.

Year	Sem	Cohort	Focus	Accept	Graduated	In progress	Withdraw	Comp rate-
1997	Sum	1		14	14			100%
1998	Sum	2		12	12			100%
1999	Sum	3		14	14			100%
2000	Sum	4		10	10			100%
2001	Sum	5		8	8			100%
2001	Sum	6		10	10			100%
2002	Sum	7		11	10		1	91%
2002	Sum	8		6	6			100%
2003	Sum	9	K12	13	9		4	70%
2004	Sum	10	K12	13	12		1	92%
2004	Sum	11	HIED	16	12		4	75%
2004	Fall	12	HIED	15	13		2	87%
2005	Sum	13	K12	13	12		2	92%
2005	Fall	14		12	11		1	92%
2006	Sum	15	K12	11	10		1	91%
2007	Spr	16	HIED	6	6			100%
2007	Sum	17	K12	12	10		2	84%
2008	Sum	18	K12	7	7			100%
2008	Sum	19	HIED	7	7			100%
2009	Sum	20		14	11	2	1	79%
2010	Spr	21	HIED	14	13		1	93%
2010	Sum	22	K12	10	5		5	50%
2010	Sum	23	K12	15	9	1	5	60%
2011	Spr	24	HIED	10	7	1	2	70%
2011	Sum	25	K12	7	4		3	58%
2011	Fall	26	LIBADM	10	5	1	4	50%
2012	Spr	27	HIED	11	7	1	3	64%
2012	Sum	28	K12	13	9		4	70%
2013	Spr	29	HIED	11	6	3	2	55%
2013	Sum	30	K12	17	12		5	71%
2014	Spr	31	HIED	8	7	1		88%
2014	Sum	32	K12	12	12			100%
2015	Spr	33	HIED	12	9		3	75%
2015	Sum	34	K12	9	8		1	89%
2016	Spr	35*	HIED	9	6		3	67%
2016	Sum	36	K12	11	8		2	73%
2017	Spr	37*	HIED	11	NA	10	1	--
2017	Sum	38	K12	12	NA	12		--
2018	Sum	40	K12	13	NA	13		--
2019	Sum	42	K12	13	NA	13		--
Totals				452	331	58	63	74%

B. Profile of Admitted Students

Demographics

Table 5.4: Enrollment headcount by diversity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender

2018-2019	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Female	27	14	4	5	50
Male	10	5	3	3	21
Total	37	19	7	8	71

2017-2018	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Female	31	19	5	4	59
Male	17	7	3	4	31
Total	48	26	8	8	90

2015-2016	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Female	36	20	8	10	74
Male	25	6	9	3	43
Total	61	26	17	13	117

Numbers of Full-time/Part-time Students

Most of our students are considered part-time students, taking 6 hours per semester and holding full time leadership employment.

Table 5.5: Percentage Full-time Students

FTS/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters.

Fall Semester	Percent Full-time Students
Fall 2016	4.9%
Fall 2017	8.0%
Fall 2018	8.8%

C. Student Funding

The levels of student support in terms of scholarships has remained fairly consistent over the past several years.

Average support per full time student

Table 5.6: Average Institutional Financial Support Provided

For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits).

Academic Year	Average Financial Support
2016-2017	\$1931
2017-2018	\$2462
2018-2019	\$1748

Percent of students will full time support

Table 5.7: Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Institutional Financial Support

In the prior year, the number of FTS with at least \$1000 of annual support/the number of FTS.

Academic Year	Percent of FTS Financial Support
2018-2019	100%

Number of assistantships and description of duties

The doctoral program employs one graduate assistant. See Section VI Resources and Finances, for more information.

Description of Assistantship Responsibilities

The graduate assistant provides support to doctoral faculty and students. The assistant works with doctoral program administration and helps with research activities.

D. Program Performance Statistics

1. Graduation Rate for each year under review

Table 5.8: Graduation Rates

For each of the three most recent years, average of the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years.

Academic Year of Entry into Program	Percent who graduated within 10 years
2013-2014	71.2%
2014-2015	71.9%
2015-2016	75.0%
2016-2017	58.3%
2017-2018	88.9%
2018-2019	78.1%

2. Average Time to Completion

Our students complete their degrees within an average of about 12-14 semesters (a little over 4 years).

Table 5.9: Average Time to Degree

For each of the most recent years, average of the graduates' time to degree.

Academic Year	Average time to degree
2013-2014	5.69 years
2014-2015	4.85 years
2015-2016	4.69 years
2016-2017	4.32 years
2017-2018	3.79 years
2018-2019	4.14 years

3. Student Retention Rates

Referring to **Table 5.3**, from 2013 to 2019, we have accepted 127 students and 15 withdrew from the program, representing a 88% retention rate. We have graduated 62 students and have 49 students in progress.

Tables 5.10 and 5.11 are data from Institutional Effectiveness and are shown by cohorts. Table 5.10 represents HIED cohorts. A new doctoral program was added in Spring 2017 for higher education leadership and students switched to that degree plan. Spring 2016 and 2017 appear to be a loss but these students changed degree plans.

Table 5.10: 1-year retention rate for HIED cohorts.

1-Year Retention Rate Spring Cohorts Next Spring			
Spring	Cohort #	Retained #	Retention Rate
S18 Cohort Retained S19	-	-	-
S17 Cohort Retained S18	10	4	40%
S16 Cohort Retained S17	8	6	75%
S15 Cohort Retained S16	11	9	82%
S14 Cohort Retained S15	10	9	90%

Table 5.11 represents K-12 cohorts. With the exception of cohort 36 in Summer 2016, retention rates remain high.

Table 5.11: 1-year retention rates for K12 cohorts.

1-Year Retention Rate Summer Cohorts Next Summer			
Summer	Cohort #	Retained #	Retention Rate
Summer 18 Cohort Retained Summer 19	15	14	93%
Summer 17 Cohort Retained Summer 18	13	12	92%
Summer 16 Cohort Retained Summer 17	12	8	67%
Summer 15 Cohort Retained Summer 16	10	10	100%
Summer 14 Cohort Retained Summer 15	12	12	100%

Note: Retention = Fall to Fall, Spring to Spring. NA - graduation period is beyond Summer 2019.

4. Graduate licensure rates (not applicable)

5. Employment Profile

Most students who complete the doctoral program at Sam Houston are employed by K-12 organizations in the Houston area. Most students advance at least once during their time in the program.

Table 5.12: Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)

For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year employed, those still seeking employment, and unknown.

Employment Field	Employed	Seeking employment	Unknown
2016-2017	100%	0%	0%
2017-2018	100%	0%	0%
2018-2019	100%	0%	0%

6. Student Publications and Awards

Table 5.13: Student Publications/Presentations

For the three most recent years, the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE.

Academic Year	Average Number of Publications/Presentations per Student
2016-2017	Pub = 0.60, Pres = 0.79
2017-2018	Pub = 0.42, Pres = 0.46
2018-2019	Pub = 0.14, Pres = 0.47

The student publication rate has decreased. Presentations have remained about the same. Examples of recent student presentations:

Fraga, K. (2019, September). *Differences in end of course examination performance between Black and Hispanic students: A Texas, statewide investigation*. Paper presented at annual conference of the Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA), Dallas, TX.

Le, A. (2019). *College-readiness rate differences for students in special education in Texas over time: Should we be concerned?* Paper presented at the Graduate Research Exchange of the Texas Council of Professors of Educational

Administration (TCPEA) conference held in conjunction with TASA/TASB Convention, Dallas, TX.

Miller, B. J., & Slate, J. R. (2019). *Inequities in days assigned to out-of-school suspension by ethnicity/race: A Texas, statewide analysis*. Paper presented at the Graduate Research Exchange of the Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration (TCPEA) conference held in conjunction with TASA/TASB Convention, Dallas, TX.

Rivera, D., & Roman, L. (2019, June). *A practical guide to creating a high-performing school: Tools you can use now*. Workshop presented at the annual conference of the Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association (TEPSA), Austin, TX.

Examples of Student Publications include:

Miller, B. J., & Slate, J. R. (2019). Inequities in days assigned to out-of-school suspension by ethnicity/race: A Texas, statewide analysis. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Education*, 1(1), 29-33. Retrieved from <http://www.humanitiesjournals.com/article/view/5/1-2-11State/Local>

Price, S. & Slate, J. R. (2019). Principal tenure and elementary school distinction designations in Texas: Experience clearly matters. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(1), 24-28. Retrieved from <http://www.humanitiesjournals.com/archives/2019.v1.i1.A.4>

Student Awards

Students have received awards and special recognition for their leadership. We currently have five University Council of Ed Admin program Barbara Jackson Scholar recipients. Current students have been awarded Top 25 Most Influential Educators of DeSoto ISD, 2019 Career and Technical Association of Texas Champion of the Year Award Recipient, 2019 Texas Music Educators Association Distinguished Administrator, 2018 TASB Superintendent of the Year State Finalist, Region 6 Superintendent of the Year, and Region 6 Assistant Principal of the Year Nominee.

VI. Resources and Finances

A. Travel Funds

Students. As part of their research development, Ed.D. students are given financial support to attend at least one in-state conference or one out-of-state research conference, where they are expected to present scholarly papers. Currently the amounts equal \$500 for one state conference and \$1000 for one conference in the United States.

Faculty. Faculty members are allowed up to \$3,500 for travel support to present research. Additional money can be requested through the Graduate School office and the college. We are supported for research presentations.

B. Graduate Assistantships

Funding for these positions comes from the doctoral program's operating expenses. Currently, we are supporting one graduate assistantship. A Graduate Research Assistant can be assigned duties associated with research, faculty support, or other duties as permitted by the funding source, working 20 clock hours each week on the Huntsville campus. A student in these positions is expected to be enrolled in six semester hours each semester, or with permission from the Dean of the Graduate School, enroll in only 3 semester hours of dissertation each semester.

C. Scholarships

Currently, \$48,222 is distributed from the university for Ed.D. doctoral scholarships. This amount is based on head count in the program. In the last self-study six years ago, students received \$200 a year. The remaining money was spent to fund an international internship experience (about \$2,300 per student). Currently students taking coursework receive about \$2,000 per year in support from the department. Other scholarships are available from the Graduate School. Scholarships and financial support are reported in the 18 Characteristics Tables 7 and 8 in Appendix G.

D. Program Budget

The program budget contains \$10,000 for graduate assistants, \$34,000 for travel, and \$18,000 for operations and maintenance. These amounts appear to be sufficient levels of support in sustaining the goals for the Ed.D. program. For scholarships, the university has allotted \$48,222 for the current year. These amounts have remained consistent for the past six years.

E. Clerical/Administrative Support

The program was allowed one administrative assistant who helped with program administration of the doctoral program. She also managed the Higher Educational Leadership doctoral program and the principal master's/certification program. The university has reorganized for efficiency and has centralized several functions. Our program has lost its allocated administrative assistant, who was housed in our office area. The current plan is that we will share an administrative assistant with two other doctoral programs in the college. The assistant will report to the associate dean. The adequacy of this resource is yet to be determined.

The doctoral director can request a 0.25 FTE release each semester for work as the director. A common semester load for a director (only in Fall/Spring) equates to 0.25 FTE release, 0.25 FTE Research, and 0.50 FTE Teaching.

We have asked for help with recruitment and marketing. Although our dean has provided these resources, positions were removed recently in the university reorganization. These efforts are critical to the sustainability of the program and it remains to be seen as to the support we will receive in these areas.

VII. Facilities and Equipment

A. Facilities

Doctoral classes are taught at The Woodlands Center (TWC). The SHSU Woodlands Center is located adjacent to Lone Star College-Montgomery in a newer building with attached parking garage. Classes are held at TWC, described in greater detail at this link: <http://www.shsu.edu/woodlands/>. Facilities include a computer lab for statistics classes (with SPSS software) and large classrooms with presentation equipment. The center also houses a librarian, computer lab, and replicates most services found at the main campus. Our facilities are commendable.

Our library resources are commendable. We receive an assigned librarian and access to many research databases. Our library staff host several workshops related to research and publication.

B. Technology and Technology Costs

No additional technology over and above normal operations is required for our program. We receive support from SHSU Online and are provided with Qualtrics, Zoom, and SPSS from the university. These resources are commendable as they support our students, faculty, and program delivery needs.

For qualitative software, our department has funded the use of QDA-Miner software for all students and faculty for the past two years (at a cost of \$4000 per year). We did not renew that agreement this year. We should reach out to other departments who use qualitative software or IT to request licenses for a specific software.

VIII. Assessment Efforts

A. Annual program assessment reports

Each year, the doctoral program director completes the 18 Characteristics report, located in Appendix C and G; this report is required by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board each year. In addition, reports for learning outcomes related to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACs) are completed each year. Our college is accredited by Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Accreditation received through CAEP and SACS assists the doctoral program in monitoring and sustaining state, federal, and institutional standards of quality educational standards. The department is active at the national levels and holds an institutional membership in the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) and the International Council of Professors of Educational Leadership (ICPEL).

Student Learning Outcomes

Currently, we assess the program outcomes list in Section I, A using the probationary review rubrics (see Table 2.1), comprehensive exams (see section III C), research competencies (see Table 3.2), and the dissertation proposal and final defenses.

Dissertation Reviews

The dissertation also serves as a final assessment product of the program. In the dissertation, students must satisfy the research and writing requirements of their committee of faculty, the dean of the college, the graduate dean of the university, and the director of library services. At the final defense, the committee member signature

represents an endorsement of the quality of the work. Further, the graduate school dean submits dissertations for external review.

In addition, our students win a variety of external dissertation awards. Our students have won the dissertation award given by the Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration. In 2017, Dr. Jordan won the AERA-SIG Graduate Student Research Award of AERA Studying and Self-Regulated Learning SIG for his dissertation titled, *Academic Performance: A Retrospective Investigation of Study Skills and LASSI Performance*.

We have a local award given in our college for outstanding dissertations for the past year, called the Sam Houston State University College of Education Jack Staggs Dissertation Award.

B. Alumni Surveys

We collect alumni data through advisory groups and online questionnaires. Six graduates responded to the Student Survey, found in Appendix E. Generally, our alumni help promote a positive reputation and are some of our strongest supporters.

C. Employer Surveys

For our program, data are collected from our alumni in surveys and advisory group interviews. We do not collect data from employers.

D. Student publications and presentations

See student Section V for a discussion of student publications. (Table 5.13). Our students have numerous research presentations before they graduate, as explained in Section V. Presenting at a research conference or publishing a research paper are

research competencies in our program and are assessed in the comprehensive exam stage of our program, explained in Section III, C and shown in Table 3.2. Based on the results of the most recent student survey, most of the students agreed that they had opportunities to work with faculty members on research projects. Most students agreed that faculty members encouraged them to publish and agreed that faculty members encouraged them to present at research conferences.

As part of their professional development, Ed.D. students are given financial support to attend at least one in-state conference and one out-of-state conference, where they are expected to present scholarly papers. Currently the amounts equal \$500 for one state conference and \$1000 for one conference in the United States.

E. Student Questionnaires

Most academic years, each doctoral student is given the opportunity to assess the Ed.D. program via an electronic-based survey. For 2019, 33 of 34 students reported that they were somewhat or very satisfied with the doctoral program. In addition, 33 of the students agreed that the courses were reasonably rigorous. Further, 100% of the students agreed that the coursework was giving them the knowledge to do independent research and skills to further their professional careers. The quantitative student survey results for AY2019 are shown in table 8.1 and qualitative results can be found in Appendix E.

Table 8.1: 2019 Ed Leadership Doctoral Student Survey Results (n = 34)

	Sem 1-3	Sem 5-8	ABD	Graduate	
2. Indicate your status in the program.	10	14	4	6	

	Very Satis	Satisfied	Dis	Very Dis	
3. Please indicate how satisfied you are with your overall experience in this doctoral program	26	7	1	0	

	Strong Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree
4. Courses offered are reasonably rigorous for a doctoral program of study.	24	9		1	
5. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) the knowledge and skills for doing independent research.	31	3			
6. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) some knowledge and skills for furthering my professional career.	27	7			
7. I understand the requirements to complete this degree program.	31	3			
8. Opportunities exist to work with faculty members on research or other projects.	25	7	2		
9. Faculty members encourage students to publish or present work.	32	2			
10. I am encouraged to present a paper at a research conference.	34				
11. I am receiving information to help me complete a dissertation.	29	5			
12. I have received guidance from a faculty member in the Educational Leadership Program.	32	2			
13. The doctoral program at SHSU has a good reputation.	31	3			
14. I would recommend the doctoral program at SHSU.	31	3			

IX. Recruitment and Marketing Efforts

Recruiting and marketing efforts for the EDL program continue to be an area of need in response to the increase in competition and the number of online doctoral programs offered.

A. Demand for Graduates

Upon completion of their doctoral degrees, our graduates are often promoted to leadership positions within Texas educational institutions. The demand for doctoral degrees in K12 has remained steady over the past decade as evidenced by maintenance of our cohorts and the competitive market.

B. Geographical Location of Students

Our doctoral students come from urban, suburban, and rural geographical locations throughout south Texas. Primarily, doctoral students live and work in the greater Houston area, with the majority of students concentrated in north Houston and its surrounding northern suburbs. In our applicant data, the most frequent zip code is 773 (Conroe, North Houston area) with 150 applicants and next is 770 (Houston) with 67 applicants. The most frequent cities listed are Houston, Conroe, Willis, Magnolia, Cypress, Bryan-College Station, Kingwood, Montgomery, Humble, Huntsville, Katy, Spring, Tomball, and The Woodlands.

C. Marketing Recruitment Efforts and Effectiveness

Our reputation and “word of mouth” have been most effective in recruiting potential doctoral students. In recent years, we have also tried several of the following strategies with varying degrees of success:

- Packets containing letters, flyers, and promotional items mailed to area school district leaders and alumni: some success
- mass emails: limited success due to manpower and firewalls
- information sessions in school districts: limited success
- Zoom online information sessions (posted on our website): some success
- Facebook page: no one to manage the page
- Professional conferences: limited success
- Graduate School recruiter: impact not known
- In-house marketing: position was removed by university
- SHSU Mar Com dept meetings: limited success

D. Current Markets

Currently, our doctoral program addresses one market in the Houston area: K-12 administrators (campus and district leaders). We offer opportunities for Texas school campus and district leaders to obtain principal and/or superintendent certification as part of their doctoral education. The certification programs in these areas are an important link to our doctoral students.

E. Potential New Markets

In K-12 school leadership, we predict a market will continue to exist for a cohort model program in the Houston area. Based on comments from our current students, we should consider moving toward a hybrid model of course offerings. Our doctoral program potentially could expand geographically to reach out to other areas of Texas. This type of expansion to a broader geographic market would require strategic planning.

We should also advertise that we do not require GRE. When our current students were asked why they chose our program over others, many of their comments related to the GRE, our location, the face/face program, the reputation of the faculty's support and involvement in their work, and program design. See Appendix E for more information from the student poll.

F. Enrollment Plan for the Next 5 Years

We are committed to maintaining a high quality, competitive educational leadership doctoral program. This requires application of the cohort model and plentiful opportunities for face-to-face interaction with professors/researchers and other cohort members, as well as a competitive selection process. Therefore, for the next 5 years, we would like to maintain an enrollment of 15 new students per year. We could consider a rolling admission cycle (two to three times per year) and a hybrid approach in specific courses.

G. Alumni and Donor Relations

The Ed.D. program maintains relationships with our alumni. We communicate with alumni through our social networks and invite them to participate in advisory board functions. Alumni are asked to provide input into how the program can better serve educational leaders and several participated in our student survey for this study. Some alumni serve as adjuncts in our program. Still, our alumni is a resource we could use to a greater extent if we had the time or a faculty member willing to do this work.

X. Outreach

A. Community Engaged Learning

One of our courses, the Program Evaluation course (EDLD 7361), carries the distinction of being an Academic Community Engagement (ACE) course. The ACE program is described as “a teaching method that combines community engagement with academic instruction” (SHSU). In 2011, SHSU was recognized as a Carnegie Community Engaged campus. Faculty have been asked to review courses and consider the addition of the ACE distinction. At this time, only the program evaluation course has been selected as an appropriate match.

B. Professional outreach

As stated in the last section, our students in the program evaluation course provide evaluation services to local school districts. These evaluations can assist leaders in identifying needs, effectiveness of programs, and areas for improvement.

Our faculty are active in state professional organizations such as Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA) and Texas Council of Professors of Ed Admin (TCPEA). Our professors have held executive board positions for TCPEA and Southwestern Educational Research Association (SERA).

XI. Summary

A. Strengths & Practices to Retain

Productivity

- Faculty publish on a wide variety of topics and in a wide range of publication outlets from top-tier journals to more practitioner-focused pieces. Faculty members are also actively engaged with the academic community through presentations and leadership positions at national, regional, and state levels.

Resources

- We are afforded generous travel support for both faculty and students to travel and present at research conferences. We have a presence at AERA, NCPEA, SERA, ICPEL, and TASA Midwinter.
- We offer our students ongoing development in the form of workshops. We offer on average 2 workshops per year, taught by various faculty members. We have a group of faculty members with diverse talents and expertise, who can offer training on a variety of topics.
- We have access to resources for research including books, software, equipment, library support, and IT support.

Program Improvement

- We have advisory board meetings and utilize the feedback to make adjustments in our program, content, and marketing.
- Internally, we use variety of data collection sources and we utilize the data to make program adjustments.

Outcomes

- Student productivity in terms of research presentations is a strength of our program and demonstrates our commitment to the scholar-practitioner goals of our program.
- Our research competencies are focused on equipping our students with experiences that reflect the scholar-practitioner model.

Student Relationships

- We have a reputation for being student- centered.
- We have improved our communication with our doctoral students by the addition of a Doctoral Student in Educational Leadership organization in Blackboard. We have uploaded numerous documents, share the proposal and final defense schedules, and post resources in that forum.
- Our students have the right to choose their dissertation chairs. Although this choice can create unbalanced loads, we believe that this selection is an important decision for students.
- We mentor our students to prepare them for conference submissions and subsequent presentation at a research conference. For many of our students, this experience is their first research presentation opportunity.

B. Recommendations

Program Improvement

- Revisit our program goals and update.
- Consider alternative formats for program delivery such as hybrid models.
- Review our comprehensive exams and their relevance to students.

Recruiting/Marketing

- Explore ways to improve our marketing efforts.
- Continue to utilize our alumni in our marketing efforts and expand our outreach efforts with the help of our alumni.

Resources

- Due to the university's recent reorganization of staff within each college, we experienced the loss of an administrative assistant located in our offices. Instead, the plan is for us to share one assistant among three doctoral programs. Evaluation should continue on a regular basis to determine if the resource is sufficient and to advocate for the needs of the program.

Appendix A: Reviewers Guidelines

Appendix A: Reviewer Guidelines

Reviewers not governed by external bodies should:

- A. Review the self-study prior to onsite visit.
- B. Conduct the onsite visit – one of the external reviewers will serve as chair of the team. The Graduate Dean will ask one external reviewer to serve as chair.
 - 1. The onsite visit must include inspection of the department/program website and sample course pages for online offerings, where appropriate.
- C. Conduct an exit interview as the last component of the onsite visit.
- D. Write an evaluation of the graduate program to include program strengths and recommendations for improvement. The evaluation should address each chapter of the self-study but need not be in identical format. Reviewers will submit the evaluation electronically to the Graduate School (graduate@shsu.edu) no later than four weeks after the completion of the onsite visit.

Appendix B: Sample Onsite Visit Itinerary

Understanding that each visit may be unique, the following may serve as a template for the onsite visit. The chair of the self-study committee will create the itinerary for the onsite review to include coordinating with individuals involved with the onsite visit. Additionally, the chair will coordinate the arrangements associated with the onsite review (e.g., lodging, travel, transportation, etc.).

Day 1

- Arrive at SHSU. Check into hotel.
- Dinner with the chair of the self-study committee (optional)

Day 2

- 7:30 – 8:30 Breakfast with chair of self-study committee
- 8:30 – 9:15 Meet with self-study committee
- 9:15 – 10:15 Meet with faculty members
- 10:15 - 10:30 Break
- 10:30 – 11:00 Meet with department chair
- 11:00- 11:30 Meet with academic dean
- 11:45 – 1:00 Lunch with self-study committee (Optional)
- 1:15 – 2:30 Time in document room/additional individual interviews (Optional)
- 2:30 – 3:00 Tour of campus and facilities (Optional)
- 3:00 – 3:30 Meet with provost and graduate dean
- 3:30 – 3:45 Break
- 3:45 – 5:00 Meet with students
- 5:00 – 5:30 Wrap-up with chair of self-study
- 6:00 – 7:00 Dinner, review team members only
- 7:00 - Time to work on report and prepare for exit interview

Day 3

- 7:30 – 8:30 Breakfast, review team only.
- 8:30 – 11:00 Time to prepare for exit interview
- 11:00 – 12:00 Conduct exit interview (academic dean, graduate dean, department chair, chair of the self-study committee)
- Lunch, if travel schedule permits
- External reviewers depart

Appendix C: 18 Characteristics of Texas Doctoral Programs Tables

Characteristics of Texas Public Doctoral Programs¹

Measure	Operational Definition
Number of Degrees Per Year	Rolling three-year average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year
Graduation Rates	Rolling three-year average of the percent of first-year doctoral students ² who graduated within ten years
Average Time to Degree	Rolling three-year average of the registered time to degree ³ of first-year doctoral students within a ten year period
Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)	Percentage of the last three years of graduates employed in academia, post-doctorates, industry/professional, government, and those still seeking employment (in Texas and outside Texas)
Admissions Criteria	Description of admission factors
Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Financial Support	In the prior year, the percentage of FTS (≥ 18 SCH) with support/the number of FTS
Average Financial Support Provided	For those receiving financial support, the average financial support provided per full-time graduate student (including tuition rebate) for the prior year, including research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships, tuition, benefits, etc. that is “out-of-pocket”
Student-Core Faculty ⁴ Ratio	Rolling three-year average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE) /rolling three-year average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty
Core Faculty External Grants	Rolling three-year average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external grant \$ per faculty, and total external grant \$ per program per academic year ⁵
Percentage Full-Time Students	Rolling three-year average of the FTS (≥ 9 SCH)/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters
Number of Core Faculty	Number of core faculty in the prior year
Faculty Teaching Load	Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty in the prior year
Faculty Diversity	Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender, updated when changed

¹ Programs included only if in existence 3 or more years. Program defined at the 8-digit CIP code level.

² First-year doctoral students: Students coded as doctoral students by the institution have completed either a master’s program or at least 30 SCH towards a graduate degree.

³ Registered time to degree: The number of semesters enrolled starting when a student first appears as a doctoral student until she completes a degree, excluding any time taken off during graduate study. Obtain the number of years by dividing the number of semesters by three.

⁴ Core Faculty: Full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach 50 percent or more in the doctoral program or other individuals integral to the doctoral program who can direct dissertation research.

⁵ All external funds received from any source including research grants, training grants, gifts from foundations, etc.

Measure	Operational Definition
Student Diversity	Enrollment headcount by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program in the prior year
Date of Last External Review	Date of last formal external review, updated when changed
External Program Accreditation	Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed
Student Publications/Presentations	Rolling three-year average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year per student

Appendix D: Faculty CV

All faculty CVs can be found here: <https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/display.php>

Dr. Julie P. Combs:

https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/fetch.php?doc_type=vita&file=75a63d5d875269794c60705682dde185.pdf

Dr. Fred Lunenburg:

https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/fetch.php?doc_type=vita&file=67a2377a2cfb43581c5acba92a5a59f8.pdf

Dr. Cynthia Martinez-Garcia:

https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/fetch.php?doc_type=vita&file=0c230c9ece9f18a261b954d7a20fbd47.pdf

Dr. George Moore:

https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/fetch.php?doc_type=vita&file=ecef97eeeaebbbcb9833e10738783bd3.pdf

Dr. John Slate:

https://samweb.shsu.edu/faci10wp/fetch.php?doc_type=vita&file=fe0a170102bdbb71fb84e58795e924e3.pdf

Appendix E. Student Poll

2019 Ed Leadership Doctoral Student Survey Results ($n = 34$)

	Sem 1-3	Sem 5-8	ABD	Graduate	
2. Indicate your status in the program.	10	14	4	6	

	Very Satis	Satisfied	Dis	Very Dis	
3. Please indicate how satisfied you are with your overall experience in this doctoral program	26	7	1	0	

	Strong Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strong Disagree
4. Courses offered are reasonably rigorous for a doctoral program of study.	24	9		1	
5. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) the knowledge and skills for doing independent research.	31	3			
6. My coursework has given me (or is giving me) some knowledge and skills for furthering my professional career.	27	7			
7. I understand the requirements to complete this degree program.	31	3			
8. Opportunities exist to work with faculty members on research or other projects.	25	7	2		
9. Faculty members encourage students to publish or present work.	32	2			
10. I am encouraged to present a paper at a research conference.	34				
11. I am receiving information to help me complete a dissertation.	29	5			
12. I have received guidance from a faculty member in the Educational Leadership Program.	32	2			
13. The doctoral program at SHSU has a good reputation.	31	3			
14. I would recommend the doctoral program at SHSU.	31	3			

15. What are the strengths of the doctoral program?

ABD students reported:

- Amount of support offered by multiple staff members
- The focus on developing a research agenda through which students can guide their work throughout the duration of the program and the quality of the research methods courses
- Emphasis on research and furthering growth in education
- The cohort model, the availability of faculty; ongoing support through the program and through dissertation process

Graduates reported:

- Strengths include a dissertation focus (courses build towards a dissertation study), presentations and publications are encouraged and supported, the location of The Woodlands campus is convenient.
- The coursework is well designed and scaffolded.
- no comment
- Excellent professors and a rigorous program that prepare us well to be successful in our educational careers.
- Very supportive professors.
- The close relationship among professors and students. My professors were always there to assist me at anytime.

Current students reported:

- professors are very knowledgeable and responsive
- Faculty
- staff support
- Professors are excellent and very personable. Open door policy and will always advise you. Research component is very high but supported.
- Cohort design, highly intelligent and motivating professors
- Qualified and resourceful faculty, very well paced courses, adequate sequence of courses, very knowledgeable and generous faculty
- Response time is impeccable when students are finding courses or topics difficult
- The faculty members are amazing. They are caring and push us to achieve. The coursework feels appropriately difficult.
- This program provide doctoral students a lot of support and resources to be successful in and outside the program.
- The knowledge and experience of the faculty, their support and relationship building with the students, the thoroughness they require for each course.
- Faculty are very invested in our success. They are always available to answer questions and provide guidance above and beyond. They prepare us far more than other doctoral programs at different universities
- Interaction with faculty members and cohort members has been a major plus in completing my coursework.
- The faculty is incredible. I have full confidence in each professor I have had in this program.
- All of the professors are very knowledgeable and personable.
- face to face classes, cohort model

- Cohort model-face to face
- The academic writing course is extremely helpful (I hear that not every university offers this course) and the professors are understanding/caring.
- seem to care and offer scholarships for students
- Professors are available to support and encourage
- Helpful Faculty, Classes are once a week,
- Starting the program with Academic Writing.
- We are building our dissertation as we progress through the program and have a lot of support from professors as well as our cohort friends.
- The active support of faculty members
- Great support from everyone

16. What are some areas that need improvement?

ABD students reported:

- Some of the courses like the Ethics and Issues in Education were not rigorous or useful for me.
- Faculty selection for some courses
- Some faculty members/courses do require the level of rigor associated with doctoral level work, ex. Social Issues and Ethics in Education

Graduates reported:

- The leadership courses taught by Dr. xxx were not consistent with the high quality of the rest of the courses. No class discussion, no inquiry, no collaborative practices. Instructional practices should be consistent with current research on pedagogy for deep learning. The classes could have been so much better for the sake of the students and the program.
- I enjoyed the coursework and have applied what I have learned in my professional experience.
- The opportunity to have superintendency classes prior to the proposal course.

Current students reported:

- I would prefer to write the dissertation during the program like other programs do.
- Rigor of some courses. Some of the courses have been very easy.
- long class time. A blended learning model would be preferred to allow professionals more flexibility. For example class meet every other week and online components address required hours.
- Some courses still have busy work that needs to be re-examined
- Collaboration between higher ed and k12 staff and students
- Class availability should be extended to weekend
- I think the coursework is fantastic, but allowing students to follow a more personalized path upon determining their dissertation topic may be a good option.
- One course, Research Methods, needed to better prepare us for the future course work. The way it was presented to the cohort was too much lecture, not enough hands on.

- Some of the principal prep courses are not relevant; and this is the first time for the new test so it feels like trial and error approach.
- Summer schedules are tough but honestly worth it to get finished.
- some professors
- certain professors not an asset
- Everyone is extremely busy, so I believe more official events should be planned for mentors/mentees to meet.
- not all the professors offer feedback as often, more diverse faculty
- Consistency with course work or assignment and expectations in non-research subjects
- More online options

17. Why did you choose SHSU for your doctoral program?

ABD students reported:

- I'm an alumni and had heard good reports from others in the program
- Because it offered the opportunity of working face-to-face for most of the program and its cohort structure.
- I am a two-time SHSU grad and the program's reputation
- Cohort model, proximity, and reputation among colleagues

Graduates reported:

- Location
- Cohort experience
- Convenient location, consistent meeting day throughout program, evening classes
- For the great academic reputation.
- Because of the location and the reputation.
- Heard great things about the program from other colleagues.

Current students reported:

- recommended
- Cohort model and reputation
- colleagues
- Friend recommended it but the support has been tremendous
- Reputation, face to face instruction, location
- Reputable program!
- Reputation and sphere of influence that has encouraged diversity
- The reputation of the program, people who have completed the program, and the lack of the GRE requirement influenced my choice of SHSU.
- Great reputation and I met great educator leaders who graduated from the program.
- Great reputation, cost, close to home, and I found out after I was accepted that the faculty truly does care to get you across the finish line with a quality product and skill set to succeed in your future career endeavors.

- I felt like I was well prepared when I received by Masters Degree from SHSU. The quality of the education was above and beyond
- Colleagues who had finished the program strongly encouraged SHSU based on their experiences.
- The scholarship availability, their location, and their reputation.
- The program is excellent
- face to face, convenience, location
- face to face classes - convenient time and location
- SHSU has a good reputation, is face-to-face, meets only one night per week, and The Woodlands Center is not too far from home (much better than driving to Huntsville).
- location and recommendation
- SHSU's reputation
- The length of the program, did not have to take the GRE, knew people who went through the program,
- First, Cost is reasonable; Location; I believe I also made the right decision because of the support and interactions I have received from professors and other doctoral students.
- I love the cohort concept. I also met people in my district that spoke highly of the professors and program structure.
- I have heard great things from the program through my principal and other colleagues that have completed or are completing the program.
- Opportunities for faculty employment

18. What info should we market about the SHSU doctoral program?

ABD students reported:

- The many opportunities for presenting our work as students in research conferences, the points I mentioned on the strengths
- opportunities to collaborate with peers and faculty, personalized attention and support throughout program

Graduates reported:

- Feature the work of alumni and current students on social media, blog posts, and marketing pieces. There are so many educational leaders in the program and alumni who have great work to share.
- Cohort experience and the support received from professors to complete the program.
- Consistent meeting days, cohort, convenient locations, consistent meeting day throughout program, evening classes,
- Share successful stories of SHSU doctoral graduates.
- SHSU- with you all the way. Meaning the faculty supports you every step of the way.
- More promotional videos from alumni discussing these experience at the program

Current students reported:

- quality, reputation, and customer service
- Success rate
- small class size. cohort model. facility/location
- Research focus with high faculty support
- Alumni outcomes, dissertation titles so that others might know what is being researches
- The wealth of knowledge available, the abundance of resources from our professors
- No GRE required
- I think highlighting graduates of the course and what they've done in the careers since graduating would be powerful.
- The amount of support that is offered
- One suggestion would be to market where or what your current graduates are doing now. I know for a fact a couple past graduates went on to be superintendents of one of the largest districts not only in Houston, but the entire state of Texas.
- Support provided to help you navigate the program along with a full-time career.
- They prepare leaders in education.
- School principals
- cohort model, face to face, staff support
- support from staff and cohort - students very supported and encouraged
- It is doable for a working professional (who is disciplined and has great work ethic).
- Possibility of graduating sooner-quantitative, Supportive Faculty, No GRE, Opportunity to collaborate with faculty and publish your work, Meet once a week
- Availability of support.
- I think that showing our cohesive network is great.
- Diversity cohort members and faculty support
- Great support, strong cohorts, and guidance every step of the way

Appendix F: Course Sequence

K12 Cohort 42

(June 2019 to December 2022)

Semester 1. Summer Year 1 (2019)

EDLD 7337 Academic Writing & Research

EDLD 7331 Leadership Theory

Semester 2. Fall Year 1 (2019)

EDLD 7362 Methods of Educational Research

EDLD 7333 Societal Factors

EDLD 7111 (one hour)

Semester 3. Spring Year 2 (2020)

EDLD 7372 Qualitative Methods

EDLD 7338 Organizational Behavior & Theory

Probationary Feedback

Semester 4. Summer Year 2 (2020)

EDLD 7365 Stats 1

EDLD 7370 Policy and Ethics

EDLD 7111 (one hour)

Dissertation Chair Selection

Semester 5. Fall Year 2 (2020)

EDLD 7368 Stats 2

EDLD 7361 Program Evaluation

EDLD 7111 (one hour)

Comprehensive Exams (includes Research Competencies) Dec 2020/January 2021

Semester 6. Spring Year 3 (2021)

EDLD 7363 Proposal (developing the dissertation proposal).

EDLD 7332 Instructional Theory (can sub for Supt course EDAD 6383)

Semester 7. Summer Year 3 (2021)

Cognates or Concentration area (6 hrs) Supt takes EDAD 6380 & 6382

Semester 8. Fall Year 3 (2021)

Cognates/Concentration area (6 hrs) Supt takes EDAD 6381 & 6384 (Practicum) & test

Semester 9. Spring Year 4 (2022) Propose dissertation

EDLD 8033 (Dissertation): 3 hrs. Note: Need 9 hours total of 8033, can take dissertation as 3/3/3 or 3/6, must remain continuously enrolled Fall, Spring, Summer until graduation.

Semester 10. Summer Year 4 (2022)

EDLD 8033 (Dissertation): 6 hrs (or 3 if another semester is needed)

Semester 11. Fall Year 4 (2022) Final defense of dissertation

EDLD 8033 Dissertation:

Program Milestones:

1. Pass Probationary Period: Sem 1-3
2. Select Diss Chair: After Sem 4
3. Pass Comp Exams & Complete Research Competencies: After Sem 5
4. Defend dissertation proposal: Sem 7-10
5. Defend final dissertation: Sem 8-11

Appendix G: 18 Characteristics Data for 2018-2019

1. Number of Degrees Per Year

For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of degrees awarded per academic year.

Academic Year	Average Number of Degrees
2016-2017	27
2017-2018	16
2018-2019	12

2. Graduation Rates

For each of the three most recent years, average of the percent of first-year doctoral students who graduated within ten years.

Academic Year of Entry into Program	Percent who graduated within 10 years
2016-2017	58.3%
2017-2018	88.9%
2018-2019	78.1%

3. Average Time to Degree

For each of the three most recent years, average of the graduates' time to degree.

Academic Year	Average time to degree
2016-2017	4.32 years
2017-2018	3.79 years
2018-2019	4.14 years

4. Employment Profile (in field within one year of graduation)

For each of the three most recent years, the number and percent of graduates by year employed, those still seeking employment, and unknown.

Employment Field	Employed	Seeking employment	Unknown
2016-2017	100%	0%	0%
2017-2018	100%	0%	0%
2018-2019	100%	0%	0%

5. Admissions Criteria

Description of admission factors.

1. Apply Texas Application
2. SHSU Application Fee

3. Official transcript from the baccalaureate degree granting institution
4. Official transcript showing receipt of a Master's degree in a related field from an accredited institution
5. Résumé (with description of education, work history, leadership experiences, and at least 3 professional references)
6. Application Essay. Not to exceed 1,800 words. Please address the following
 - What are some highlights of your professional career?
 - What are some experiences that highlight your leadership strengths?
 - What are your professional goals?
 - What reasons do you have for pursuing a doctoral degree?

6. Percentage Full-time Students

FTS/number students enrolled (headcount) for last three fall semesters.

Fall Semester	Percent Full-time Students
Fall 2016	4.9%
Fall 2017	8.0%
Fall 2018	8.8%

7. Average Institutional Financial Support Provided

For those receiving financial support, the average monetary institutional support provided per full-time graduate student for the prior year from assistantships, scholarships, stipends, grants, and fellowships (does not include tuition or benefits).

Academic Year	Average Financial Support
2016-2017	\$1931
2017-2018	\$2462
2018-2019	\$1748

8. Percentage Full-time Students (FTS) with Institutional Financial Support

In the prior year, the number of FTS with at least \$1000 of annual support/the number of FTS.

Academic Year	Percent of FTS Financial Support
2018-2019	100%

9. Number of Core Faculty

Number of core faculty in the prior year.

Academic Year	Number of Core Faculty
2018-2019	10

10. Student-Core Faculty Ratio

For each of the three most recent years, average of full-time student equivalent (FTSE)/average of full-time faculty equivalent (FTFE) of core faculty.

Academic Year	Student-Core Faculty Ratio
2016-2017	10:1
2017-2018	9:1
2018-2019	7:1

11. Core Faculty Publications

For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, books/book chapters, juried creative/performance accomplishments, and notices of discoveries filed/patents issued per core faculty member.

Academic Year	Average Number of Publications per Core Faculty
2016-2017	13.8
2017-2018	13.4
2018-2019	7

12. Core Faculty External Grants

For each of the three most recent years, average of the number of core faculty receiving external funds, average external funds per faculty, and total external funds per program per academic year.

Academic Year	Avg. Number of Core Faculty Receiving External Funds	Average External Grants \$ per Core Faculty	Total External Grants \$
2016-2017	0	0	0
2017-2018	1	5,428.00	76,000.00
2018-2019	0	0	0

13. Faculty Teaching Load

Total number of semester credit hours in organized teaching courses taught per academic year by core faculty divided by the number of core faculty.

Academic Year	Faculty Teaching Load
2018-2019	18

14. Faculty Diversity

Core faculty by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender.

2018-2019	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Female	3		1		4
Male	3	3			6
Total	6	3	1	0	10

15. Student Diversity

Enrollment headcount by diversity (White, Black, Hispanic, Other) and gender in program during the prior year.

2018-2019	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Total
Female	27	14	4	5	50
Male	10	5	3	3	21
Total	37	19	7	8	71

16. Date of Last External Review

Date of last formal external review, updated when changed.

Date
Spring 2013

17. External Program Accreditation

Name of body and date of last program accreditation review, if applicable, updated when changed.

Accreditation Body	Date
NCATE/CAPE, Program Area ELCC	Fall 2019
UCEA	Fall 2010

18. Student Publications/Presentations

For the three most recent years, the number of discipline-related refereed papers/publications, juried creative/performance accomplishments, book chapters, books, and external presentations per year by student FTE.

Academic Year	Average Number of Publications/Presentations per Student
2016-2017	Pub = 0.60, Pres = 0.79
2017-2018	Pub = 0.42, Pres = 0.46
2018-2019	Pub = 0.14, Pres = 0.47

Appendix H. Comparison of Courses to Other Programs

Three K-12 Educational Leadership Doctoral Programs were chosen to compare with the SHSU Educational Leadership doctoral program. [Stephen F. Austin University](#), [Lamar University](#), and the [University of Louisiana at Lafayette](#). A cross comparison is provided where possible. Each university offers courses not clearly comparable to the other universities.

Comparison of Courses and Course Descriptions to Other Universities

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
EDLD 7337 Academic Writing (3) Students develop the skills and strategies for academic literacy, including critical reading and clear writing. Students utilize scientific writing styles and complete a written review of research literature.	--	EDUD 6314 Academic Research Writing I This course provides an overview of technical research writing as a precursor to the dissertation required in the doctoral program. The focus is to articulate an in-depth knowledge base in verbal and written format. It is Part One of a two-part scholarly writing process. EDUD 6317 Academic Research Writing II This course provides an overview of technical research writing as a precursor to the dissertation required in the doctoral program. The focus is to articulate an in-depth knowledge base in verbal and written format. It is Part Two of a two-part learning process in scholarly writing. Academic Research I is a required prerequisite.	EDLD 801 - Writing for Research in Educational Leadership Prepares students for the dissertation. Discusses quantitative and qualitative methodologies in applied research.

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
EDLD 7331 Leadership Theory (3) Students examine the many leadership theories, models, and processes with emphasis on the results of the applications of various theories, models, and processes to educational leadership. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.	AED 601 - Connecting Leadership Theory and Practice Credit(s): 3 A consideration of the knowledge, skills and understanding required for visionary leadership.	-- Unclear what content courses exist	EDLD 810 - Leadership Theory and Practice Knowledge of past models of leadership is linked with an analysis of the complexities of contemporary schools, and the skills required to assume the role and responsibilities of the administrator in restructured school environments. Emphasis is placed on skills involving articulation of organizational mission, collegial engagement and consensus building, implementing and sustaining the change process and total quality management.
EDLD 7333 Societal Factors (3) Graduate students examine the political, economic, and cultural factors affecting public school education and instructional leadership today. This course is designed to provide instructional leaders with insight and background into the lifestyles, values, and aspirations of various cultural groups as related to the leadership process.	AED 633 - Investigating Cultural and Societal Patterns Credit(s): 3 A survey of local, state, national and global conditions affecting schools.	-- Unclear what content courses exist	--
EDLD7370 Ed Policy and Ethics (3) Students are provided opportunities to study how educational policy is developed through micro and macro	AED 602 - Inquiring Into the Foundations of Ethics and Philosophy of School Leaders Credit(s): 3 A survey of major ethical and	-- Unclear what content courses exist	EDLD 822 - Policy Development and Analysis Understanding the process by which educational policy is formulated, analyzed,

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
<p>political elements, to examine ethical and value issues confronting educational leaders, and to demonstrate how individual values drive ethical behavior and ethical decisions. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.</p>	<p>philosophical influences that are of importance for educational leadership.</p>		<p>implemented, and evaluated. EDLD 820 - Legal Issues and Ethics in Educational Organizations Studies of federal and state constitutions, legislation, regulatory guidelines and court decisions related to the operation of educational organizations such as contractual requirements, church-state relationships, education of special needs students, student and parental rights, tort liability, ethics and morality.</p>
<p>EDLD 7338 Org Behavr &Thry in Edu (3) This study of organizational theory and behavior is an integration and application of behavioral science knowledge and is built upon contributions from a number of behavioral disciplines.</p>	<p>AED 604 - Examining the Dynamics of Organizational and Human Interaction Within Educational Systems 3 An emphasis on research and the dynamic nature of school organizations as human activity systems.</p>	<p>-- Unclear what content courses exist</p>	<p>-EDLD 841 - Organizational Development for Learning Communities Theories of leadership and organizational development, and strategies for creating communities of continuous learning. EDLD 842 - Culture, Climate and Change Leadership Concepts needed for systemic changes in K-12 public education EDLD 840 - Change Theory Emphasizing the application or organizational development practices related to educational settings, this course is designed to focus on change theory and its implementation in</p>

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
			schools. The course is designed to assist in the understanding of change by utilizing some of the concepts of Kurt Lewin, including field theory and action research.
EDLD 7361 Program Eval in Edu (3) Students study educational problem solving and accountability and their relationship to needs assessment techniques, evaluation methodologies, and decision-making processes.	--	EDUD 6330 Fundamentals of Program Evaluation This course serves to provide students with the research and evaluation skills required to implement various program evaluation models. Further, the course provides students with the opportunity for systematic study of methods of gathering information for decision-making with respect to the development, modification and acceptance of programs.	EDLD 832 - Educational Evaluation Course is designed to provide students with the research and evaluation skills required to implement various program evaluation models. It is also intended to provide the skills necessary for effectively using the standards of the National Joint Committee on Standards for Program Evaluation as required by State certification guidelines.
EDLD 7332 Instr. Theory Application (3) Students engage in a systematic study of existing research on key factors influencing instructional effectiveness and on models for school restructuring. The relationship of instruction and school effectiveness is explored in depth. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in	--	Unclear what content courses exist	EDLD 830 - Foundations of Curriculum Theory and Design Investigation of curriculum theory with emphasis on the various approaches to curriculum design and development and other factors that impact curriculum.

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
research.			
<p>EDLD 7362 Methods of Edu Research Students study quantitative research with emphasis upon an understanding of statistical concepts and procedures necessary to create and implement effective educational research. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.</p>	<p>AED 623 - Designing Research Within Educational Settings Credit(s): 3 A study of qualitative and quantitative design logic inclusive of problem and question clarification, data gathering and analysis techniques to support the dissertation.</p> <p>AED 603 - Exploring Contemporary and Emerging Paradigms of Educational Research Credit(s): 3 An introduction to issues in educational research related to leadership.</p>	<p>EDUD 6355 Educational Research Methods Review of research and research methods related to informed decision making related to schooling problems/issues. Emphasis is given to conceptualizing problems, selection, and application of research literature and critical judgement of the quality of research studies. Application of these principles to a current school-based problem is required.</p>	<p>EDLD 800 - Introduction to Research Design in Educational Leadership Prepares students for the dissertation. Discusses quantitative and qualitative methodologies in applied research.</p>
<p>EDLD 7372 Qual Methodology Students study qualitative research methodology within an educational leadership problems-based contextual framework with an emphasis placed on qualitative research techniques through lecture, discussion, readings, and field-based research projects using the methods learned. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.</p>	--	<p>EDUD 6357 Qualitative Research Methods This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series. Throughout the semester, this course builds upon students' understanding of qualitative research, its theory and methods. As a doctoral-level research course, the material covered will be intended to prepare the student for successful completion of a qualitative doctoral dissertation. The history and development of</p>	<p>EDLD 803 - Qualitative Methods in Educational Leadership Future trends, issues and problems in academic educational systems, understanding and developing a qualitative research design, identifying problems and solutions and developing relevant theory in qualitative research.</p>

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
		qualitative research will be covered, as well as the theory underlying the method(s).	
<p>EDLD 7365 Applied Stats I</p> <p>This course is designed to familiarize doctoral students with the logic and dynamics of the research process in education and provide students with the opportunity to develop skills in posing research questions, designing studies, collecting and examining data, and interpreting and reporting research results in educational leadership.</p>	--	<p>EDUD 6356 Quantitative Research Methods</p> <p>This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series. throughout the semester, this course builds upon students' understandings of quantitative research, its theory and methods. As a doctoral-level research course, the material covered will be intended to prepare the student for successful completion of a quantitative doctoral dissertation. The history and development of quantitative research will be covered, as well as the theory underlying the method(s).</p>	<p>EDLD 802 - Quantitative Methods in Educational Leadership</p> <p>Introduces advanced statistical techniques commonly used in educational research, parametric and non-parametric analysis through the use of statistical analysis software. Prerequisite EDFL 571 - basic stats course required</p>
<p>EDLD 7368 Applied Stats II</p> <p>Doctoral students compute and interpret multivariate statistics to analyze quantitative data used in educational settings. A strong focus is placed on the use of statistical software to analyze data and written presentation results. The curricula for this</p>	--	--	--

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
course include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and ongoing student engagement in research related to processional practice.			
EDLD 7363 Proposal Development Students apply fundamental concepts and tools of research to educational problems. Each student prepares a proposal for the dissertation. This course requires knowledge of the literature and ongoing student engagement in research.	AED 682 - Developing the Dissertation Research Proposal Credit(s): 3 The design, development and implementation of dissertation research.	EDUD 6361 Dissertation I - Proposal Writing This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series.	EDLD 900 - Doctoral Dissertation Seminar I Proposal and dissertation writing. Grades S, U, W. Same as EDF 900 .
Dissertation			
EDLD 8033 Dissertation (3) The completion of an approved dissertation that will contribute to Instructional Leadership. Minimum of 9 hours total required. Field-based projects will be emphasized. May be repeated. Variable Credit (1-3). Prerequisite: Admission to the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership; completion of required Leadership Core and Research Component coursework and successful completion of comprehensive exam	AED 699 - Dissertation Credit(s): 1-6 Completion of individual dissertation.	EDUD 6362 Dissertation II - Proposal Defense This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series. EDUD 6363 Dissertation III This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series. EDUD 6364 Dissertation IV This course serves as one of three research courses (9 hours) in the doctoral program's research series.	DLD 999 - Dissertation Research and Dissertation Grades S, U, W.
Cognates (Superintendent Cert)	Electives: Nine hours		Electives

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
EDAD 6380. Exec Ldrshp-Superintendents. 3 Hours. This course provides candidates with the skills to assume the role of the contemporary superintendent. This course consists of topics, content, and independent inquiry that address the specific and unique leadership needs of districts.	See list below		See list below
EDAD 6382. Human Resource Management. 3 Hours. Students study the administrator's role in recruiting and retaining adequate staff. Such topics as recruitment, salary policy, tenure, leaves, contractual obligations, evaluation systems, and academic freedom are considered.			
EDAD 6381. Dist Business & Financial Mgt. 3 Hours. This course provides candidates with the skills to understand basic district accounting and budgetary functions as well as the management of district facilities. This course deals with basic concepts of management of campus activity funds, personnel accounting, instructional budgetary functions, translating student			

SHSU EDLD (60 hours)	Stephen F. Austin University (66 Credit hours)	Lamar University (60 Credit hours)	Univ of LA @ Lafayette (60 + Credit hours)
academic needs into the budget, public finance; problems in local, state, and federal support of education and state financial systems with emphasis on Texas; local taxation; budgeting; financing capital items; and fiscal management.			
EDAD 6383 Instructional Theory Superintendent			
EDAD 6384 Practicum Superintendent	AED 681 - Internship Credit(s): 3 (six hours) Field experiences that link theory, research and practice.		EDLD 897 – Internship Subject matters varies.

Courses from Stephen F. Austin that do not correlate with our courses:

AED 631 - Learner-Centered Curriculum and Instruction Credit(s): 3

A study of curriculum development, implementation and assessment with state, national and international applications.

AED 632 - Legal Regulatory Issues in Education Credit(s): 3

A study of the evolution and current status of the law regulating educational institutions.

AED 621 - Examining Human Inquiry Systems Credit(s): 3

A study in comparing and contrasting philosophies and logic systems, which inform human inquiry and educational research.

AED 634 - Mixed Methods in Research Credit(s): 3

An advanced seminar in the study of the logic and applications of mixed methods research with an emphasis on the conceptual, epistemological, and methodological implications of cross paradigmatic, mixed methods approaches to educational research.

AED 650 - Synthesis Seminar I Credit(s): 3

Integrating, synthesizing and evaluating the major concepts encountered in the preceding courses

AED 651 - Synthesis Seminar II Credit(s): 3

Advanced Seminar: Integrating, synthesizing and evaluating the major concepts encountered in the preceding courses

Electives Courses from Univ of LA-Lafayette that do not correlate with our courses:

EDLD 831 - Critical Analysis of Current Research On Effective Educational Practice

Course will focus on recent research on best practices of leadership for empowering teachers, creating communities of continuous learning, and increasing student achievement. The students will hone their critical thinking skills through analysis, synthesis and evaluation of research reporting.

EDLD 821 - Politics and Community Relations

Administrative factors in developing community involvement in public schools and individual communication. Uses social science theory for educational policy-making.

EDLD 823 - Fiduciary Management of Educational Organizations

Study of the principles of taxation, local, state and federal financing of education and equalization of educational opportunity. Special emphasis given to the complete budget making process at the district level and a detailed study of school business management at the local school level. Sound accounting procedures reviewed and additional topics will include introduction to purchasing, transportation, food service operations and other business-related tasks and functions.

EDLD 812 - Supervision in Educational Settings

Course will include advanced definitions and determinations of staffing needs, supervision, and management and coordination problems. Also to be addressed are policies for recruitment, selection, assignment, salary planning, scheduling, promotion, separation, grievances, reassignment, records, development programs, in-service training, evaluation, benefits and services.

EDLD 720 - Educational Law in the Non-Public Sector

Legal structures and needs of non-public schools. Contract labor, tort liability and civil rights.

EDLD 811 - Educational Management

Course is designed to examine the role of superintendents and central office directors in emerging social, economic and political contexts that are changing the nature of schooling, altering how schools are viewed, and are transforming how they lead. A broad range of issues that are critical to the success of new superintendents and issues that affect relationships and impact districts will be explored. Particular attention will be paid to issues of leadership in diverse organizations. .

EDLD 700 - Administration in the Non-Public Sector

Overview of theories and good practice principles related to school administration and management across the full range of management tasks that exist in a non-public setting.

EDLD 705 - Educational Philosophy and Ethos

Survey of traditions of educational philosophy including a focus on specific obligations inherent in non-public school missions.

EDLD 710 - Financial Management

Non-public school processes and responsibilities including budget building, financial management, reading non-profit financial statements, financial planning, and non-traditional financing.

EDLD 715 - Curriculum Design and Evaluation

Private sector mission/Program/Curriculum critical alignment with an emphasis on assessment of curricular, student, faculty and institutional performance.