

The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Educational Leadership

Student Handbook

PK-12 Strand



Preparing Professionals for Service in Our Communities

Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, & Instructional Technology
School of Education and Professional Studies
Central Connecticut State University
March 2015 (Revised)

Table of Contents

	Page
Purpose of the Handbook	3
Program Description	3
Conceptual Framework	4
Doctoral Program Learning Outcomes	7
Academic Advising	8
Program Design	8
Assessment Processes for the Ed.D.	11
Tests and Performance Tasks	11
The Leadership Portfolio	12
Assessment Exercises and Certification Tests	15
Proposal Defense and the Dissertation	16
Dissertation Responsibilities	18
References	21
Appendices	
A: Rubric for Assessing Leadership Portfolio	22

Purpose of the Handbook

The *Student Handbook* for the Ed.D. Program is a guide for students who have been accepted into Central Connecticut State University's doctoral program of studies. It is written by program faculty and provides a detailed explanation of program structures, policies, procedures, and courses. Students should use the handbook as a reference for questions that may arise about and during the program.

Program Description

The Ed.D. in Educational Leadership for PK-12 Educators is a cohort-based doctorate of practice designed for professional educators and administrators working in education settings. The program has been offered successfully in Connecticut since 2003 and focuses on the development of scholarly practitioners, transformational administrators, and instructional leaders who blend practical wisdom with professional skills and knowledge to develop the learning organizations of the future. The cohort model provides socialization, support, and a professional network for participants.

Program graduates will be education leaders who know how to design educational programs and learning organizations that support student success as well as institutional accountability. Program graduates will be skilled in using research and data to solve multi-layered problems in education settings. They will be able to create research and disseminate the results to a variety of communities.

The doctorate in education (Ed.D.) is designed for delivery to full-time educational professionals on weekends and evenings, throughout the calendar year. The Ed.D. is based on the premise that learning takes place through an integration of course work and experiences that stem from a clear conception of leadership, the knowledge base in the field, and a structure that allows doctoral students and faculty to collaborate on shared work improving education in the State of Connecticut.

The Ed.D. includes two distinct strands that support the learning needs of two different groups of educators. The PreK-12 strand has many innovative features and serves teachers and administrators in PreK-12 education who want to prepare for a variety of leadership positions: principals, lead teachers, department heads, curriculum and assessment specialists, assistant superintendents, and superintendents.

The Higher Education strand of the Educational Leadership Ed.D. program is intended to provide graduates with an understanding of theory and research, teaching and learning, and leadership and to develop skills in research and inquiry that enable them to apply this knowledge to solve persistent educational problems in higher education. Using a cohort learning design, the program will support individuals who aspire to a variety of leadership responsibilities in higher education enabling them to improve institutional productivity and provide effective leadership and service to their institution and its wider community of stakeholders. The higher education strand is intended to serve mid-career professionals employed at two or four-year higher education institutions who seek to enhance their leadership capacity.

Conceptual Framework

The School of Education and Professional Studies' (SEPS) theme for programs in SEPS is, "Preparing Professionals for Service in Our Communities." The set of principles that support the development of all programs in SEPS is presented in Figure 1.

The seven learning outcomes for the educational leadership doctoral program have emerged from our understanding of the SEPS Principles, and from our understanding of several core documents: the *Common Core of Leading: Connecticut School Leadership Standards* (2012); the ELCC/ ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (published by the National Policy Board for Educational Administrators, 2011); and the *CAEP 2013 Accreditation Standards*. Additionally, the work we do derives from several areas of research: transformational school leadership, leadership and school restructuring,

leadership and effects on learning for all students, and the literature of organizational learning. We have also added our own distinctive concerns about the preparation of leaders for diverse and multicultural environments.

In pursuit of its mission, the School of Education and Professional Studies has been guided by a set of principles and beliefs which stem from basic values such as educational quality and intellectual integrity, high standards and distinction, and respect for diversity and social justice.

Specifically action rests on the following principles:

- **High Standards.** All professional preparation programs should be characterized by distinction and those being prepared should be encouraged to aspire to and to meet the highest of standards;
- **Respect for Diversity.** All professional programs should be committed to strategies that foster understanding and respect of all persons a multicultural society;
- **Educational Access and Social Justice.** All professional preparation programs should promote access for a diverse learning community of students and serve as an advocate for groups that have been traditionally discriminated against;
- **Collaboration.** All professional preparation programs should recognize the need for evolving partnerships with educational and human service institutions within the region and state for the purpose of working together toward improvement and change and for enhancing our own teaching and scholarship;
- **Expanding Opportunities.** All professional preparation programs in education should be developed so that graduates are committed to providing first-rate and expanded educational opportunities to all learners in society;
- **Effective Teaching.** All Faculty should be committed to serving students and providing for them the highest quality of teaching supported by appropriate intellectual and scholarly agendas;
- **Student Development.** The School should be committed to student development through specific activities aimed at developing reflective practitioners and life-long learners;
- **Faculty Development.** The School should be committed to faculty development through specific programs and by encouraging faculty to engage in scholarly inquiry within their professional fields.

Figure 1. School of Education and Professional Studies Principles

The notion of transformational school leadership is an important one for the doctoral program. The *Task Force Report on the Professional Doctorate* (2008) stipulated that a professional doctoral degree should support candidates in their preparation for the potential transformation of a field of practice. Transformational skills needed by such leaders include research and inquiry preparation. According to the Task Force “Such skills and knowledge provide the practitioner with the ability to decipher, debate and design research to address the multitude of problems they face (p. x).” Further,

Inquiry in practice preparation is the process of posing significant questions about complex problems in the way education takes place and using research, theories and professional wisdom to design innovative solutions. At the center of this process is the ability to use data to understand and evaluate the effects of an action. As such, inquiry in practice requires the scholarly practitioner to gather, organize, judge and analyze situations, literature and data with a critical lens.

A central question posed by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (2007) was, “What knowledge, skills and dispositions should professionals working in education possess and be able to use?” Critical responses focused on the role of applied research and practical theory. Applied research, practical theory, engagement in using research to address complex problems, use of data to evaluate the impact of actions, building capacity to effect education transformation—all are central tenets in the CCSU doctoral program. The result is our commitment to support the development of the “scholarly practitioner” (Perry, 2015).

According to the American Association for School Administrators (AASA), scholarly practitioners are those leaders who are prepared to:

- blend practical wisdom with professional skills and knowledge to name, frame and solve problems of practice;
- use practical research and applied theories as tools for socially just and equitable change; and
- resolve problems of practice by collaborating with key stakeholders and disseminating solutions in multiple ways.

Doctoral Program Learning Outcomes

Assessment of candidate performance is driven by two major sources: (1) the program's conceptual framework in the form of seven learning outcomes, and (2) the *CAEP 2013 Accreditation Standards*. Figure 1 presents the seven learning outcomes that make up the program's conceptual framework. The *Advanced Standards for Educational Leadership* can be found through CAEP's website.

We believe that:

1. Effective educational leaders demonstrate an ethical and moral commitment to collaborative work that promotes positive learning for all members of the organization.
2. Effective educational leaders understand teaching and learning is at the heart of the organization and demonstrate the ability to foster best practice.
3. Effective educational leaders connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger philosophical, political, and historical context, and the organization's mission.
4. Effective educational leaders establish a commitment to social justice through their work and act in ways that promote social justice in their organization
5. Effective educational leaders utilize evolving technologies to improve organizations, enhance learning, and build institutional identity.
6. Effective educational leaders foster continuous organizational improvement grounded in the collection, analysis, interpretation, and application of data.
7. Effective educational leaders locate, interpret, and assess relevant educational research and apply it to both practice and the design and conduct of research.

Figure 2: Learning Outcomes for the Doctoral Program

Academic Advising

Once admitted to the program, the doctoral director serves as the academic advisor for all doctoral students during the first two years. The doctoral director works with each doctoral student to develop a *Planned Program of Study* using the form provided by the Graduate School to document requirements and assess that each graduate has completed the planned program. The student, the doctoral director, and the Dean of the Graduate School must sign this form, which serves as a type of “contract” between the student and the program. The advisor must approve any substitutions or modifications to the planned program before the student takes any course not specified on the Planned Program form.

At the end of the second summer residency, each student is invited to submit a list of potential dissertation topics and names of three faculty members with whom the student potentially wishes to work with on the dissertation process. The doctoral director works with the lists and faculty members to match each student with a dissertation advisor. The pairings are announced in the fall of the second year. Each student officially begins work with the identified faculty advisor in the spring semester of the second year of study. It is at this time that the student, in concert with the dissertation advisor, works to complete and defend the Leadership Portfolio (described further in this Student Handbook), and begin work on the dissertation. Following two years of coursework, the student then works with the dissertation advisor to develop and write the dissertation.

Program Design

The Ed.D. program consists of 48- 63 credits of requirements: a core (18 credits), a specialization sequence (15 credits), and inquiry seminars and dissertation work (30 credits). It is designed to be completed in just under four years. Courses are offered during two summer residencies (approximately four weeks) and in courses delivered during the academic year.

Program Components for PreK-12 Candidates

Component I: Foundational Core (18 credits)

Component I establishes the foundational core of the program with particular emphasis in education leadership and teaching and learning. Coursework focuses on the knowledge required to lead educational institutions for improvement. Course content will focus on leading accessible educational systems, increasing student success, improving teaching and learning, curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, data-informed decisions, and leading organizational change.

Courses include: EDF 700; EDL 701, 702, 705; and EDT 700. All courses in the core are open only to Ed.D. students. Descriptions of the courses are as follows:

- EDT 700 Topics in Leadership for Technology in Schools (3 credits)
- EDF 700 The Purposes of Education in America (3 credits)
- EDL 705 Leadership to Promote Effective Teaching & Learning (6 credits)
- EDL 701 Leading Organizational Change I: Theory (3 credits)
- EDL 702 Leading Organizational Change II: Program Development & Evaluation (3 credits)

Component II: Specialization (15 credits)

Component II includes a specialty area of the student's choice. For example, candidates may choose to pursue a specialty in:

Administrative Leadership. This specialization is for students who aspire for administrative positions in public schools.

Curriculum and Literacy. This specialization is for students who plan leadership careers in educational settings such as reading and curriculum specialists. It includes courses in literacy, curriculum, and instructional leadership.

Administrative Leadership course possibilities

- | | |
|---------|---|
| EDL 610 | School Leadership I (3 credits) |
| EDL 611 | School Leadership II (3 credits) |
| EDL 620 | Educational Policy, Communities, and Pluralistic Governance (3 credits) |
| EDL 630 | Education Law, Ethics, and Equity (3 credits) |
| EDL 681 | District Leadership: Governance/Leadership Issues (3 credits) |
| EDL 682 | District Leadership: Student Matters (3 credits) |
| EDL 683 | District Leadership: Personnel and Operational Issues (3 credits) |
| EDL 688 | Administering Programs for Diverse Learners I (1 credit) |
| EDL 689 | Administering Programs for Diverse Learners II (1 credit) |

EDL 690	Internship in Educational Leadership I (2 credits)
EDL 691	Internship in Educational Leadership II (2 credits)
EDL 695	Internship: The Superintendency I (3 credits)
EDL 696	Internship: The Superintendency II (3 credits)

Curriculum and Literacy

In Reading/ Language Arts, students may take up to 15 credits selected from among the following 3 credit courses:

RDG 667	Multicultural Literature in the Classroom
RDG 675	Reading and Writing as Integrated Process
RDG 680	Current Trends and Issues in Reading and Language Arts
RDG 686	Literacy Instruction for Diverse Populations II
RDG 698	Research Seminar
RDG 700	Seminar in Literacy

Component III: Inquiry Seminars, and Component IV: Dissertation (30 credits)

Component III (Seminars) of the program includes research courses, field-based inquiry projects, and a series of seminars designed to help students understand the processes of inquiry. Component III leads into and facilitates Component IV.

Component IV is the completion of the dissertation and dissemination of the results of the study to appropriate audiences. Special course work in research and ongoing inquiry projects will culminate with the completion of the student's dissertation. More information about all of these components is available on the program's website.

Coursework will focus on quantitative skill development (including institutional data bases; survey research; and basic skills for using descriptive and inferential statistics); qualitative skill development (including interviews, observation, and focus groups); evaluation and intervention studies; and policy studies. Oral defense, submission of the studies and project outcomes for conference presentation and/or publication, and presentation of the findings to school professionals are required of all candidates. Courses in Component III and Component IV include the following:

- EDL 710 Inquiry Seminar I: The Study of Human & Organizational Learning Research I (2 credits)
- EDL 711 Inquiry Seminar II: Quantitative Research (3 credits)
- EDL 712 Inquiry Seminar III: Qualitative Research II (3 credits)
- EDL 713 Inquiry Seminar IV: Study of Organizational Change (2 credits)
- EDL 714 Inquiry Seminar V: Advanced Research Design (3 credits)
- EDL 715 Inquiry Seminar VI: The Dissertation Proposal (3 credits)

EDL 716 Inquiry Seminar VII: Dissertation I (2 credits)
EDL 717 Inquiry Seminar VIII: Dissertation II (5 credits)
EDL 718 Inquiry Seminar IX: Dissertation III (5 credits)
EDL 720 Inquiry Seminar XI: Disseminating Research Findings (2 credits)
EDL 719 Inquiry Seminar X: Dissertation IV (may be taken to complete the dissertation and may be repeated for up to 6 credits over three calendar years) (1 credit)

Assessment Processes for the Ed.D.

In doctoral programs, candidate assessments have most often consisted of evaluation of required course work, independent essays or research papers, and comprehensive examinations. In designing an assessment plan for the CCSU Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership, the faculty sought to break from tradition and provide a broader array of assessment practices, with emphasis on performance assessment. Specifically, an alternative in the form of the *Leadership Portfolio* has been designed to monitor candidates' progress from entry into the program through end of coursework, and to replace the traditional comprehensive exam. Further, the assessment processes call for a new approach for designing and disseminating the dissertation.

Performance assessment of candidates is accomplished through five major processes: (1) course completion, as well as tests and performance tasks employed in particular courses and seminars; (2) The leadership portfolio; (3) assessment exercises and certification tests; (4) proposal defense; and (5) dissertation and dissemination activities. The requirements and procedures for each of these processes are described in the following sections.

Tests and Performance Tasks

Each course, seminar, and field experience or internship will have some type of performance assessment. In some instances, these assessments will be more traditional tests, in others they may be in the form of projects or performance tasks. These assessments will contribute to candidates' grades for particular courses and may also be used as exhibits for the Leadership Portfolio. A high level of performance is required on

each assessment and across all courses. Prior to submitting *The Leadership Portfolio*, candidates must complete any courses with incomplete grades.

The Leadership Portfolio

The Leadership Portfolio is intended to provide an alternative to the comprehensive exam, traditionally used to assess candidates' content knowledge and to determine whether or not they are ready to proceed with the dissertation. Candidates must successfully defend the Leadership Portfolio in front of a faculty committee in order to move on to the development of the dissertation. The rationale often cited for the comprehensive exam is that it ensures that candidates can demonstrate in writing the ability to conceptualize and apply content associated with the field at an advanced, doctoral level. Most often this exam has consisted of questions chosen by the faculty and administered to the candidates over two, three-hour time blocks. The arguments for an alternative assessment rather than the more traditional comprehensive exam are twofold. First, this approach is more broadly based, that is, the portfolio requirements call for showing the integration of ideas and their application in ways not possible on a written examination. Second, this approach goes beyond what candidates "know" by also assessing their capabilities in important areas of leadership.

As an assessment instrument, the purpose of the Leadership Portfolio is threefold: (1) to provide evidence of the candidates' progress so feedback can be provided in timely fashion; (2) to provide evidence that each candidate meets identified program learning outcomes; and (3) to provide faculty with evidence that candidates are ready to proceed with the doctoral dissertation.

Candidates are introduced to the task of the leadership portfolio in the first year of the program. They begin work on the leadership portfolio during the second summer of the program with the development of one proposition for purposes of receiving feedback from the program director before development of all other propositions. During the second year of the program (Fall and Spring Semesters) each candidate will continue work on the leadership portfolio for the purpose of summative review and evaluation.

During the spring semester of the second year of the program, candidates work with their primary dissertation advisors on the leadership portfolio. This final portfolio will consist of evidence of their mastery of each of the seven learning outcomes for the program (see Figure 1).

Procedures for Portfolio Development- Candidates will begin by developing a narrative statement for each learning outcome in which they define what each outcome means for them. In the proposition narrative statement, candidates will also synthesize important and relevant literature studied throughout the program and clearly demonstrate their understanding of the advanced standards in educational leadership related to that learning outcome. This introductory narrative to the learning outcome will be approximately 3 pages in length and include a reference list of significant literature discussed in that particular outcome's narrative statement.

Candidates will then select two examples of their work relative to each learning outcome. The exhibits candidates choose to place in the portfolio should reflect "best work" as well as work that demonstrates growth as an educational leader. One of the portfolio entries for each learning outcome will be a product (papers, projects, evaluations) that resulted from assignments in core courses, inquiry seminars, or specialty electives. The other entry for each learning outcome will be an example that candidates choose to represent their application of that outcome in the world of practice.

Each exhibit should be accompanied by a brief (2 to 3 pages) reflective essay. The reflective essay should describe how the exhibit best represents the candidate's work related to the proposition and how leader standards are demonstrated in the work. In addition, the candidate should reflect about what was learned, and explain how the work or activity could be changed or improved in the future. The narrative statement in total will number approximately 7-10 pages, with an appended reference list. All writing should adhere to APA formatting. Although candidates may use the same exhibit to support more than one learning outcome, a diversity of exhibits is required. The portfolio must include for each learning outcome one exhibit that represents course assignments

and one exhibit that represents leadership in action. Candidates should consult with their advisor or the program director about specific concerns related to portfolio development.

Candidates will place all materials on a flash drive that includes a clearly marked “folder” for each proposition (which includes the introductory narrative, artifact #1 and its reflective statement, and artifact #2 and its reflective statement). Candidates are responsible for making and distributing multiple copies to the portfolio review committee members.

Portfolio Assessment- Candidates will submit the Leadership Portfolio to a portfolio committee consisting of the following three members: (1) the student’s dissertation advisor; (2) the Ed.D. program director; and (3) someone who has been mutually chosen by the advisor and the candidate, either an educational practitioner who holds a doctorate or a faculty member from outside the core Ed.D. teaching faculty. This third person must be approved in advance by the program director. The candidate is responsible for scheduling a date and time for the portfolio review that is convenient for him/herself and members of the committee.

Portfolios must first be approved by the candidate’s advisor. The candidate will then provide the advisor-approved portfolio to all committee members at least two weeks in advance of a scheduled portfolio presentation meeting and defense. All committee members will attend the presentation and defense, which is anticipated to be about one hour in length. At that time, the candidate will make a 20-25 minute presentation that is intended to synthesize the salient features of the reflections and the products, integrate the entries into a coherent whole, and establish clearly for the committee what the candidate believes are the salient features of the portfolio as related to the candidate’s growth as a leader in the field and readiness to embark on the dissertation. The presentation should demonstrate appropriate use of technology and other communication tools. The remainder of the meeting provides time for questions, clarifications, and discussion.

An assessment guide (Appendix A) is used by the committee to assess the portfolio. The evidence and reflections submitted in support of each doctoral proposition, as well as the presentation and defense, will be judged by the committee using a three-category rubric: Distinguished, Meets Standards, and Does Not Meet Standards. “Distinguished” will be reserved for truly outstanding work. Outcomes for which there is insufficient evidence or evidence of insufficient quality will be judged “Does Not Meet Standards” and will require revision and/or additional documentation. If the candidate does not meet standard, a timetable for revision and review of the revision will be established. Defending the portfolio at the Distinguished or Meets Standard levels is a prerequisite for moving into the stage of development of the dissertation proposal.

Assessment Exercises and Certification Tests

While in the program, candidates may choose to work toward an Intermediate Level Administrator Certificate (092), or Superintendent’s Certificate (093). For those candidates working towards the 092 certificate, some aspects of their work will be assessed through specially designed assessment center exercises and the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT) administered by the Connecticut State Department of Education and required for 092 endorsement.

The Connecticut State Department of Education provides the following description of the CAT:

The CAT consists of four modules. The first two modules require candidates to take the role of an instructional supervisor and are asked to review, analyze, and prepare recommendations for support in response to a teacher’s unit plan, student work and brief videotape of a teaching episode. The two school instructional analysis modules include an elementary and a secondary school context. The second two modules ask applicants to take the role of an administrator, to review Connecticut strategic school profiles (SSP) and community information, and to describe a school improvement process. Again, the two modules include an elementary and secondary school context.

Testing time for the four modules is six and one half hours. (Go to <http://www.eastconn.org/CAT.htm> for further information.)

A 350 clock hour internship is required for endorsement for the 092 Certificate. Work on the internship is spread over a summer and two semesters and is documented through an internship portfolio that includes products demonstrating the candidate's skills in a variety of areas.

Proposal Defense And The Dissertation

Candidates in the CCSU PK-12 Ed.D. Program focus on the translation of theory to practice. Therefore, the faculty has designed the dissertation and the processes used to complete, evaluate, and disseminate it to meet the unique needs of students in the program. The Ed.D. Dissertation maintains many of the features of the more traditional dissertation, particularly those that demand quality, rigor, and originality. If done properly, the dissertation can be not only a satisfying capstone experience for doctoral candidates, but also an opportunity for candidates to break new ground by providing a bridge between what is known from research and what is needed in practice. It is anticipated that the dissertation can also serve the educational community of Connecticut by impacting the work of schools and improving student learning.

Each candidate is responsible for working with the dissertation advisor to identify a dissertation topic with the dissertation advisor, and completing the dissertation, as outlined in this *Handbook*. Key features and requirements are summarized below.

Dissertation Topic. In general, candidates are encouraged to select a topic associated with the applied aspects of teaching and learning and/or school improvement. Although applied in nature, the dissertation should nonetheless apply theory to the particular problem under investigation. Candidates will be provided assistance in defining a topic in EDL 715, Dissertation Inquiry Seminar, which will be offered during the Spring Semester of the candidate's second academic year.

Dissertation Advisor. The Program Director works with the candidate to identify a dissertation advisor who will serve as the chairperson of the dissertation committee. The dissertation advisor must be a member of the Ed.D. Core or Extended Core Faculty approved by the Ed.D. program director, and must have appropriate expertise and an interest in the candidate's topic. The director is responsible for assuring that faculty load and other administrative matters do not preclude a faculty member's participation as a dissertation advisor.

Dissertation Committee. The candidate in consultation with the dissertation advisor invites faculty to serve on the dissertation committee. This committee typically includes at least three members and should have at least one member from the Department of Educational Leadership who is a member of the Ed.D. Core Faculty, one person from outside the Department who has membership in the Ed.D. Extended Core Faculty, and one person from outside the Core and Extended Core Faculty. The outside member may be from another academic school at CCSU or may be an appropriately credentialed practitioner in K-12 Schools. All members of the dissertation committee membership must have a doctorate. The dissertation committee must be approved by the advisor and the Director of the Ed.D. Program.

Dissertation Proposal. As part of EDL 715, Dissertation Proposal Seminar, and with the help of the dissertation advisor, the candidate will complete a dissertation proposal. The proposal must clearly define the problem to be studied, review the literature and other work on the problem, and describe the methods to be used to investigate the problem. Data collection instruments, materials, and other exhibits that clarify the methods should be appended.

Defense and Approval of the Dissertation Proposal. When the candidate and the dissertation advisor agree that the proposal is ready, the dissertation proposal will be distributed to committee members and the candidate (with the assistance of the advisor) will schedule a committee meeting for the purpose of defending the proposal. At that meeting, the candidate will present the proposal, respond to issues that are raised, and

hear from individual committee members about changes that are expected before they will sign their approval. The proposal must also be approved by the Ed.D. Director and the Human Studies' Committee (which serves as CCSU's institutional review board) prior to the candidate's commencing the study. (For further information about the HSC, consult www.ccsu.edu/hsc/).

Dissertation Seminar. EDL 715 has been designed specifically to assist students in developing and obtaining approval for the dissertation proposal. This seminar will be taken during the Spring Semester of the second year of study. It is anticipated that some aspect of this seminar will be conducted using web-based instruction.

Defense of the Dissertation. In completing the dissertation manuscript, it is essential that the candidate to consult closely with the dissertation advisor to ensure the dissertation is ready for a formal defense before the dissertation committee and others. During the defense, the candidate will provide a brief oral presentation about the dissertation (including use of technology as appropriate). However, the heart of the defense is questioning and discussion, including the opportunity for the candidate to demonstrate a deep mastery of the research literature, methods (including alternatives to the chosen methodologies), findings and implications for practice.

Dissemination of the Dissertation. At the completion of the dissertation, candidates disseminate the results of their study in two venues: to the world of scholarship and the world of practice. EDL 720, taken during the final winter or summer of the program, supports this dissemination requirement. The completed dissertation is also submitted to the Dean of Graduate Studies for approval and for the purpose of having it digitized and archived in the library.

Dissertation Responsibilities

Successful dissertations require that several parties carry out their responsibilities in effective ways:

The Candidate:

- Requests a dissertation advisor, with guidance from the program director and others.
- Invites committee members with the guidance of the dissertation chair.
- Completes a proposal and arranges for committee review.
- Meets all required deadlines for submission.
- Conducts study as approved by committee and HSC.
- Completes the dissertation following required guidelines and APA style (6th Edition).
- Arranges for committee review of the dissertation.

The Dissertation Advisor/Committee Chair:

- Establishes willingness and availability to work with the candidate.
- Helps the candidate define an appropriate topic that can be accomplished within the time and resources available.
- Guides the candidate in acquiring a committee appropriate for the candidate's dissertation topic.
- Clarifies with the candidate the role of the advisor and the committee.
- Guides the candidate in writing the dissertation proposal including helping choose appropriate methodologies.
- Approves the proposal for presentation to the dissertation committee.
- Supervises all aspects of the study and the writing of the dissertation.
- Maintains contact and a positive relationship with the candidate.
- Approves the dissertation for final committee review and defense.
- Helps schedule the final defense.
- Provides guidance for disseminating the dissertation.

The Committee Members:

- Provide assistance on the dissertation in areas of their expertise.
- Are available to meet with the candidate when requested and to provide constructive feedback.

- Provide written and oral critique of both the proposal and final dissertation in a timely fashion.
- Are available to participate in the proposal review and the dissertation defense and dissemination.

References

Candidate Registration Bulletin/ Study Guide for the Connecticut Administrator Test (CAT). (2014). EastConn Regional Education Service Center. Retrieved from <http://www.eastconn.org/CAT.htm>

CAEP 2013 Advanced Program Accreditation Standards. (2013). Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org>

ELCC Standards for School Leaders. (2011). National Policy Board for Educational Administrators. <http://www.ncate.org/public/programStandards.asp?ch=4>

Perry, J. A. (March 2015). The EdD and scholarly practitioners. *School Administrator*, 3(72) 21-25. Retrieved from <http://cpedinitiative.org/articles/edd-or-not-edd>

Task Force Report on the Professional Doctorate (2008). Council of Graduate Schools.

Appendix A

Rubric for Assessing the Leadership Portfolio

Doctoral Program Leadership Portfolio Assessment Guide

Revised 12/12/2014

Candidate _____ Cohort _____ Date of Defense _____ Faculty reviewer _____

The Candidate's Leadership Portfolio Committee will evaluate evidence provided in a candidate's portfolio using four standards. Responses by the Committee members during the Portfolio Defense are logged on the Portfolio Assessment Record by the candidate's advisor and submitted to the Doctoral Director.

Learning Outcome	Standard 1: Knowledge of individual and organizational learning	Standard 2: Application of key concepts to discussion of the artifacts	Standard 3: Skill in Reflection on learning	Standard 4: Communication Skill in written and oral presentation	Summary score by Learning Outcome
1. Effective educational leaders demonstrate an ethical and moral commitment to collaborative work that promotes positive learning for all members of the organization.	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact.</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
2. Effective educational leaders understand teaching and	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis;</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition;</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed</p>	

<p>learning is at the heart of the organization and demonstrate the ability to foster best practice.</p>	<p>mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>3. Effective educational leaders connect the immediate work of organizational improvement to the larger philosophical, political, and historical context, and the organization's mission.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>4. Effective educational</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature;</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning;</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected</p>	

<p>leaders establish a commitment to social justice through their work and act in ways that promote social justice in their organization.</p>	<p>thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>5. Effective educational leaders utilize evolving technologies to improve organizations, enhance learning, and build institutional identity.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	

<p>6. Effective educational leaders foster continuous organizational improvement grounded in the collection, analysis, interpretation, and application of data.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self; limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	
<p>7. Effective educational leaders locate, interpret, and assess relevant educational research and apply it to both practice and the design and conduct of research.</p>	<p>3 high level of knowledge of significant literature; thoroughly researched; includes comprehensive and convincing synthesis; mature and original thinking</p> <p>2 good level of knowledge of significant literature; proposition is researched; convincing synthesis; some original thinking.</p> <p>1 limited or narrow knowledge of significant literature; proposition not well-researched; linkage between ideas unclear; little synthesis of literature; sources inappropriately selected or limited.</p>	<p>3 relevant and appropriate artifacts; clear explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; thoughtful depiction of development and implementation of artifact.</p> <p>2 two appropriate artifacts; some explanation of artifacts' connections to proposition; some description of aspects of implementation of the artifact.</p> <p>1 inappropriate artifacts; very limited explanation of artifacts' connections to</p>	<p>3 insightful reflection about own learning; important suggestions for future work; describes contexts for own learning; critiques own capacity relative to proposition</p> <p>2 reflection at a descriptive level about own learning; some goals set for self; some consideration of own capacity relative to the proposition</p> <p>1 reflection at low level about own learning; limited and inappropriate goals for self;</p>	<p>3 statements are well written and organized; components connected seamlessly; comprehensive, sophisticated, convincing analysis; well-developed introduction and conclusion; APA is correct.</p> <p>2 most narratives clear and organized; some effort to connect components; ideas logically sequenced; convincing analysis; arguments focused and logical; APA correct in general.</p> <p>1 narratives unclear, disorganized; little effort to connect components; ideas not well-sequenced; analysis not convincing; arguments unfocused and illogical; incorrect APA patterns.</p>	

		proposition; very basic description of development and implementation of artifact	limited focus on own capacity relative to proposition		
Summary score by standard					

Oral presentation	<p>3 Candidate discusses personally important learning; compelling presentation that synthesizes salient features of the portfolio; demonstrates strong communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates deep understanding and mastery of content and leadership standards</p> <p>2 Candidate discusses some personally important learning; interesting presentation that synthesizes features of the portfolio; demonstrates adequate communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates some understanding and grasp of content and leadership standards</p> <p>1 Candidate does not discuss personally important learning; presentation lacks interest and synthesizes features of the portfolio in a minimal way; demonstrates low-level communication skill (oral presentation, use of technology); defense discussion demonstrates little understanding and grasp of content and leadership standards</p>
--------------------------	--

Holistic Score for the Leadership Portfolio

_____ 3 Distinguished: Considered as a whole, the portfolio and presentation represent work of exceptionally high quality

_____ 2 Meets standard at doctoral level: Candidate has provided substantial and meaningful evidence of achievement and possesses the skills required to commence the dissertation

_____ 1 Does not meet standard at doctoral level: Improvements are needed before candidate is approved to move on.

Comments

