



CHAIR
Sherwood Lingenfelter
Fuller Theological Seminary

VICE CHAIR
Horace Mitchell
California State University, Bakersfield

Mark Bookman
American Jewish University

W. Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Jerry Dean Campbell
Claremont School of Theology

Anna DiStefano
Fielding Graduate University

James Donahue
Graduate Theological Union

Jackie Donath
California State University, Sacramento

Aimée Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

John Eshelman
Seattle University

John Fitzpatrick
Schools Commission Representative

Laurence Gould
Public Member

Michael L. Jackson
University of Southern California

Linda Johnsrud
University of Hawaii

Roberts Jones
Public Member

Louanne Kennedy
*California State University,
Dominguez Hills*

Thomas McFadden
*Community and Junior Colleges
Commission Representative*

Leroy Morishita
San Francisco State University

William Plater
Public Member

Sheldon Schuster
Keck Graduate Institute

Eleanor Dantzer Siebert
Mount St. Mary's College

Carmen Sigler
San Jose State University

Larry Vanderhoef
University of California, Davis

Michael Whyte
Azusa Pacific University

Paul Zingg
California State University, Chico

PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ralph A. Wolff

January 21, 2009

Geoffrey L. Chase
Dean, Division of Undergraduate Studies
WASC Accreditation Liaison Officer
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-8000

RE: Progress Report on EdD, K-12 and Community College Tracks

Dear Geoff:

Your November 17, 2008 progress report on the EdD program, which was approved by the Commission on June 22, 2007, has been reviewed by the staff and a member of the panel of the Doctoral Committee of the Substantive Change Committee that reviewed your original proposal.

In its July 27, 2007 letter approving the EdD, the Commission asked that this progress report address the following issues:

1. The development of the assessment plan, including research questions and plans for data collection and analysis, the use of data to improve student learning, and direct methods of assessment.
2. Rubrics for evaluating the qualifying examination and dissertation.
3. An explanation of the program review process, in which assessment of student learning is a central focus.

In our review, we found that an excellent assessment plan had been developed. We especially appreciated the "pre-formative evaluation" that you conducted using outside consultants and saw that it was very valuable in identifying three aspects of the program central to its success. The assessment plan included both direct and indirect methods of assessment, multiple measures of assessment, and both formative and summative assessments. Plans for the use of data were well developed. Assessment will be conducted on a regular and frequent enough schedule. The tools and rubrics for the dissertation and qualifying exam are well developed and thoughtful.

We did find that the report did not directly address the university-wide program review process and how the assessment work described in the report will be integrated into the program review.

Letter to Geoff Chase

1/21/2009

Page 2 of 2

Therefore, we request that you submit a brief addendum to the progress report, no later than March 1, setting forth a description of the university-wide program review process and indicating when such a review will be conducted and how the assessment work described in the progress report will be integrated with this program review. Following our review of this addendum, we will determine whether to accept the report or to refer it to a panel of the Doctoral Committee for further review and action.

We also wish you continued success with the program and look forward to our next review on our Special Visit in Fall 2012.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Therese A. Cannon
Executive Associate Director

Cc: Stephen L. Weber, President, San Diego State University