Dear Senator Alpert:

I am writing to follow up on our recent conversation about the Master Plan for Higher Education, joint doctoral degree programs, and the need for high-quality programs to train educational leaders in California. As I mentioned to you, I am committed to ensuring that joint doctoral degree programs, an essential element of the Master Plan’s delineation of function, are increasingly used as an important means for responding to state needs for graduate education.

With respect to the need in education, I am committing the University to increasing public higher education’s capacity for producing education doctorates by 50 percent over the next five years and 100 percent over the next 10 years. A major means for meeting this commitment will be new joint doctoral programs with the California State University. I enclose a copy of a letter I have sent to Chancellor Reed stating the actions and commitments I am undertaking to ensure the success of current joint doctoral negotiations and to stimulate additional collaborations.

My first objective is to obtain approval this year for the new joint doctoral program being prepared by UC Riverside and multiple regional CSU partners in Southern California. In addition, I expect to receive for final review completed proposals for both the UC Berkeley joint doctoral program in urban educational leadership with San Jose State, San Francisco State and CSU Hayward and the UC Santa Barbara joint doctoral program with Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. Finally, I have asked UC Irvine to complete agreements this year with several CSU campuses and include them in its joint Ed.D. program with UCLA.
• **Expansion of and enhanced access to existing programs.**

In addition, each UC chancellor with a current doctoral degree program in education will be asked to determine the extent to which the program can be enlarged or modified to increase access and availability for working professionals in K-12 and the community colleges. According to CPEC, in 1997-98, UC (including its joint program with CSU) produced 145 doctoral degree recipients out of a state total of 457. For example, UC Davis is transforming its Division of Education into a new School of Education that will more than double the current number of faculty focused on improved educational outcomes in K-12 schools.

• **Development of new programs.**

As my letter to Chancellor Reed states, each campus will also be asked to examine its current joint doctoral degree offerings and to take responsibility for getting in touch with each CSU campus in its region to identify areas where collaboration at the doctoral level might prove fruitful not only in education, but in all disciplines. In particular, I will ask each campus for a plan for meeting regional needs in the area of educational leadership. I am also suggesting to Chancellor Reed that a call go out to all UC and CSU campuses for proposals for new joint doctoral degree programs. Planning grants would be awarded to the proposals identified as most worthy by the CSU/UC Joint Graduate Board.

*New UC Institute for Educational Leadership.*

Your Master Plan Committee discussions have made me think that a more coordinated approach to the issue of training educational leaders in California is needed. Doctoral degrees in education are just one piece of a much greater need for effective training for administrators in K-12 and the community colleges. UC has stepped up its activities in this area in a number of ways: the Governor’s Principal Leadership Institutes, focused on professional development for principals and on developing a cadre of new principals; individual campus programs for principals already on the job, such as the Principal’s Executive Program run by UC San Diego; and programs at the doctoral level that successfully place graduates in K-14 leadership positions. However, I believe this entire area could benefit from a coordinated approach. Thus, I plan to establish a new University of California Institute for Educational Leadership that will focus on developing educational leadership and policy research to meet the state’s needs. The institute would be organized to do the following:

• It would be headed by a respected educator and would have a core set of rotating fellows who would be selected from the ranks of higher education faculty, Community College and K-12 leaders (superintendents, administrators, principals, and faculty leaders), and the business community.
• It would operate an Executive Program for K-14 Leadership Development that would invite K-12 district and Community College teams composed of administrators and faculty leaders to attend either an intensive summer or mid-school year program (the institute would offer both) that focuses on practices, policies, questions, and challenges related to K-14 leadership in schools, districts, and colleges.

• The institute would sponsor a series of policy seminars and symposia on topics of central concern and interest to K-12 and Community College leaders and policy makers. The audience for the series of seminars would be administrators, faculty leaders, and board members, as well as State leaders and policy makers.

• In consultation with an institute advisory council, the institute fellows would assume joint responsibility for defining a research agenda on critical questions related to K-12 and Community College leadership. A subset of the research would be sponsored by the institute itself and could be conducted collaboratively with campus-based faculty.

• The institute would build capacity over time to provide current and comprehensive policy perspectives, information, data, and research related to educational leadership in K-12 and Community Colleges. We anticipate that State leaders, administrators, teacher leaders, and others (inside and outside California) would come to rely on the institute as a resource center in making informed decisions.

• As this makes clear, the institute would focus not only on K-12, but also on the California Community Colleges, developing parallel programs for current and future Community College leaders.

I hope to have this institute operating by the end of the year.

In addition, I will also be advancing the following proposals, some of which would need to be supported by the State and/or the K-12 and Community College systems:

• Development of financial resources and incentives for K-12 and Community College administrators to pursue further education, including: additional scholarship funding and graduate student support for advanced training in educational leadership; a loan assumption program for educational administrators in conjunction with the State (modeled on the APLE program in which the State assumes up to $11,000 in loans for teachers who teach in California K-12 schools).

• K-12 and Community College funding programs that would provide release time and support for administrators to pursue leadership training at UC, CSU, or AICCU institutions.
K-12 and Community College leadership organizations have training programs for board members, administrators, and teacher leaders, and there may be a role for UC to work with these programs (possibly by offering credit or certificates through UC Extension).

Planning grants for new UC Master’s of Advanced Study (MAS) and new doctoral degrees that would focus on educational leadership, including new models of educational leadership training that draw not just on education school faculty, but also on faculty in other professional schools such as law, business, and public policy. For example, UC Irvine has created a new M.A. in Educational Technology Leadership for fully employed K-12 professionals that builds on the campus’ strengths in computer and information technologies.

Expansion of the Principal Leadership Institutes to other UC and CSU campuses, using them as a pipeline to doctoral programs (as envisioned for the UC Berkeley/CSU Urban Education Leadership collaboration).

While the recent CPEC report on education doctorates clearly indicates that California is producing more doctorates than needed to meet K-12 demand, K-12 and Community College leaders are saying emphatically that there is a shortage of well-trained K-12 administrators and leaders. Thus we are committed to ensuring that more successful joint doctoral degree programs are developed and implemented and that they are tailored to the needs of the working professionals in K-12 and the Community Colleges.

The provisions of the Master Plan for Higher Education have been instrumental in the development of California’s three segments of public higher education, each of which is at the highest level of excellence in its own area of responsibility. I look forward to working with you as we move forward in this important area.

Sincerely,

Richard C. Atkinson
President
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