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ABSTRACT: In this article, we reveal results of a multiple-case study supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education that examined how schools of education reformed their EdD programs as a result of membership in the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. The cross-case analysis was conducted on 21 cases written by 38 researchers who visited institutions across the United States. Results indicate that changes in EdD programs have taken place at institutional, programmatic, and individual levels as a result of incorporating the Carnegie project's principles and design concepts into program reform.

This enables the accomplishment of a key goal of the redesign movement: communicating and being responsive to the leadership needs of schools and education communities.

Since 2007, the CPED has engaged more than 80 colleges and universities in an action-oriented initiative, bringing together administrators, faculty, doctoral students, and practitioners to simultaneously pursue two goals:

Goal 1: Delineate a clear distinction between the professional practice doctorate in education (EdD) and the education research doctorate (PhD).
Goal 2: Improve the efficacy and efficiency of programs leading to the EdD.

To guide this work, members collaboratively developed a working definition of the EdD (the first since its inception at Harvard University in 1920). The CPED definition of the education doctorate is as follows: “The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession” (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2009).

To accomplish these goals, faculty members in the consortium created a guiding framework that consists of six design concepts and six principles for program development. The six design concepts are as follows:

Scholarly practitioners: graduates who are individuals capable of blending their practical wisdom with their professional skills and knowledge to name, frame, and solve problems of practice.
Signature pedagogy: the pervasive set of practices used to prepare scholarly practitioners for all aspects of their professional work; “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” (Shulman, 2005, p. 52).
Inquiry in practice: the process of posing significant questions that focus on complex problems of practice.
Laboratories of practice: settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other.
Problem of practice: a persistent, contextualized, and specific issue embedded in the work of a professional
practitioner, the addressing of which has the potential to result in improved understanding, experience, and outcomes.

**Dissertation in practice**: a scholarly endeavor that affects a complex problem of practice.

These design concepts offer tools for the development of EdD programs that are grounded in the framework of a set of working principles created by consortium members (CPED, 2009).

Regarding the six principles for program development, the professional doctorate in education

- Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
- Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
- Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
- Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
- Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates practical and research knowledge and that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
- Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

CPED faculty members created these principles as a response to move the consortium away from a prescriptive program model and toward a framework that honored local context yet supported commonality and quality across institutions. As a result, the new definition of the EdD, the design concepts, and the principles for program development have allowed the CPED to be the first action-oriented effort working to distinguish and define the EdD as a rigorous and relevant degree for professional practice (Perry, 2010, 2012; Perry & Imig, 2008).

In 2010, the CPED consortium received a $700,000 grant from the U.S. Department of Education (Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education) to study how 21 of its original member schools of education changed their EdD programs as a result of being part of the CPED. Specifically, the fund's research project sought to use a multicase analysis to answer the following research questions:

**Research Question 1**: What has been the CPED's impact on doctoral preparation—has it been perceived as an innovation?

**Research Question 2**: What do the professional practice doctorates look like, and how do they differ from what was offered before?

**Research Question 3**: How did the college/school make and diffuse these changes?

**Research Question 4**: What are the lessons learned?

This article presents the findings from this study. In addition, teams of researchers are currently developing byproducts of learning to support the dissemination of lessons learned, which will be available on the CPED website (http://cpedinitiative.org).

**THEORETICAL FRAME**

To understand and evaluate how programs changed, the researchers utilized Rogers's **diffusion of innovations** model as a guide. Rogers (1995) defines diffusion as "the process by which an innovation is communicated through certain channels over time among members of a social system" (p. 10). The diffusion process involves four elements—the innovation, the communication channel, time, and the social system. First, the innovation is the idea that is "perceived as new by an individual or other unit of adoption" (p. 11). The second element, the communication channel, is the "means
by which messages get from one individual to another" (p. 18). The third element, time, includes the innovation decision process by which individuals pass from initial understanding of the innovation to full adoption of it. Time refers to the innovative willingness of individuals and the rate of time that it takes the full system to adopt or reject the innovation. Finally, the social system element consists of the "interrelated units that are engaged in joint problem-solving to accomplish a common goal" (p. 23).

Rogers's diffusion of innovations and his perspective on four elements of change—that is, defining of the innovation; the means of communication; the time necessary to adapt, adopt, or reject the innovation; and the social system—were chosen to help the researchers understand if and how institutions viewed the CPED's design concepts and principles as innovations and if EdD programs were changed utilizing the CPED framework. Rogers's elements of diffusion offered a lens for understanding change within a complex system such as a school of education.

**Method**

Data for this study were gathered from individual case studies conducted at 21 CPED Phase I member schools of education across the United States. The original cases were written by a total of 38 researchers who, in teams of two, traveled to an institution where they conducted interviews using semi-structured protocols, performed observations, and gathered artifacts (e.g., syllabi, handbooks, promotional materials). This qualitative data-gathering process utilized protocols that were developed using Rogers's theoretical framework. Institutional Review Board approval was received for all data collection tools and procedures prior to the study.

Data were analyzed in a two-phase process: individual case writing and then cross-case analysis. In the first stage, the teams of two researchers constructed case studies from the transcripts of their interviews, observations, and artifacts. The researchers followed a structured analysis plan that began with a reading and rereading of all data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Then they coded their data (primarily the interviews and observations) with a set of predetermined codes based on Rogers's theory and on the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Fifty-nine codes were provided and grouped into six categories:

1. organizational changes;
2. faculty perceptions of their roles, their engagement, and the redesign elements;
3. CPED program design concepts and principles;
4. student perceptions, intentions, and outcomes;
5. curriculum design; and
6. learning environment.

Researchers were encouraged to add more codes for their analyses as they emerged naturally from the data. To begin, the researchers were asked to perform a sample coding. Research team partners each coded one of their transcripts and then cross-checked their coding together. Discrepancies were discussed until 80% agreement was maintained (Miles & Huberman, 1994). After consistency was established, the research teams were encouraged to continue coding the rest of their case data. After all the interviews and observations were coded, the researchers performed a categorical analysis. They developed categories and subcategories and defined the properties and dimensions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) for each. They then related the categories and subcategories to one another and identified the conditions, actions, interactions, and consequences of each phenomenon. They used this deductive process until the data had "run its course" and categories were saturated (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 62). Research teams then made assertions to answer each research question for their cases. Researchers then wrote case reports that followed an organized outline constructed from the research questions to create consistency (Yin, 2003). Each report explained the CPED's impact on doctoral preparation and identified the changes that were made and how, as well as the lessons learned by various individuals.
The second layer of analysis entailed three researchers conducting a cross-case analysis across the 21 case reports. The researchers applied codes, developed categories, merged categories into themes, and from these created a table with assertions. Tables were then merged so that similarities and differences could be seen within and across institutions. Through continued comparison and adjustment, findings surfaced and led to assertions aimed at answering each research question (Stake, 2006).

**DISCUSSION**

Results from this multiple-case study demonstrate that the CPED, as an innovation, has had an impact on schools of education on three levels. First, at the institutional level, the CPED had an impact on school of education policies, on the types of faculty positions created, and on the understanding of the EdD as a professional degree. Second, at the program level, the CPED has changed the way that EdD programs are designed, the program content, and the expectations for graduates. Finally, at the individual level, the CPED has had an impact on the views and roles of deans, faculty, and students. The following sections offer a deeper explanation of these assertions and the answers to the research questions.

**Impact on Schools of Education**

The cross-case analysis revealed that the CPED has had an impact on the 21 schools of education in terms of policies, faculty positions, and understanding of the EdD degree.

**Policies.** The CPED helped schools of education address the internal and external problems that they were facing. Internally, most institutions saw confusion between the EdD and PhD; questions were being asked about the quality of the EdD programs; and enrollment issues indicated that changes were necessary. In many cases, the confusion between the EdD and PhD was the primary reason why institutions joined the CPED. No or little distinction between degrees was evident in terms of coursework or degree requirements, and faculty and students were discontented. Coursework was disconnected from the needs of EdD students, and low-quality dissertations were being generated to satisfy capstone requirements. Upper administration viewed the CPED as a means to design EdD programs that would be equal in quality to other campus programs and provide well-trained graduates.

Because quality was a problem, many institutions had large numbers of ABD (all but dissertation) candidates, as well as competition for enrollment with nearby institutions. Schools of education reported that reviews of their programs revealed that they were losing money and not meeting the needs of their current students or attracting future students. Working with the CPED to define the EdD's purpose became a means to establish policies that pushed completion rates for lagging students while better designing quality programs to attract and serve the needs of students who wanted to remain in the field and not work in academe.

Externally, institutions reported facing pressure from multiple sources. State-level governance wanted improvement in the preparation of educational leaders; districts and organizations were asking for well-trained individuals and research partners; and practitioner advisory groups wanted programs that would provide them with the leaders that they needed. Pressures caused institutions to investigate their programs through self-studies and internal reviews. Some institutions found that students and graduates wanted programmatic changes that would better help them gain leadership abilities, specifically around the dissertation. However, in a few cases, state legislatures did agree to programmatic change, and as a result, a traditional program continued while a CPED-influence program was created alongside it.

The CPED offered direction for change that would allow these issues to be addressed and that would establish new policies for doctoral preparation that were grounded in a national effort. Resulting policy changes included the following:
Time to degree: moving from 6-10 years down to 3-4 years, where dissertation work is included in the program time frame.

Number of degree credits: moving from the traditional PhD number of requirements to 42 to 60 credits beyond the master’s.

Dissertation format: moving from a traditional five-chapter, lengthy dissertation to various designs, shorter lengths, varied types of research, and a new name—such as capstone and dissertation in practice.

Dissertation oversight: moving from traditional committees composed of only tenure-track faculty to those including practitioners, reducing committee size, allowing students to execute and author research together, and advising of students as groups rather than one-to-one.

Faculty teaching: moving from the traditional classroom format to meeting more frequently (including meeting in informal settings). When and where faculty taught changed, including summer intensive sessions, weekend teaching, and online and hybrid formats.

Faculty advising: moving from a traditional apprentice model to a more egalitarian and communal situation where faculty and students collaborate in learning. In most cases, group advising became a more manageable means to working with a larger number of EdD candidates.

Although not all institutions made dramatic shifts in policies, it was clear from the cross-case analysis that all schools of education were faced with internal and external policy issues that needed to be addressed. The CPED offered a means to begin conversations of change in some cases and institute drastic policy shifts in others.

EdD as a professional degree. As noted, the primary reasons to distinguish the EdD as a professional degree centered on image and quality. Because the EdD has historically been viewed as a “PhD-lite” (Shulman et al., 2006), school of education administrators and faculty were looking for ways to rebrand and give better identities to their degrees. In addition, with districts and organizations asking for programs specifically designed for their employees, interviews showed that traditional program time frames and research preparation were not meeting the needs of current and potential students. Joining the CPED presented means for establishing the EdD as a professional degree; however, data revealed that because of the literature that was emerging at the time from the Carnegie Foundation’s work on the PhD and on preparation in other professions (Golde & Walker, 2006; Shulman et al., 2006; Walker, Golde, Jones, Conklin Buschel, & Hutchings, 2008), faculty conversations often began percolating before the CPED initiative was formally created.

As an innovation, the CPED offered a way to improve the quality of preparation—making programs, as one dean explained, more “intellectual . . . not just a matter of perseverance.” Rogers (1995) explains that an innovation is an “idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual” (p. 11) and has the function of solving a problem or improving a situation. In this respect, the CPED supplied a language for redesigning programs—signature pedagogies, laboratories of practice, dissertation in practice—as well as a set of design principles that provided a pathway or framework for change. The CPED bestowed relevance to the EdD degree by paying attention to rigor and program quality while focusing on practitioner needs as a means to avoid the “PhD-lite” label.

Types of faculty positions. Emerging from the data were two notions around faculty hiring. First, although not present across all cases, was the hiring of clinical faculty to have a role in EdD programs and fill non-tenure-track roles. Several institutions noted clinical faculty to be central to designing their professional preparation doctorate and teaching in their programs. These individuals were highly valued because of their strong connection to the world of practice, combined with faculty experience and their professional contacts. They served as liaisons between the school of education and districts or educational organizations. Clinical faculty members were also given roles on dissertation committees, serving as guides to help students apply research to solve problems in practice.
A second change in positions frequently seen across CPED institutions was the role of assistant faculty members. Junior faculty members were hired into tenure-track positions with the intent of having them heavily involved in or even leading the change effort for the EdD program design. The data suggested that new tenure-track faculty were chosen to lead and be involved in programs because it was believed that they would be invested in the institution and more open to change than some of the more established faculty members. Assistant faculty members were viewed as having more energy and ambition, as well as vision for change. A few interviewees from across a handful of institutions noted, however, that giving this kind of work to junior faculty members could be detrimental to their promotion and tenure as well as the change process itself. Assistant faculty members had little institutional knowledge (e.g., how to work around the system), voice, or resources to get things accomplished. In addition, they were encumbered with the responsibilities of the tenure process.

Resistance. Resistance to change from faculty was present in most cases and appeared in the forms of noninterest, noninvolvement, and pushback on change ideas. In the majority of the cases, a minority of faculty at some point in the change process expressed resistance to redesigning the EdD—either its purpose or its program design. In some cases, resistance resulted from the decision-making process and how the institution became involved in the CPED. Rogers (1995) suggests that who makes the decision to adopt an innovation has a direct impact on the willingness of constituents to adopt it. At institutions where the dean made the decision to join the CPED without consulting or collaborating with faculty first, a great degree of resistance could be found among those who were not invited to lead the effort. At institutions where faculty members were part of the decision-making process, they were more engaged in the change effort. Resistance also came from faculty members who were not as involved in the EdD redesign process and from those not chosen to serve as liaisons between the CPED and their home institutions. Many cases revealed that those not close to the effort or as familiar with CPED principles and design concepts claimed that they could not see the immediate difference in the CPED-Influenced EdD. In some cases, the reason was that traditional EdD programs were still being implemented alongside CPED-influenced EdD programs, thereby making distinctions harder to see from the outside. In other cases, change was simply resisted because faculty members who were not directly involved were less aware of discussions about the CPED and its ideas.

Other types of resistance emerged as faculty saw the results of changes and did not agree with certain components of what was happening. These resisters held on to historical visions of the EdD, saw no use for change in their program's mission or coursework, or pushed back on ideas such as moving classes from weeknights to weekends. Some institutions also saw a complete resistance from faculty (Zaltman & Duncan, 1977) who were not willing to work with new hires and their fresh perspectives. In successful cases, it was noted that key to working with resisters and implementing a successful redesign of the EdD was early and inclusive engagement of faculty in various stages of their careers.

Cachet. For the institutions examined in this study, participating in the CPED also brought a certain level of cachet that supported their EdD redesign and resulted in impactful changes. This cachet came in the form of name recognition and networking. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has a long history of success in reforms, and members had no reason to believe that this project would be any different. Having the Carnegie name attached to the project was an advantage. Members saw value in having direct interaction with individuals who had experience leading reform efforts in higher education. They found the ideas of Dr. Lee Shulman, president emeritus, and his Carnegie colleagues to be extremely useful, and they valued the CPED's leadership under Dr. David Imig, president emeritus of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, who arranged for opportunities for them to interact with and develop ideas about the EdD with like-minded individuals at biannual meetings. Such advantages brought ownership,
look different and are distinct from PhD programs and degrees. The CPED affected all aspects of program development—from admissions to the type of courses offered, the course delivery, the support structures, and the look and feel of the dissertation. However, even with these changes, programs did not become clones (Shulman et al., 2006). Institutions were able to use their own experiences, values, expertise, and visions to design or redesign their programs. CPED member schools of education incorporated the project’s concepts and principles; however, how these were incorporated varied based on where an institution was located and where a program was in the design or redesign process.

Program design. The third element of Rogers’s (1995) diffusion of innovations model is the role of time in the change process because it matters to both the decision-making process and the rate of adoption or rejection of an innovation. When it came to design changes, time mattered. Data show that programs were at varying phases of development—from starting fresh to redesigning an older program to having already begun the redesign before joining the CPED—and so determined what they sought from membership in the CPED. The data reveal three stages of program design development:

- Some EdD programs had been in existence for a long time but were indistinguishable from PhD programs. These programs were losing money, had overworked faculty, and had many ABDs. As a result, administrators and faculty realized that they needed to redesign their programs and turned to the CPED for answers.
- Some programs had just been granted approval, and faculty members in these institutions were just beginning the program design process. These members wanted guidance, ideas, models, and direction from the CPED.
- Other programs were clear and distinct—that is, faculty had already implemented changes and were on the right track. Faculty members in these programs wanted confirmation of their current design and the opportunity to
showcase their ideas. These programs became models for other institutions.

No matter where a program was in the design or redesign process, being a part of the CPED helped deans and faculty members make their programs more relevant to practice and working educational professionals. In successful programs, the CPED’s principles and design features were incorporated into the program’s design. Articulating a vision of a scholar practitioner and understanding these individuals as working professionals with professional knowledge helped members develop clear mission statements and goals. In the words of an interim dean, “I don’t think program changes would have taken place without the CPED initiative.”

Admissions. The CPED affected admission policies by helping to clarify the type of individual that was admitted and what was required of applicants. For example, policies refocused on admitting candidates working in preK–20 education or organizations that supported it, who had several years experience, and who planned to remain in a work setting. The data also noted changing admissions policies to admit a more diverse student body. Wanting to attract top working professionals, some institutions waived GRE requirements in lieu of more authentic demonstrations of professional knowledge and leadership. Some admissions policies also required students to indicate a problem in practice that they intended to study and improve during their program. Different types of essays and writing samples—ones that focused on problems of practice or professional writing (versus academic writing)—were changed requirements. Finally, a small number of institutions asked applicants to provide permission from their professional institutions to make doctoral study an integral part of their work—offering time off for class, studying, or writing.

Cohorts. Attrition rates have been a concern for institutions of higher learning, and as noted earlier, because of the confusion between the EdD and PhD, there had been many ABDs. Failure to complete doctoral programs was multifaceted for working professionals who maintain a full-time position as they pursue their degrees. Working on a doctorate requires sacrifice. In the words of a student, “I think that working in the field and doing this [program] at the same time is the best possible combination, even though it makes all of us crazy.” In addition, lack of advising after their coursework often leaves working professionals without the contact needed to remain engaged in study. To reduce attrition, CPED-influenced programs use a cohort structure, which ranges in size across member institutions from 12 to 150 students. Cohorts are seen as a means to offer support and structure from orientation to dissertation defense because students stay together through most of their program and, in many cases, are expected to finish together. Additionally, at some point in the program, students are often broken into smaller groups (five to nine students) to facilitate faculty advising. These groups have a faculty mentor, and in some cases, these faculty members follow them to the dissertation phase and serve as their chair. These smaller groups have varied names—structured seminars, laboratories of practice, and leaders’ scholar communities—and in multiple cases, these groups contribute to the growing retention and graduation rate reported.

The data demonstrated that the cohort model varies widely from institution to institution. At some institutions, faculty work to ensure that student cohorts form close bonds, but at other institutions, cohorts are simply groups of students admitted together who take courses together. In most institutions, students see cohorts as a means to learn from and with one another. Administrators and faculty equally see the cohort model as a means of personal and professional support, as well as a means to eliminate ABDs.

Courses. CPED-influenced programs graduate students in 2 to 4 years. Consortium members decided early on that this time frame supported what they had learned from self-studies—that practitioners had limited time and funds to commit to doctoral programs. However, the data showed that at several institutions, this quick completion time was a challenge for students. Being working professionals with family commitments, students noted troubles balancing
they learn in their courses and reporting back through coursework. Courses are designed to scaffold learning and be closely tied to dissertation work. In many programs, dissertation work begins on day one, in course one.

Courses in CPED-influenced programs are taught by a variety of individuals in varied combinations. At some institutions, only tenure-track individuals teach courses, whereas at others, combinations of faculty and clinical faculty (sometimes graduates of the program) teach, and sometimes practitioners co-teach with faculty. At some institutions, two courses are blended and co-taught by faculty to provide interdisciplinary understanding.

Research methods courses. Historically, the perception of the EdD as PhD-lite (Shulman et al., 2006) resulted from less rigorous and weak methods courses and dissertation products. However, data show that the CPED has influenced strong and concerted change in both the teaching of research and the development of dissertations. Even though students in CPED-influenced EdD programs typically take fewer research methods courses than do PhD students (12 hours compared to 18), rigor and quality are not sacrificed. Rather, methods courses in CPED-influenced EdD programs are targeted and useful to student practice—teaching students to consume, use, and do research. As one student interviewee noted, methods courses now “matter to them.”

Articulating the benefit of methodological knowledge, faculty members from the one institution said that they wanted their students to become sound decision makers and problem solvers. Aligned with the CPED’s principles, developing students into problem solvers was a common theme among faculty interviewed. To accomplish this goal, program content encourages students to apply what they learn to problems in their practice setting. When it comes to method courses, instructors provide understandable information in increments or use a “just in time” approach. Examples of this include gap analysis, cycles of action research, and the research phases presented here by a faculty member from one institution:
Phase 1: Students complete research and inquiry coursework that focuses on epistemological perspectives and understanding of approaches to systematic inquiry (first-year coursework), research design (fall), quantitative analysis (fall), and qualitative analysis (spring).

Phase 2: Students explore theories and frameworks related to the field of educational leadership to gain lenses through which to understand their identified problems of practice (coursework focuses on leadership, social justice, professional development, educational policy, and research methods).

Phase 3: Students complete a capstone project that applies field-based inquiry, using professional and theoretical knowledge, to understand a problem of practice.

New pedagogies. The CPED as an innovation resulted in the development and diffusion (Rogers, 1995) of new programmatic ideas, such as newly developed pedagogies. Because of the CPED, programs created new pedagogies that focused on practitioner and adult learner interests and needs:

Writing boot camps—to improve students' academic writing and provide time for students to write academically
Modules—to allow online flexible learning
Case-based learning—to develop thinking about authentic problems of practice
Project-based learning—to encourage collaborative efforts around problems of practice
Guest speaker colloquia—to expose students to practitioners and academics who have addressed problems of practice
International trips—to broaden students' perspectives of education and leadership

Learning environments. In CPED institutions, learning environments vary; however, most are collaborative and constructivist in nature and designed to cross the university–practice divide. Even though some direct instruction and lecture still take place, most environments are complemented with internships or laboratories of practice so that students can learn from more knowledgeable others, with embedded fieldwork so that students can learn from practice, and with peer-to-peer collaboration to support learning. In one faculty member's words, "students take their learning back to their school sites, because it's not simply a theory-based program."

Patterns of engagement. Data show that faculty members in CPED-influenced programs are highly engaged with their students, often remaining with them through the dissertation phase. Data indicated that because of this intense relationship, students feel that faculty members valued their professional skills and experience. Students saw faculty members as respectful, understanding, caring, and committed to their success. The downside as indicated by faculty was that working with students this closely used valuable research and writing time. Some faculty interviewed mentioned that it was difficult to balance student commitments with other responsibilities, such as publishing. Others stated that if they were not willing to be as committed to students, they were asked to leave a program.

Dissertations. Dissertations in CPED-influence programs vary, but most are focused on problems of practice, which the CPED (2009, 2013) defines as "a persistent, contextualized, and specific issue embedded in the work of a professional practitioner, the addressing of which has the potential to result in improved understanding, experience, and outcomes." In most CPED programs, dissertation work is embedded in coursework and begins early. Dissertations are the cornerstone of many programs, and all coursework is linked to and so enhances their development. Some programs still have traditional five- or six-chapter dissertations. However, variations do exist. For example, most dissertations are the work of an individual, but some programs encourage group products. Students write thematic dissertations, produce technical reports or evaluations for a client, write three research articles bound by an introduction and a conclusion, produce a coauthored product, and write policy papers that offer the implications and alternatives of current policy initiatives in education. In most instances, students report their findings back to their constituents.
Impact on individuals

Through participation in the CPED, schools of education gained a new vision of the EdD; however, changes that resulted from CPED influence had an impact on administrators, faculty, and students in varied ways. Impacts as revealed by the data are explained as follows.

Administrators. At all 21 institutions, administrators were necessarily involved in the change process in various manners. At some institutions, involvement came from the upper level. For example, at one university, the president insisted that the revision of the EdD program be part of an overall restructuring of the institution’s curriculum. At another, the graduate dean was enthused about the possibilities of a refashioned EdD and provided financial support for faculty to have time and materials to plan and implement the new program.

More frequently, however, it was the school of education dean who was directly involved. The CPED gave deans new ways to bargain and collaborate across, as well as outside, their organizations. As a first indication of involvement, the dean of each school of education who applied to be part of the first CPED cohort had to sign an agreement to participate. This meant they would offer funds so faculty (and sometimes students) could attend biannual convenings. In addition, some deans provided the program’s principal investigator support through a graduate student so they could assist with program management. As noted, whether the dean chose to join the CPED in consultation with the faculty was critical to how change ideas were eventually accepted and diffused. Exemplifying Rogers’s (1995) notion of the importance of collaborative decision making, deans who acted alone in making the decision to join the CPED reported lingering fallout, whereas deans who formed a faculty-led team to develop the CPED proposal and program redesign plan saw more success.

The CPED offered deans a level of cachet that allowed them to introduce the change ideas to their upper administration with ease. As a result, they could provide financial support for faculty and, sometimes, graduate students to attend the biannual convenings as well as support the design or redesign process.

Occasionally, the dean and/or an associate dean attended convenings as well. In addition, several deans were able to host a CPED convening on their campuses, a custom that continues within the consortium. Having the dean’s support, both financially and through advocacy to upper administration and among reluctant faculty, has helped institutions be successful in their EdD redesign efforts. In several cases, where the original dean has left the school of education since the admission into the CPED, faculty reported that this departure meant less or a loss of support for the EdD redesign and participation in the CPED.

Beyond the satisfaction of seeing a new or revised EdD program get underway in their schools, several deans suggested that the CPED made their EdD programs distinct and of high quality and ultimately built enrollments and increased graduation rates. This success gave them credibility among upper administration and their faculty. In addition, among peers, deans noted that they benefited from the communication with other CPED deans at meetings of the Council of Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions. The CPED helped deans build and reinforce their professional network.

Faculty. Both the faculty member who was directly engaged with the CPED consortium (known as the principal investigator and who served as the liaison between the CPED and the home campus) and his or her home institution colleagues who worked with the program redesign were affected by the CPED. Specifically, the CPED provided a national network and framework within which faculty learned and contributed. This network of like-minded individuals offered new ways of thinking about program design, assessments, and ways to work within restrictive university policies. For example, faculty members learned how to pilot program features and gather data to show success before seeking approval from university governance. They learned how to develop group advising and dissertation committee structures. They were able to do these because they could “see what
others were doing” (faculty participant). Faculty members involved in the CPED also offered constructive criticism to help their colleagues improve their designs. This kind of sharing, contributing, and learning across a diverse group of faculty offered an unfamiliar but welcomed model of professional development and support to enact programmatic changes.

Once programs were implemented, faculty members noticed a shift in workload and changes in reward structures. Many faculty members described their workload as much more intense in terms of time, more interactive with students, and more engaging with their teaching colleagues. Faculty members in CPED-influenced programs are teaching in time frames that are more accommodating to their students and perhaps not so to their own schedules. In several cases, faculty members are coteaching courses, working together to design complementary courses, and meeting more regularly to discuss program design. Such interaction has changed and created new faculty-to-faculty relationships.

Another characteristic discovered across CPED-influenced programs is the intensive and extensive focus on students and their problems of practice. Such commitment has required the development of new courses and new ways of delivering them, along with expanded communication and collaboration with colleagues for coordination. Faculty members have had to be more collaborative with colleagues. Advisor-advisee relationships have changed, and faculty members are more interactive and engaging with students. These condensed programs of study with students moving at a quicker pace has simply required more of faculty members’ time.

Consequently, a frequently heard theme in the data was flexibility. Faculty members noted the continual need to be open to revision as their EdD programs are implemented. This was especially true when program leaders and participants retire or move away and new colleagues are hired. As one interviewee noted, “it is interesting to watch faculty who advocate change in PK12 settings figure out how to make changes in their own university workplaces that are typically conservative in terms of change.”

The cross-case analysis revealed that in some departments, faculty members received stipends for developing or teaching new courses, had a course buyout, or were provided a graduate assistant to help them with their work. At other schools, little or no remuneration was offered. Yet, despite the benefits of remuneration, financial encouragement was not the main reason why faculty members became invested in the CPED-influenced EdD redesign.

Rather, a majority of faculty across institutions cared deeply about understanding what it was that practitioner students in EdD programs wanted and needed in terms of their preparation and professional goals. Whether leading the redesign effort or serving as part of the faculty team, developing a new doctoral degree or revising an existing one required new ways of thinking, teaching, and advising. Faculty involved in the EdD redesign process have been encouraged by what they see their students learning and accomplishing as a result of program changes.

Changes in faculty roles and time commitments produced ongoing challenges for several institutions. For example, faculty members who were not directly involved in CPED meetings yet were affected by change results frequently resisted the changes to their role and time commitments. Their lack of support could frequently slow the design/redesign process in the department or school of education democratic system. Responses to resisting faculty have ranged from letting them stay out of program design/redesign to inviting them to dissertation defenses so that they could see the types and quality of research that students were performing and, in turn, want to get involved. Another example included junior tenure-track faculty who were appointed to be principal investigators and who often struggled to understand how this programmatic work and the work with the CPED fit into their tenure/reward process. Equally, data revealed that, in some cases, practitioners who were hired as clinical faculty did not feel welcomed into academic departments.

Students. Students in CPED-influenced programs explained that clearer distinctions between the PhD and the EdD made it obvious that the EdD was their degree of choice, for a variety of reasons. Overwhelmingly, students were drawn to and pleased with their program’s focus on their own problems of practice and professional goals, seeing im-
mediate relevance to their workplaces. Students welcomed the use of their practitioner knowledge and professional opinions in their classes. Students benefited from and welcomed the extended communication and interaction with faculty and with the members of their cohort, in terms of knowledge and encouragement.

Although all 21 EdD programs demonstrated some level of incorporation of the CPED principles, the students interviewed showed varied degrees of knowing the principles. The program in one institution, for example, is titled “The CPED EdD,” and students indicated familiarity with the key points and intents. In others, students were not immediately familiar with the CPED or with its principles. However, once given a copy of the CPED principles, the majority quickly stated, “Oh, yes, that describes what we are doing.” It seems even without knowing that their school or program was involved in the CPED, students could feel the shift in focus and purpose of EdD programs.

The data also revealed that many students interviewed felt that they were contributing to the changes in their programs. Many schools of education conducted focus groups with students and graduates to better understand their needs. Several programs created student advisory teams and frequently consulted the students about proposed and implemented changes. Other schools of education have ongoing opportunities for student feedback and recommendations through surveys, “quality council” meetings, faculty-student meetings, and exit surveys. Having a voice in the design and implementation of the EdD program provided students with opportunities for development and growth and created a sense of satisfaction.

IMPlications and Further Research

Utilizing Rogers’s (1995) diffusion of innovations as a theoretical framework, this cross-case study of 21 schools of education participating in the CPED initiative documents changes in the signature learning processes, learning environments, and patterns of engagement of administrators, faculty, and candidates in EdD programs. The significance of this study lies in its demonstration of how innovation was diffused and how change occurred when schools of education adopted the CPED’s principles and design concepts. As part of this learning, new frameworks of “lessons learned” or “best practices” are emerging and can aid other graduate schools of education in efforts to rethink and redesign doctoral study. Over the coming year, researchers will be producing exemplars of these lessons learned.

In the meantime, even with lessons emerging, more lines of research need to be developed. The institutions studied were part of the original cohort admitted in 2007. Since then, membership in the CPED has increased to 86 schools of education, and programs have continued to evolve and grow. Future studies can explore how and if changes at these 21 schools of education maintain or slip back into old ways of thinking about the EdD over time. Research may also investigate the challenges and benefits of newly designed programs in this economically challenged environment. More study about newer members and their ability to create and maintain similar changes is needed. Finally, and perhaps more crucial in today’s political climate, the CPED has been in existence long enough to investigate the impact that CPED-influenced program graduates are having on their work environments. With more member programs developing and more graduate emerging, the CPED is ripe for gathering evidence that has the potential to alter policies around leadership in education. These challenges and insights may be just what the EdD needs to be distinct and reclaimed.
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