



July 31, 2009

Maricelle Garcia
The Spencer Foundation
625 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Ms. Garcia,

Enclosed please find two copies of the narrative Final Report for the *Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate: Creating Rubrics for the Assessment of EdD Candidates* (Spencer Grant # 200900057).

We are appreciative of the grant that has benefited faculty, deans, and graduate students in the twenty-five participating colleges and universities, the Council of Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions, and the team that has led the initiative. Jill Perry, the Assistant Principal Investigator, and I are grateful to the Spencer Foundation for the funds provided and the support given over the past year. It has enabled us to document the purposes and goals of the pilot institutions and to build a rubric of candidate outcomes across the participating CPED colleges and universities. It has established a basis for cross-institutional comparisons and a way to describe the capabilities and competencies of candidates in the CPED institutions.

We are currently looking for additional monies to both expand our effort to include other graduate schools of education and to focus more carefully on actually assessing candidate competencies and characteristics.

We will be filing the financial report by the end of September. If you or other Spencer staff have any questions regarding the narrative report or the project, you can best contact me via email at davidimig@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

David Imig, PhD
CPED Project Director

cc: Lauren Jones Young
Walter Gmelch

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED)
c/o College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park 20782
301-405-7850

**Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate: Creating Rubrics for the Assessment of EdD
Candidates (Grant # 200900057)
Narrative Report to the Spencer Foundation July 31, 2009**

Executive Summary

With support from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CF), The *Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate* (CPED) was launched in February 2007. Its goal was to enhance the preparation of professional practitioners. During the first year of the project, we assembled some twenty-five graduate schools of education (most were members of the Council of Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions) and built a network of campus-based representatives to undertake this work. During the second year of the project, we began to focus on programmatic outcomes and candidate attainments for those enrolled in doctoral programs at the participating CPED institutions. At that time, we turned to the Spencer Foundation to help us document the cross-institutional efforts to identify these outcomes and attainments. With seed funding, CPED undertook a year-long research project to look across the work of the member institutions (with linkage to the dozen California State Universities engaged in parallel work) to determine if a common set of expectations or learning outcomes for professional practice doctorates in education could be developed.

We learned that all institutions have similar expectations for their candidates regardless of their field of study and that the influence of the national standards' movement for teacher and administrator preparation has had a significant impact on program design and the creation of benchmarks. This examination also provided us with the challenge of clarifying which practices led to the particular outcomes CPED institutions enumerated for their candidates. As a bi-product of the SF investment, we now have an evolving set of "promising practices" to use in the design or evaluation of their EdD programs. Commonalities revealed that we also had the basis to move forward to create a preliminary rubric of outcomes and an assessment design for EdD candidates (that might be aligned with the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and closely coupled with work undertaken by the University Council for Educational Administration.)

Findings from this SF funded initiative contribute to the scholarship on the preparation of professional practitioners and substantiate the claims made in the Shulman, Golde, Bueschel and Garabedian piece that appeared in the April 2006 *Educational Researcher*[1]. Findings have also advanced notions of signature pedagogies, laboratories of practice, assessments, and capstones and their role in the design and conduct of professional preparation programs. In addition, the potential for CPED to make a significant contribution to education lies in its goal to provide a means for assessing the capabilities and competencies of education doctorate graduates across the CPED institutions.

CPED is nearing the end of its initial three-year funding cycle - with the Spencer Foundation grant a major contribution to our on-going work. We recognize that CPED has the potential of enabling graduate schools of education to measure their impact by developing authentic assessments to be used across graduate schools of education. The findings from its Spencer Foundation funded research on outcomes is a means for developing standards for ensuring highly-qualified leaders are prepared at our graduate schools and colleges of education.

CPED Final Report: Introduction

Graduate schools of education are engaged in an extraordinary effort to revision their future, engage the profession, and build dynamic new partnerships with schools and colleges. One of the boldest efforts is to redefine and strengthen the professional practice degree to make it the degree of choice for aspiring school and classroom leaders. Graduate schools of education are analyzing and assessing every aspect of their doctoral programs with the goals of strengthening the programs and practices that lead to careers in both educational research and school and classroom leadership. Faculty and graduate students are working together to identify competencies and characteristics of outstanding leaders and trying to find ways to ensure that program graduates have such capacities to lead 21st century student learning. From recruitment and admission practices to program offerings and conduct, from the types of experiences undertaken and the assessments used to measure attainment, to the capstones required to assess proficiency and the placement and support provided, everything is being transformed. As a result of strategic investments by both the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CF) and the Spencer Foundation (SF), every aspect of this transformation is being closely examined and shared with others. Everything about this major redesign of graduate schools of education is intended to enhance the education of students.

With support from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CF), The *Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate* (CPED) was launched in February 2007. Its goal was to enhance the preparation of professional practitioners for schools and colleges. Its focus is on doctoral education in graduate schools of education with specific attention to the professional practice degree in education – the EdD. The project aim was to increase the quality of the experience for professional practitioners who teach in and/or lead the nation’s PK-12 schools, other colleges and universities, and the organizations that serve them. The project was designed to nurture two-dozen “proofing sites” where new designs for the EdD were to be considered, experimentation was to be undertaken, and evaluation occurred. CPED seeks to promote individual campus experimentation and to build a network of sites that are leading the way. The eventual goal is to affect the practices of all graduate schools of education through outreach to the universe of schools offering the EdD.

During the first year of the project, we assembled some twenty-five graduate schools of education (most were members of the Council of Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions) and built a network of campus-based representatives to undertake this work. Schools of education responded to invitations from CF to be part of this innovative network and we carefully examined their commitments and capacities for collaborative work with an array of peer institutions (mostly large public education schools located on campuses across the country.) Initially, we assembled lots of base-line data for each institution and then promoted cross-institutional collaboration and support through a series of "convenings" and participation in the national meetings of professional societies and associations. Each participating institution made the commitment to support the staffing of the initiative on the campus (usually released time for a faculty member or two, support for graduate students, and the travel of a team of three persons to two convenings per year.)

During the second year of the project, we began to focus on programmatic outcomes and candidate attainments for those enrolled in doctoral programs at the participating CPED institutions. We used convenings to focus on outcomes and attainments and gathered information from the participants. We tried to differentiate between school and teacher leadership outcomes and attainments for both programs and individual candidates. At that time, we turned to the Spencer Foundation to help us document the cross-institutional efforts to identify these outcomes and attainments. With seed funding from the Spencer Foundation, CPED undertook a year-long research project to look across the work of the twenty-five member institutions (with linkage to the dozen California State Universities engaged in similar and parallel work) to determine if a common set of expectations or learning outcomes for professional practice doctorates in education could be developed. Again, convenings provided a way to secure the interest of participants and to capture documents and data (in "pre-convening" homework assignments.) Data collected and analyzed from the individual institutions provided us with a basis for moving forward and seeking to build a set of common expectations and learning outcomes.

We learned that all of the institutions have similar expectations for their candidates regardless of their field of study. That the influence of the national standards' movement for teacher and administrator preparation has had a significant impact on program design and the creation of programmatic benchmarks. This examination also provided us with the challenge of clarifying which practices - core offerings and inquiry courses, pedagogies and clinical practices, faculty assignment and professional engagement, assessments and capstones - led to the particular outcomes CPED institutions enumerated for their candidates. For some, this represented a major detour from the primary task of identifying measurable outcomes; for others, this was a necessary step to maintain the integrity of the effort. As a bi-product of the SF investment, we now have an evolving set of "promising practices" for EdD programs to use in the design or evaluation of their programs. Commonalities across institutions in program offerings and candidate expectations revealed that we also had the basis to move forward to create a preliminary rubric of outcomes and an assessment design for EdD candidates (that might be aligned with the work of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and closely coupled with work undertaken by the University Council for Educational Administration.)

Findings from this SF funded initiative contribute to the scholarship on the preparation of professional practitioners and substantiate the claims made in the Shulman, Golde, Bueschel and Garabedian piece that appeared in the April 2006 *Educational Researcher*[1]. That article argued that drawing better distinctions between a scholarship of practice and the scholarship of research in education is essential to strengthen both the PhD in Education and the professional practice degree in education (EdD). Findings have also advanced notions of signature pedagogies, laboratories of practice, assessments, and capstones and their role as guiding principles in the design and conduct of professional preparation programs. In addition, this work has advanced knowledge about institutional transformation and change and has offered "proofing sites" as models for use by other graduate schools of education that are not currently members of the CPED initiative.

In addition to contributing to the on-going debate regarding the potential of graduate schools of education continuing the role as a primary incubator of new talent for staffing the nation's

schools and colleges, the potential for CPED to make a significant contribution lies in its goal to provide a means for assessing the capabilities and competencies of education doctorate graduates across the CPED institutions. Our education system faces enormous challenges that demand a new form of school leadership – leaders who possess a new vision, have a different “skill set”, are innovators and entrepreneurs, understand both student learning and the dynamics of local communities, believe in “systems thinking” and are willing to experiment with promising practices. Preparing highly effective school and classroom leaders is the key to addressing the myriad of problems that face schooling in this country.

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate is nearing the end of its initial three year funding cycle - with the Spencer Foundation grant a major contribution to our on-going work. Across the spectrum of participating institutions, some remain at the beginning stages (admitting their first student cohorts in September 2009) while others have graduated students and are studying the impact they are having on the PK-20 schools and classrooms. CPED has the potential of enabling graduate schools of education to measure their impact by developing authentic assessments to be used across the network of graduate schools of education. The findings from its Spencer Foundation funded research on outcomes is a means for developing standards for ensuring highly-qualified leaders are prepared at our graduate schools and colleges of education.

Review of Initiative Goals for Research

With the goal of enhancing the preparation of PK-20 professional practitioners in the nation's graduate schools of education, CPED focused primarily on improving the preparation of school and classroom leaders. (There were parallel threads or strands that focus on organizational leadership and on leadership for community colleges and professional development schools.) Most of these potential leaders were enrolled in doctoral programs in some 150 graduate schools of education and CPED was determined to enhance the quality of the experiences they received and the support that was provided in their training and initial placement. With seed funding from the Spencer Foundation, the initiative was able to seriously examine whether the collaborative identification of best practices and program outcomes was a positive way to proceed. We began this phase of the project by:

- Preparing a set of common rubrics for graduates of professional practice programs leading to responsibilities in clinical teacher education, school leadership, and the management of educational organization.
- Translating the rubrics of professional practice into a framework that can be used to build a common set of assessments that can be used across CPED to guide the work of the institutions and ensure high quality in the professional practice doctorate.
- Preparing a framework for sharing the experiences, data, prototypes, and outcomes with other colleges and universities.

Due to the influence of Lee Shulman, CF President and originator of the grant that launched the initiative, CPED sought to define what *stewards of practice* should know, believe, and be able to do and to redefine professional practice preparation programs to align with these expectations and outcomes. With the Spencer Grant, CPED institutions were able to work to cross campus-

boundaries and to work with other institutions to facilitate the identification of common outcomes for both student performance and consequently, program design; began the mapping of these onto a rubric that defined commonalities for EdD candidates in school and teacher leadership, guided the construction of laboratories of practice (redefined internship and clinical experiences) and laid the groundwork for both institutional and cross-institutional evaluation.

Summary of Activities

The original research design proposed was to create groups of CPED members that would produce “outcomes” for each of the three targeted programs areas in CPED— school leadership, clinical practice in teacher education, and organizational leadership. We then aimed to bring together an oversight committee, chaired by Ellen Goldring (Vanderbilt), to help envision this work and, ultimately, to gather the work of the separate teams, fashion it into a common protocol for all institutions, and produce a common rubric with “measurable” outcomes that could be used by all institutions to determine the effectiveness of their efforts.

While the goals of the research did not change, the design for conducting the research was restructured when it was realized that time, resource and distance constraints would not permit the organizing of several individual groups. Instead, we sought to have greater participation of CPED members and to utilize common meeting times/locations— CPED convenings, UCEA and AACTE annual meetings, the AERA annual meeting in San Diego, and the CPED website— to gather data, to elicit responses from members, and to receive constructive oversight from Ellen Goldring (Vanderbilt) and Robert Yinger (Cincinnati). Given that this ambitious initiative is being undertaken with “grassroots leadership”[2]— faculty members from the twenty-five institutions at the helm of creating new programs and a new identity for the professional practice doctorate— we felt it important to have the input from all members to ensure meaningful results. In addition, to accommodate this goal, we made this work central to the June 2009 CPED Convening. As a result, we asked for and received a no-cost extension for one month and extended our work until July 31, 2009.

The research was conducted in three phases[3]. In the first phase, member institutions (see Appendix A) were asked to prepare a description of student and program outcomes in four areas of their EdD degree— core/foundation courses, inquiry courses, capstone experiences, internship or laboratory of practice experience— that could lead to Shulman's goal of a “low stakes-high yield” assessment system for EdD candidates in school leadership, clinical practice in teacher education, and organizational leadership. Prior to the the October 2008 CPED Convening hosted by the University of Southern California, participants we asked to bring demonstrations of outcomes in the following program areas: core/foundation coursework, inquiry coursework, capstone experiences, and internship experiences (or laboratories of practice). This data was collected and discussion of analysis and expectations for outcomes was presented to 68 CPED member faculty and graduate student present at the convening. From these data, a thematic analysis produced three documents— *a Thematic Analyses by Institution*, *a Taxonomic Analysis of Professional Practice Degree (or EdD) Graduate Characteristics*, and a *Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric* (see Appendix C). These documents were then posted on the CPED website (<http://cpedinitiative.org>) in a forum discussion where a handful of CPED member faculty provided feedback on methodology and results of the data

analysis. A larger reporting out and discussion took place at a “town hall” meeting at the AERA 2009 Annual Meeting in San Diego where 45 attending members from 22 institutions plus Anthony Bryk, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Lee Shulman, former President, spent three hours in focus group and broad discussions about the results, their viability, and the future directions of assessing the results.

Discussions from the AERA town hall and from the website postings resulted in the second phase of the analysis where members comments and concerns led to a second round of analysis of the *Taxonomic Analysis of Professional Practice Degree (or EdD) Graduate Characteristics*, and the *Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric*. In addition, member discussions led to the identification of three main issue categories concerning the development of EdD programs and preparation of highly qualified practitioners. Epistemological, conceptual, and process issues generated a set of questions that serve to guide the development of programs and the definition of what practitioners should know and be able to do (see Appendix D).

The results of phases I & II were then sent to Ellen Goldring and Robert Yinger, who were invited to serve as “experts” with the particular assignments of: 1) attending the June 2009 CPED Convening in Palo Alto and serving as “critical friends” for the convening with the opportunity to offer observations and guidance, 2) reviewing the outcomes-documents that resulted from the data analysis, 3) considering the way CPED gathered data from member institutions and its feasibility for getting at ways that institutions have transformed their EdD programs, 4) identifying gaps and holes in the process and making recommendations for other things CPED can do, and 5) making recommendations about ways to build a case-based approach for the further refinement of the CPED programs.

The final phase of this research consisted of engaging the insights and feedback of Dr. Goldring and Dr. Yinger on CPED progress at the June 2009 CPED convening. Sixty-five CPED members from all institutions worked over five hours to consider and expound on the following questions:

- How do we determine/review outcome quality?
- How do we define indicators and operationalize them?
- What are our sources and understanding of quality of evidence?
- What is our unit of measurement?
- How frequently should we measure?
- Who responsible for collection of data?
- Who places the judgments and determines evaluation?
- Who should be involved in determining outcomes?

Dr. Goldring and Dr. Yinger then provided a final report that recognized the hard work undertaken and progress made over the year of funding by CPED members as well as the potential that CPED has to become the national leader in redefining professional practice preparation. They also acknowledge, given the enormity of the task and the consequences of the results on graduate schools of education, professional practitioners, and national policy on PK-20 leadership, that much work remains to be undertaken. In particular, they have suggested that our work better align with that underway by the NBPTS and focus more precisely on 3-5 outcomes that can be assessed across institutions (see Appendix E). Despite the end of this

initial grant from the SF, we continue with this work. Next steps for the CPED research will be based on the convening discussions and recommendations from Dr. Goldring and Dr. Yinger.

This brief description is meant to provide a summary of the activities undertaken with the Spencer research grant. A full description of methodology and findings can be found in the appendices. The next section will summarize the major findings from each phase of this project as well as the significance and recommendations for future action.

Summary of Findings and Significance

The one-year, Spencer Foundation seed grant was meant to begin investigations and establish a research agenda to enable the education profession to take a major step towards reclaiming the education doctorate. The goals were: 1) to determine that a common rubric could be developed for assessing what graduates of professional practice doctorate programs know, believe, and are able to do, and, 2) to establish a need for more research and development around common assessments and standards for educational leaders. The results of one-year have proven to be both fruitful as well as more extensive than originally anticipated. Analysis of outcomes documents provided by twenty-five CPED member institutions has demonstrated that strong commonalities exist across institutions in their development of professional practice programs and expectations for graduates of these programs. The sources of these commonalities are both the extant literature on leadership in education as well as the several benchmarking efforts provided by state agencies (INTASC and ISLLC) and professional societies (NCATE and TEAC). These commonalities are the foundation for developing common assessments for graduates and for developing the programs that prepare highly-qualified practitioners.

In the first phase of the research, we discovered that the development of assessments for graduates could not come without simultaneously determining the characteristics of a professional practice doctorate program. Therefore, our analysis took on two themes with parallel paths—educational leaders and preparation program construction. From the data collected, these two themes emerged and reflected the main points of inquiry set forth by CPED and the research literature upon which this project is grounded. Our first goal was to understand each CPED institution program in light of these two themes (see Appendix C). We then conducted a secondary, in-depth analysis to compare emergent themes from initial findings in order to brainstorm a working list of domains. This analytical process resulted in a working taxonomy, the *CPED Taxonomic Analysis: PPD Graduate Characteristics*, which describes six areas of competencies—Inquiry stance, Equity stance, Community engagement/Social responsiveness, Leadership ability, Harnessing human capital, and Commitment to continuous improvement. To look more closely at candidate assessment, we then amplified these six areas to focus on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of graduates. The resulting document, the *Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric*, is a commencement of dissecting the taxonomy to develop a rubric that could allow for assessment of candidate performance. This rubric has been compared to those established by ELCC and ISLIC and we have determined that CPED institutions have identified an additional area for candidate evaluation—the *ability to harness human capital*.

This initial work of comparing outcomes across twenty-five institutions has been productive for it has confirmed that commonalities exist in EdD programs, namely that common graduate outcomes are expected and that these outcomes need to be assessed in a way that informs program development and leader preparation. Admittedly, one of our greatest challenges in this process has been to interrogate these two themes – characteristics of an educational leader and characteristics of preparation programs – separately in a way that would allow one to inform the other. We anticipate future work will focus more closely to achieve this end.

In the second phase, member review of phase one research resulted in the development of a set of issues and questions that led us to better differentiate between candidate and program outcomes. Epistemological, conceptual and process issues then pushed our distinction and research further by asking a set of questions that aimed to understand the goals and outcomes for programs and candidates (see Appendix D). These questions have provided the basis for faculty conversations at CPED institutions as they consider all aspects of program development and graduate outcomes – core courses, inquiry preparation, internships or laboratories of practice, faculty qualifications, assessments, capstones; as well as the admissions criteria for incoming candidates and expectations for the development of skills, knowledge, and dispositions and how to measure those. In the coming years of this project, institutions will utilize this research to reconsider program components and how those sufficiently prepare graduates to tackle both national and local issues in schools and organizations.

The third phase of this research served to gain outside perspective on the research project to date and to provide future direction for CPED. The work of CPED has been purposely isolated for the past 2.5 years so that member institutions could have time for the "intellectual interrogation" of the concepts outlined in the work CF and Lee Shulman – *signature pedagogies, capstones, laboratories of practice, authentic assessments, scholarship of teaching, etc.* This time produced advancements in thinking about the needs of practitioners, the needs of PK-20 institutions, and the needs for school and teacher leader preparation. However, as CPED moves forward and develops concepts and definitions around program and candidate assessment, we seek to both share and align our work at the national level. Therefore, it was necessary to gain perspectives from beyond our original sources and we concentrated on gaining understanding of new Carnegie president Anthony Bryk's work and its impact on creating more entrepreneurial school and teacher leaders. We also invited Ellen Goldring and Robert Yinger to review the outcomes work which provided perspective on process and results and recommendations for future directions. Their contributions have validated the CPED findings and given strong recommendations to move forward in developing outcomes for candidates that can inform the work of the NBPTS and other doctorate programs around the nation.

The research undertaken over the past year has contributed to our ways of imaging a common set of standards for expectations or learning outcomes for professional practice doctorates in education. The results demonstrate that across twenty-five schools and colleges of education, common goals and expectations for programs and practitioners are driving faculty and graduate students to establish standards or expectations for the professional practice doctorate that would parallel what has been offered for PhD programs in education. Indeed, as Lorrie Shepard (NEAD) and Felice Levine (AERA) work with the National Research Council to attempt to profile the field of education, they have suggested that CPED is the central body for

confronting the challenge of differentiating between the PhD and EdD. As CPED continues to advance the research and development of professional practitioner preparation, it is already recognized that not only has our work demonstrated several “proofing sites”, or institutions that have advanced outcomes in program design and candidate evaluation, but also that as a larger group we are determining what is most promising or exemplary for leaders and leadership development.

Over the next 3-5 years, CPED will seek additional funding to test the outcomes for program design and graduate assessment. In doing so, CPED members are re-envisioning the role of the EdD in the context of the new Carnegie Foundation design-engineering-development (DED) initiative focused on schooling. Members will consider innovative ways to engage stakeholders in school communities and the for-profit education sector to develop cases and/or simulations that can be used to better prepare and test practitioners. In addition, though CPED members are individually documenting their change strategies for program development and outcomes assessment, an evaluation of the work done to date needs to be undertaken for the initiative as a whole. Such an evaluation will allow CPED to better describe the efforts of all two-dozen institutions for the larger community.

For a host of reasons, it is believed that CPED is a worthy effort and can benefit all education schools as they struggle to redesign and renew their graduate degree programs. This particular initiative, while focused on preparing professional practitioners, can also contribute to strengthening all of doctoral education at CADREI member institutions. Careful consideration of professional *practice degrees* can benefit the way that faculty and others look at their *research degrees*. Given the host of recent criticism regarding education schools, it is believed that this should be a matter of high priority and, ultimately, will benefit not only institutions selected to participate in the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, but all schools and colleges of education.

In addition to the strong efforts of our CPED members, we continue to learn of other efforts around the nation to tackle the redesign of the EdD. Every week, seemingly, a new institution inquires about ways that they can benefit from our work. To meet that need, the work of CPED is being disseminated in many ways. Several CPED members will be presenting their outcomes work at University Council for Education Administration (UCEA), American Educational Research Association (AERA), and American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) annual meetings. At least two book proposals are in place and several scholarly papers are in progress. In addition, CPED leadership is seeking funding to advance the utility of the website to serve as a resource and communication space for members and non-members alike. We have already developed several knowledge galleries to share products of program deliberations and designs. Our goal in the next 3-5 years is to strengthen our knowledge, bring it to the larger education community, and to engage in broader discussions while leading the way to reclaiming the education doctorate.

Appendix A: CPED Member Institutions

Institution	Type	CPED Focus Area
Arizona State University	Public	School Leadership
California State System	Public/multi-campus	School Leadership
University of Central Florida	Public	School Leadership
University of Colorado, Denver	Public	School Leadership
University of Connecticut	Public	School Leadership
Duquesne University	Private	School Leadership
University of Florida	Public	School Leadership
University of Houston	Public	School, Teacher, & Organization Leadership
University of Kansas	Public	School Leadership
University of Kentucky	Public	Organizational Leadership
University of Louisville	Public	School Leadership
Lynn University	Private	School, Teacher, & Organization Leadership
University of Maryland	Public	Organizational Leadership
University of Missouri-Columbia	Public	School Leadership
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Public	School & Teacher Leadership
Northern Illinois University	Public	School Leadership
University of Oklahoma	Public	School Leadership
Pennsylvania State University	Public	Teacher Leadership
Rutgers University	Public	Teacher & School Leadership
University Southern California	Private	School, Teacher, & Organization Leadership
University of Vermont	Public	Leadership
Virginia Commonwealth University	Public	School Leadership
Virginia Tech University	Public/multi-campus	School Leadership
Washington State University	Public/multi-campus	Teacher & Organizational Leadership
The College of William & Mary	Public	School, Teacher, & Organization Leadership

Appendix B: Full Description of Methodology, Data Collection, and Analysis

To conduct this research, the researchers specifically settled on the design of grounded theory (Creswell, 1998). This design is intended to generate or discover a theory, an abstract analytical schema of a phenomenon (the development of a specific course of advanced training and education for educational practitioners) that relates to a particular situation (the need in-field, for educational practitioners that can approach their practice within a context of situational leadership and be able to problematize their practice in order to function as adaptive change agents responsive to multiple stakeholder needs that may arise).

Grounded theory allows for the study of individuals as they engage in and respond to a phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). Researchers can study how individuals act within and react to this phenomenon by gathering data in the form of interviews, field observations, artifact review, and site visits. Researchers then analyze this data, developing a sense of interrelations among themes, connections, and then develop theoretical propositions or hypotheses in order to present a conceptual framework for the theory.

The purpose of this research was to identify thematic consistency among the 25 CPED institutions with regard to the professional practice degree, or EdD, program structure and expectations for practitioner outcomes and their alignment to school, college, or organizational expectations and established professional standards/competencies.

The study was conducted in two phases over the project life cycle. The first phase of data collection and analysis process commenced with the review of reports provided by the 25 participating institutions on their individual approaches to professional practice program development according to CPED organizational themes: signature pedagogy, capstone requirements, laboratories of practice, scholarship of teaching, and assessments. The initial analysis of these reports yielded three concrete deliverables: *a Thematic Analyses by Institution*, *a Taxonomic Analysis of Professional Practice Degree (or EdD) Graduate Characteristics*, and *a Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric* (see Appendix C) representing six themes derived from the primary thematic analysis: Inquiry Stance, Equity Stance, Leadership, Human Capital, Community Engagement, and Continuous Improvement.

These documents were made available for electronic review to CPED institutional partners and at the 2009 American Educational Research Association meeting in San Diego to serve as a member check. The AERA town hall meeting took place in a loosely organized focus groups and researchers collected field notes and working group documents as artifacts to inform the second stage of analysis.

The second phase of data collection and analysis led to a second thematic analysis of the original CPED institutional outcomes data viewed through the lens of new institutional perspectives resulting from comments submitted electronically, data gathered at the AERA town hall meeting, as well researchers' consideration of certain professional standards (ISLLC and ELCC) that help ground the work within a national context.

Researchers approached the identification of institutional outcomes through a secondary theoretical lens comprised of three areas of organizational design that intends to be the groundwork for a common assessment system for EdD candidates in school leadership, clinical practice in teacher education, and organizational leadership.

Researchers considered the identification of what candidates should know, believe, and be able to do (following Shulman's *Habits of Mind, Heart, and Hand* concepts) in each of the aforementioned three areas with a description of appropriate levels of proficiency. Researchers intended to demonstrate how each institution is both examining its own assessment protocol for the EdD and the process for documenting the progress of programmatic change toward a new EdD, as well as a demonstration of shared accomplishments and challenges across CPED institutions, as new outcomes are piloted. The reporting of the aforementioned outcomes criteria was intended to occur within the following parameters:

- Core/foundation coursework
- Inquiry coursework
- Capstone experiences
- Internship experiences (or laboratories of practice)

Data Source Phase 1: Institutional Reports from CPED Partner Institutions

These data artifacts were selected to comprise the data source for the following reasons:

- Access: Gatekeepers to program content and information are readily available as representative leaders within the CPED Initiative; the CPED initiative invites and works with each institution's program faculty and leadership toward each bi-annual convening.
- The Institutional Reports represent the most current and robust articulation of institutional program requirements, intent, and outcomes.
-

Data Collection and Organization Procedure Phase 1

All institutions provided reports in advance and at the behest of CPED leadership. The reports varied greatly in format and intent, though guidelines for producing these reports were provided by leadership. Not all reports yielded relevant data, nor the same quality and quantity of data. The basic format of the data protocols provided below is based on the two guiding themes mentioned above.

Data Analysis Phase 1

A semi-structured thematic analysis was conducted, interrogating reports from CPED participating institutions that outlined the purpose, development, and implementation of select professional practice doctoral programs. Researchers brainstormed and developed two guiding themes (*The Educational Leader and The Program Construct*) that reflected the main points of inquiry set forth by CPED that were based on nascent themes drawn from guiding literature. All of the institutional reports that serve as data sources for this study were obtained from CPED participating institutions that maintain programs in varying stages of development and implementation.

After the initial review of institutional reports, researchers conducted a secondary in-depth analysis to compare emergent themes from initial findings in order to brainstorm a working list of domains. This analytical process resulted in a working taxonomy that has been represented in this report as the *Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric* (see Appendix C).

The thematic analysis process enabled researchers to look at emerging data with an eye for developing additional domains and to facilitate the identification of unexpected patterns or categories. Researchers modified the working taxonomy as the process of coding data protocols progressed. The taxonomy was further modified as the inquiry continued and domains were further deconstructed. This second analytical approach was a more refined and focused effort directly based on the broader approach of the initial inquiry. The second examination of this data set yielded domains that resonated with researchers more as sub-domains to the initial set of themes extracted from the first data set – these domains yielded the indicators for content analysis.

Researchers coded protocols with an awareness of contextual elements that might not be readily evident from the institutional reports (for example, the nuances of the CPED lexicon and the intent of CPED leadership). The codes were then compiled and duplicate codes were eliminated. The presentation of findings in this report is also based upon foundational themes extracted from researchers' field notes obtained from the October 2008 Convening.

Results from the data analysis of this phase can be found in Appendix C.

Data Source Phase 2: CPED member review

CPED member faculty were gathered at the 2009 AERA Annual Meeting for a “town hall” forum based on their availability and willingness to participate in a focus group discussion of the findings of the initial institutional outcomes analysis. Participant bias: Because the findings in question were derived from an analysis of data collected from the partner institutions' reports, researchers understood that program leadership/faculty opinions about the content would be partial to their specific culture or disciplinary preferences.

Data Collection and Organization Procedure: Phase 2

Though the primary data collection method for this phase of the study was focus group interviewing, the recording of subject interaction was performed through field notes and participant note taking, rather than audio recording. The richness of data from this component of data collection was gleaned from multiple data collection approaches – both the participants and researchers kept notes. Researchers collected observations and notes that would be compared during the data organization. Participants were directed to engage in full group discussion, as well as breaking out into smaller groups and conducting reflective activity, while a scribe was assigned in each group to record the outcomes of the activities.

A specific interview and observational protocol was not utilized during this data collection effort, though researchers played an active part in facilitating group dialog and reflection and designed the group activity protocols that would define the structure of the town hall forum.

Data Analysis Phase 2

Following the methods of grounded theory data analysis protocol, the discussions from the AERA town hall meeting generated three main issue categories: Epistemological, Conceptual, and Process. Each issue category represents a distinct level of consideration among focus group participants that is dimensionalized on a continuum ranging from structures of consciousness (Epistemological) to concepts of systematic reflection and causality (Conceptual), to the conditions and constructs within which phenomena occur (Process).

The coding paradigm began with the exploration of interrelationships among categories; however the representation of data was most appropriate as a hierarchical schema. The results of these issue categories can be found in Appendix D.

Appendix C: Outcomes from Phase I

Thematic Analyses by Institution and Considerations

Arizona State University

The Educational Leader:

- Problematize local practice and respond to critical issues; contextualize issues
- Seek guidance through literature in the field; function as active consumer of larger and smaller scale data
- Adapt theoretical frameworks to localized application
- Systemic view of institutional relationships; systematic inquiry following problems through holistic process toward root causes

The Program Construct:

- Three year time frame involving two major applied and localized research efforts developed through inquiry coursework culminating in dissertation capstone. Main project outcome: show local/community benefit through research.

California State University – Fresno

The Educational Leader:

- The visionary leader is the prototypical graduate able to problematize, assess, intervene, and evaluate. Able to gather information from the field and from literature, this leader can lead across “educational silos” and contribute to the field through outcomes-based studies conducted within a localized framework.

The Program Construct:

- Applied research efforts built on groundwork of diversity in education toward policy-based reform.
- Evidence-based decision-making among leaders who can function as consumers of general information regarding critical issues, as well as being able to delegate toward more specialized colleagues.
- Standard dissertation path.

Duquesne University

The Educational Leader:

- Functions within a culture of dialogic argument – a constructivist ideal that sees the leader work on a continuum of knowledge development that can benefit institutions through continuous improvement. The leader is always problematizing practice.

The Program Construct:

- The curriculum is focused on embedded inquiry concepts and emphasizes themes of social responsiveness and maintaining an audit trail that marks the process if accountability to stakeholders.
- Learning occurs primarily within field-based settings.
- Capstone assessment options are varied, but maintain the common theme of direct social contribution.

University of Kansas

The Educational Leader:

- Governs with a foundational vision
- Values human capital and can connect skill sets with critical issues
- Implements evidence-based decisions and maintains transparency to all stakeholders
- Understands issues that occur on a localized basis within the larger context of literature surrounding these issues in the field
- Maintains a communication framework with varied constituencies in order to maintain a systemic understanding of local issues in a holistic context
- Values the constructivist ideal of pushing new knowledge from localized contexts outward to the field; encourages colleagues and staff to maintain high levels of professional growth to sustain this continuum

University of Kentucky

The Educational Leader:

- Promotes community growth through workforce development.
- Understands the relational dynamics of localized issues within larger system contexts
- Approaches practice through an inquiry stance that enables localized inquiry outcomes to contribute to larger dialogs within the field, though such outcomes are not necessarily generalizable in the traditional sense
- Contextualizes the culture of the institution or organizational body in which critical issues arise; this localized understanding of dynamics serves to specify design concepts with regard to evaluation and implementation

The Program Construct:

- Three year process involves building a base of contextual understanding of the field and an inquiry skill sets in years 1 and 2, followed by a focus on student outcomes assessment and organizational management in year 3. This leads to a capstone experience comprised of team efforts toward development of research proposals with aims of direct local contribution.

University of Central Florida

The Program Construct:

- Practitioners build on existing professional base, but view local contexts within larger theoretical framework within the field
- Learn to problematize their practice within a framework of systematic inquiry
- With a focus on utilization, learn to use evaluation studies, reports, and research findings toward developing application-oriented plans of action in response to local critical issues
- Practicum experience involves applying aforementioned process to a specific, selected issue occurring in a local professional context; subject to evaluation by program leadership

University of Missouri – Columbia

The Educational Leader:

- Transforms organizations through disruption of established beliefs/practices
- Focuses on continuous improvement
- Approaches practice with a constructivist vision and remains a step ahead of accountability mandates

The Program Construct:

- Practitioners view organizations through a lens of reform
- Utilize theoretical frameworks to evaluate local contexts
- Develop an inquiry stance and select local critical issues to frame problems that can be diagnosed toward the development of interventions
- Maintain data sources regarding selected issues in context toward capstone work
- Demonstrate knowledge through relating inquiry process to program advisors
- Report and communicate findings regarding recommendations for improvement in local contexts resulting from inquiry process

Northern Illinois University

The Educational Leader:

- Is reflexive within his/her practice
- Takes stakeholder dispositions into account when examining local problems in context

The Program Construct:

- Core knowledge will reflect understanding of scholarship from the engaged consumer's perspective
- Ability to problematize issues in practice
- Ability to engage in broad-based inquiry efforts throughout an organizations and the ability to garner support from all relevant stakeholders
- Capstone experience is intended to afford the practitioner the opportunity to synthesize knowledge gained and demonstrate contribution to the field

University of Oklahoma

The Program Construct:

- Main outcomes/competencies: ability to apply research in local contexts; demonstrate sound judgment (evidence-based) in leadership; synthesize knowledge via capstone project
- Practitioners gain knowledge of various conceptual frameworks in education, including student affairs and organizational management through embedded field experiences
- Practitioners are consequently socialized into leadership frameworks
- The inquiry cycle is conducted entirely in-field
- Four year program sequence culminates in a field-based practicum immediately followed by capstone work occurring in varied formats: grouped/thematic; localize problem; policy evaluation; traditional

Pennsylvania State University

The Program Construct:

- Core focus on teacher education, specializing in Research in Teacher Education, The Role of Foundation Courses in Teacher Education, History and Policies of Teacher Education, The Role of Field Experiences in Teacher Education, The Role of Methods Courses in Teacher Education.

- Demonstrate inquiry stance through reflection and understanding problems of practice.
- Engage with faculty and other graduate students in grouped research projects
- Engage in at least two field-based practitioner rotations including: (1) research rotation; (2) teaching rotation; (3) supervision rotation; (4) community rotation.

Rutgers University

The Educational Leader:

- Demonstrates leadership skills in three main areas: curricular design/implementation; organizational management; teacher development

The Program Construct:

- Program foci include: communities of practice; continuity of program facilitation in theme and faculty; explicit connections between theory and practice; capstone experience that demonstrates clear benefit to practice
- Core/inquiry focus: ability to identify knowledge gaps and consequently frame problems in order to develop inquiry approach
- Utilize field experience and in-field mentor relationships to build toward an applied capstone experience that demonstrates local contribution

University of Colorado – Denver

The Educational Leader:

- Driven by an equity mind-set to problematize practice and ensure a standard of inclusiveness in education

The Program Construct:

- Focus on extended interaction with traditionally marginalized members of the educational stakeholder community
- Develop holistic approach to framing problems in practice by taking non-school based advocates into consideration
- Pursue localized problem through guided research experience with program faculty
- Build toward grouped or individual capstone experience, working directly with representative of context in which localized problem is being studied

Lynn University

The Educational Leader:

- Demonstrates proficiency in leadership, equity, accountability and assessment, and curriculum planning

The Program Construct:

- Three year process that includes development of inquiry stance intermixed with field study and application in years 1 and 2; year 3 involves the identification of a core problem and the application of the inquiry cycle toward a capstone experience

University of Connecticut

The Educational Leader:

- Perceives the inquiry cycle holistically in order to maintain a systemic perspective on the process and not lose sight of key stakeholders or issues

- Problematize a specific issue in practice, but utilizes theoretical frameworks found in literature to re-vision the issue multiple times in order to gain a better understanding of the complexities of the problem and all contribution dynamics

The Program Construct:

- All core program experiences are unified and build (regarding content and deliverables) toward the capstone experience
- Practitioners complete several cycles of inquiry in order to build toward the capstone project
- Develop ability to synthesize and deliver information in a variety of formats
- Practitioners mitigate their authority dependence and develop ability to be decisive based on their own interpretation of findings
- Years 1 and 2 involve developing knowledge base synchronized with practicum/field-base inquiry experiences. During year 3 the outcomes of these inquiry efforts culminate in a draft capstone deliverable that is refined and defended through year 4

University of Houston

The Educational Leader:

- Independently problematizes, assesses, designs and evaluates critical issues and responsive interventions in practice

The Program Construct:

- Development of inquiry stance occurs in a localized context and practitioner outcomes demonstrate community benefit
- Practicum experience models team-oriented facilitation as it would occur in the field
- Local educational leaders are active partners in the process of developing practitioners – college faculty collaborate with leaders to help vet the feasibility and relevance of practitioner research topics
- Practitioners engage in an action research cycle of: reflect à inquire à collaborate à share
- The capstone experience resembles a consultation model, providing recommendations to local stakeholders that demonstrate direct community benefit

University of Louisville

The Educational Leader:

- Exemplifies core competencies: critical thinking; problem solving; leadership
- Conducts effective practice through constant reflexivity methods

The Program Construct:

- The inquiry process involves planning, implementation, and evaluation as interdependent steps, not discrete efforts learned in linear progression
- Curricular development is learner-centered and focused on the needs of candidates and the localized contexts in which they will be employed
- Experiential outcomes determine course content, not vice versa; problems in context drive learning
- Capstone experiences must demonstrate benefit to local contexts
- Capstone experiences must promote awareness; recommend action; or evaluate existing processes

University of Maryland

The Educational Leader:

- Has a general awareness of the knowledge base of the field and can make informed inquiries into the general contexts surrounding specific critical issues

The Program Construct:

- Develop strong competencies in evaluation; inquiry design; and communicating to various stakeholder groups with discrete dispositions
- Field experiences represent demonstration of synthesis of knowledge base

University of Nebraska – Lincoln

The Program Construct:

- Necessary to acknowledge the parameters of professional practice education and develop a strategic coalition responsive to the needs of all stakeholders: students, faculty, administration, and especially the leaders in the field; clear articulations should be made between progress in practice and impacts on scholarship and vice versa

University of Southern California

The Educational Leader:

- Utilizes gap analysis methodology to problematize practice toward continuous improvement
- Localizes inquiry with a clear understanding of cultural dynamics specific to the institution
- Promotes the inquiry stance as an organizational attitude beyond the individual

The Program Construct:

- Principles of core knowledge: leadership, learning, diversity and accountability
- Inquiry is a framework through which all experiences are conducted and an ongoing lens through which the practitioner evaluates learning
- Capstone experiences model real-world aspects of in-field problem solving including facilitating team dynamics and contextualizing localized issues.
- Field experience, like the inquiry stance, is linked to the overall program experience throughout is continuum

University of Vermont

The Educational Leader:

- Focused on transforming the outcomes of individuals and institutions within local and specific contexts

The Program Construct:

- Cohorts of practitioners focus on applied inquiry, leadership, and change within learning organizations
- Capstone experience is addressed early in the practitioner's tenure and planning begins within year 2 of a potentially 5-year stretch
- Capstone experience is problem-based and focuses on localized inquiry

Virginia Commonwealth University

The Educational Leader:

- Engages critical issues through a variety of available theoretical and contextual lenses
- Extends the inquiry mindset toward the organizational to maintain a model of continual learning and improvement
- Has a global understanding of the learning organization and its localized dynamics, in order to implement multi-tiered inquiry/evaluation plans

The Program Construct:

- Cohort model focuses on contextualized inquiry supported by a broad knowledge of the literature of the field
- Core competencies reflected throughout the curriculum: managing change; managing human capital; reflexivity within the individual and the organization; communicating to varied stakeholders; and evidence-based decision making; research literacy (rather than the production of new knowledge)
- Capstone experience is a client-response based consultation model
- Capstone experience reflects real-world team dynamics
- Faculty and field-based advisors review final content

Virginia Technology University

The Educational Leader:

- Problematizes practice and seeks out ways to disrupt the status quo
- Demonstrates positive impact on local contexts
- Demonstrates positive impact on multiple tiers in the organization: from administration to the classroom – maintains a holistic perspective in management
- Engages in inquiry through multiple lenses
- Promotes the inquiry stance organizationally
- Perceives individual and organizational contexts beyond the classroom in order to best analyze problems

The Program Construct:

- Focus on evidence-based decision making; equity; learner-focused inquiry
- Curricular inputs are aligned with localized contexts of need, as well as national standards in the field
- Mentorship is a strong input; students are shepherded throughout the program by scholars who are ongoing learners in their field as well

William & Mary

The Program Construct:

- Core focus on planning and consumer utilization of existing research

Washington State University

The Educational Leader:

- Problematizes practice and seeks out ways to disrupt the status quo
- Demonstrates positive impact on local contexts; focus on equity via social justice concepts
- Promotes the inquiry stance organizationally

- Perceives individual and organizational contexts on multiple levels in order to work from a perspective of holistic organizational improvement

The Program Construct:

- Focus on evidence-based decision making; learner-focused inquiry; utilization focused intervention
- Curricular inputs are aligned with a mission of localized responsiveness
- Students work within an apprenticeship model and guided through their program via a network of scholars and practitioners

Questions and Considerations Emerging from Initial Thematic Analysis

What instructional delivery model(s) is/are utilized within your programs?

1. What components signify problem-based inquiry?
2. How are practitioner competencies built-in/embedded within the coursework?
3. What aspects of teaming are utilized within instruction?
4. What aspects of co-production of knowledge are apparent?
5. What type of evaluation model(s) is/are utilized to assess student outcomes?

To what extent is curricular content based on perspectives from the field?

1. What does the field want from the leaders we produce?
2. What do we expect our graduates to know/be able to do?
3. How does your program teach students to think in a “larger” way?
4. Did program development begin with a set of graduate outcomes followed by ‘backward design’ to define program parameters?
5. What aspects of your program promote socialization into the field?

How is inquiry taught within the scope of your program?

1. Has a distinction been made/seen as necessary between the research methods content intended for Ph.D. students being trained for scholarship and EdD students being trained for practice in the field?
2. How can we teach inquiry as a problem-solving skill set?
3. Is inquiry taught as a systematic concept throughout all the coursework?
4. How can we teach our students to deconstruct problems in-field?
5. Is inquiry discussed as a leadership skill?
6. Is communicating data taught as a primary skill-set?
7. Do we teach the utilization of data as a means to promote organizational learning?

Rather than being taught to conduct research, can practitioners be best served by being taught to:

1. Become good consumers of research
2. Interpret and present data
3. Assess intervention outcomes
4. Utilize GAP analysis: Where are we? Where do we want to be?
5. Think about inquiry as a problem-solving skill and not as a discrete set of techniques.

What evidence do we have that students, within their practice, actually utilize the skills we teach? Can previous graduates be utilized to mentor current students?

Student inquiry should be guided by how they frame their practice. Inquiry has to be a stance:

1. Adaptive vs. routine expertise.
2. Leaders should be able to teach teachers/staff how to conduct inquiry (develop an inquiry mindset/organizational culture of inquiry).

Considering Capstone Concepts

What we know about the capstone experience:

- The capstone experience/process demonstrates learning
- Students are primarily part-time, but some are full-time
- Dissertations are of variable quality
- The capstone does not necessarily have to be a dissertation
- Many programs are not sure of the criteria for a good dissertation
- The capstone should represent a comprehensive demonstration of knowledge
- The capstone should be oriented toward the problems-of-practice; students should be able to gather and synthesize information
- The capstone should be individualized, written, and scholarly
- The EdD capstone (demonstrates development of practitioner skill-sets) should be distinctive from the Ph.D. culminative experience (theory-building; generalizable)
- The capstone experience is highly variable across institutions
- The EdD capstone concept is more applicable to practitioners than the Ph.D. dissertation concept
- Conventional dissertation work does not help the profession with the immediacy of issues-at-hand

What do we want to know about the capstone experience?

- How can existing dissertations be modified to fit the capstone model?
- If not a capstone, then what?
- What is the capstone experience? What qualities define this experience?
- How can EdD quality of learning best be assessed?
- How can we get the capstone experience accepted as a legitimate higher learning activity?
- Should the capstone experience be individualized or grouped?
- Should the capstone experience occur only at the end of the program or be formative?
- Does the type of capstone experience offered affect the employability of the graduate? Do employers care about the capstone experience?
- Is the doctoral dissertation *not* a valid option as a capstone experience?
- Shouldn't students be able to connect the purpose of their learning/degree to their capstone experience?

Defining the capstone experience:

- Capstone projects require students to have specific knowledge of targeted literature to make informed decisions about policy and practice; this is a method necessary for practitioners and distinctive from exhaustive Ph.D. level knowledge development.
- The consultancy model: using clients such as school districts; institutions; state agencies:
 - Helps define an authentic problem to be studied
 - Helps define what is necessary to provide meaningful recommendations
 - Adaptive expertise: makes knowledge visible for practice
 - Analytic tools: this method provides an alternative focus for problem resolution; there are different levels of inference required for different types of inquiry

Suggested Capstone Components:

1. Utilized to identify, frame, and resolve problems of practice.
2. Not intended to broaden the literature base, but to enhance the discipline of professional leadership.
3. Faculty invite students to join in the consideration of problems of practice.
4. Collaboration of tenure track and clinical faculty.
5. Faculty role as coach; student as worker.
6. Building group dynamics among students eases the load for faculty regarding student accountability and mentorship – instead, a peer-based model is implemented.
7. Every student that goes out into the field is asking the same question regarding problems in practice.
8. Faculty work with students to develop their research/inquiry outlines.
9. Peer review: every student receives the benefit of input from all the others in the group. This strengthens cohort grouping and the professional learning community structure.
10. Students work with system leaders to discover their practice and processes.
11. Students conduct independent research in their own districts, but their literature reviews and methods sections are common – there is variation in the discussion of findings.
12. Thematic grouping requires advance planning, developing questions together, and knowing utilization goals.
13. Students are not meant to look at gaps in the literature, but for help in understanding the context of a problem.
14. Students often provide executive summaries and recommendations to institutions at which research is conducted.
15. Team leaders are appointed within groups to ensure workflow and accountability – in order to maintain the balance between shared work and individual work.
16. Students have 3 member committees, with fourth member as a practitioner-leader.

NOTE: Courses within PPD programs should be tied to the college and not to the faculty. Courses should not be taught only as faculty are available to do so – instead students should be able to expect a set course sequence and schedule, thus promoting program continuity and consistency.

Proposed Guidelines for Within-Institution Interrogation of Programs (Derived from Initial Analysis of Institutional Outcomes)

Assessing Student Learning

1. How did you define student learning outcomes for your students/cohorts?
2. How do you know whether the defined program outcomes are matching up with current students' learning progress?
3. How do you gather, analyze, and use student learning data to improve students' learning experiences?
4. How would you describe the degree to which students are taking ownership of their learning experiences?
 - a. How do your students address substantive problems or issues in their learning collectively and individually?
 - b. What are the artifacts that students produce that demonstrate mastery of concepts that are presented within their learning experience?
 - c. What course deliverables, oral and written, are expected?

Identifying Signature Pedagogies

A signature pedagogy can help us organize what is already known in our field. It can also help us to see new relationships, such as ways to present valued public scholarship toward the strengthening of a programmatic content base that is systematically linked with the knowledge base used in-field. A signature pedagogy encourages ongoing collaborative inquiry between the academy and practitioners and policy-makers such that the co-production of knowledge maintains relevance to the field.

Given this definition of signature pedagogy, answer the following questions:

1. In preparing future practitioners for their professional work, what "suite of approaches" to teaching do you believe are most effective in developing successful educational practitioners?
2. How are these evident through your program?

Describing the Core Curriculum

1. Do you have a specific set of learning experiences and competencies that you believe all program graduates should possess?

Defining Labs of Practice (practicum experiences)

1. How are practicum experiences providing students with the experiences and skills necessary to be exemplary practitioners?
2. What are the 'job embedded' learning experiences that prepare students to be exemplary educational administrators?

Evaluating the Student Experience

Constructive collaboration among students and program faculty

1. Describe your methods for encouraging collaboration among students within the cohort.
2. Describe your methods for engaging students and building stronger faculty-student connections.
3. What options do students have for feedback in expressing their thoughts, ideas, and concerns about the program to faculty and administrators?

Building the practical knowledge base

1. Describe how you are working with students to use a ‘hands-on’ approach in identifying and addressing the challenges that occur on practical levels in their field.
 - a. How are students encouraged to use creativity in solving contemporary problems that exist within their field?
 - b. How are students being prepared to make decisions and solve problems using quantitative and qualitative evidence?
 - c. How are students being prepared to judge the value of existing research?

Recommendation for Further Inquiry: A more in-depth content analysis of existing member institutions’ programs, with regard to the aforementioned criteria, as well as a history of the modifications these programs have undergone to date, should be based on the following points of inquiry:

1. What are the contextual backgrounds for these programs?
2. What challenges have been addressed to date; through what methods?
3. What are the governance structures, organizational frameworks, and student support services frameworks that contextualize these programs?
4. Can the varied disciplinary foci for K-12, Higher Education, and Teacher Education programs be covered through a single core sequence?

Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric

Preliminary Identification of Candidate Performance Rubric/Best Practices According to Taxonomic Analysis

Inquiry Stance

Identifies Critical Issues

Able to see beyond the driving and restraining forces impacting an issue and identifies the critical factors involved

Uses Data to Drive Decisions

Able to navigate databases and disaggregate data to identify problem areas within populations

Translates Research to Practical/Localized Application

Able to consider large-scale interventions found within the literature and modify the approach to suit localized needs

Conducts Systemic Institutional Inquiry

Approaches inquiry with a holistic view on the connections between levels of an institution, regardless of position within the institution

Designs and Implements Utilization-focused Inquiry

Able to design outcomes-based intervention with post-hoc knowledge of application and evaluation

Values Application of Theory in Practice

Encourages field-based, job-imbedded components to the learning process; practitioners-in-development are expected to test their change concepts in the laboratory of life

Equity Stance

Promotes Equity in Consideration and Stakeholder Inclusiveness

Views the needs of the institutional community with equal consideration; considers voices across institutional silos

Recognizes and Works within Contexts of Institutional Culture

Builds strong support base with institutional gatekeepers and develops interventions with sensitivity to institutional mores and boundaries

Leadership Capability

Active Consumer of Research Literature

Aware or current research in the field; considers impacts on the institutional level and all its derivatives

Leads Across Institutional Silos

Able to recognize driving and restraining forces in distinct institutional pockets; able to recognize the common connections between groups that can bridge the divide

Governs with a Foundational Vision

Connects decision making to guiding vision; sets the expectation that all decisions made are measured against the institutional vision

Disruptive Leadership

Seeks to disrupt the status quo and engage stakeholders in moving beyond accepted beliefs and practices to consider renewed approaches to practice

Anticipatory Leadership	Values the concerns of stakeholders across the institutional continuum; anticipates necessary change before accountability mandates require this change
Community Engagement	
Promotes Decision Transparency to All Stakeholders	Maintains a clear audit trail throughout the inquiry process so that stakeholders can be well-informed and can hold the inquiry team accountable
Works within a Constructivist Framework that Promotes Dialogism within the Field	Has knowledge of ongoing dialog regarding a certain issue and engages in inquiry that is open to diverse perspectives and critiques Able to personalize reporting and communication of inquiry findings and outcomes through relevance structures specific to varied stakeholder groups
Communicated Across Stakeholder Silos	Utilization-focused in evaluation; program implementation is accompanied by an evaluation framework intended to demonstrate benefits to stakeholders
Demonstrates Programmatic Benefit to Institutional Stakeholders	Values the input of all stakeholders involved in all aspects of institutional decision making; values the feedback loops created through this framework, as well as the new ideas that arise toward continuous improvement
Maintains Open Communication with Institutional Stakeholders	
Harnessing Human Capital	
Harnesses Human Capital through Recognizing Connections between Skill-sets and Application	Able to identify and capitalize on the varied skill-sets found within the team dynamic and can delegate tasks to appropriate individuals Recognizes value of not only working from the outside-in, but also from the inside-out; identifies leaders within local contexts and transitions them into positions as champions of the change initiative
Leverages All Available Human Resources	Utilizes change initiatives to socialize growing leaders into the culture of change and continuous improvement in order to ensure seamless transition of the human agents within the institutional growth process
Engages in Succession Planning	Focus on extended interaction with traditionally marginalized members of the stakeholder community
Recognizes Value of All Levels of Community through a Lens of Differentiated Consideration	
Commitment to Continuous Improvement	
Promotes Professional Development through Cycles of Continuous Improvement	Applies perspectives on continuous improvement to build strong networks of ongoing professional development; conveys a sense of value

Problematizes Practice

Promotes Consideration of Multiple Perspectives

to stakeholders regarding the concept of institutional commitment to professional development.

Works through a lens of evaluative consideration and continuous improvement

Harnesses the valuable perspectives of various stakeholders by making them active participants in the process of:

reflect → inquire → collaborate → share

Appendix D: Epistemological, Conceptual, and Process Issues

Findings derived from the analysis of focus group data, document analysis, and field observation conducted during the meeting of CPED partners during the 2009 AERA town hall meeting yielded three primary components of stakeholder response – epistemological, conceptual, and process. CPED partners, in review of the initial findings of the institutional outcomes analysis, identified the following critical themes intended to refine the approach toward the development of professional practice doctorate programs as well as establishing a set of universal expectations that define the successful professional practitioner graduate.

Epistemological Issues

- We must perceive outcomes through a lens of utilizing data in order to pursue purposeful practice.
- The practitioner we define must act with epistemological self-awareness.
- We must establish an EdD brand? In doing so, how do we avoid the “PhD lite” tag? What distinguishes the EdD as a professional degree that is also distinctive from other professional degrees? What distinguishes it from the research degree in education?
- Can we expect that professional practitioners will demonstrate their responsibility toward their discipline?. Is this a stewardship responsibility analogous to the stewardship responsibility that research scholars hold for advancing their fields of study? What does this mean/entail?
- We should not seek to establish best practices but rather a typology for educational practitioners.
- How do we develop measures to assess the performance of our graduates and their leadership capability?
- We will fail to succeed in our efforts if this type of program exists within another academic silo.
 - Can the PPD exist with an interdisciplinary core that represents core themes across institutional departments?
 - This core need not be represented by distinctive coursework; rather, it may be sufficient to expose students to the varied experiences across the disciplines.
- Can PPD students themselves look reflexively at the preparation of practitioners? How can they contribute to the co-development of this degree?
- How can we measure an individual disposition toward, for example, teaching excellence?
 - We must build into the curriculum the opportunity for students to practice the professing of a concept such as this.
- How can an individual know that she knows something?
 - How might she know otherwise?
- We must literally design activities that provide opportunity for demonstrating a learned concept: then the student can profess, exemplify, and practice that concept.
 - Can we assess, capture this process?
 - Can we build this process into the capstone experience?
 - Is there a normative component to the research questions students ask?
 - Every such research question should reflect the central philosophy of the program construct; this is a point of assessment in and of itself.

- Can practitioners take ownership of the standards for performance we set forth?
- How can we maintain program individuality while attempting to identify and institutionalize universal programmatic themes?

Conceptual Issues

- The best practices rubric should represent: highly qualified, qualified, and developmental levels for practitioner growth.
- We should define leadership in terms of disruptive leadership, adaptive leadership, and social justice leadership (e.g., social justice leadership involves seeking equity for transitional populations).
- The programmatic concept of inquiry should represent a reflection on process.
- With regard to Equity Stance: do program specifics and the characteristics of the individual contradict one another?
 - The ideal practitioner should be able to successfully collaborate with leaders of local populations.
 - The culturally responsive leader must have a keen knowledge of deficit paradigms; she must build the cultural climate within the organization (Researchers' note: organizational climate and culture are distinctive concepts; climate is a more immediate concept and may change within shorter time frames; culture is a more macro-level concept; change may take 5-7 years to change or establish).
- The practitioner must identify when systematic inquiry is appropriate in practice.
- The practitioner must be able to make persuasive arguments.
- The practitioner must be able to produce different products for different settings.
- The capstone process should be:
 - Iterative and progressive through programs.
 - Evaluated by multiple stakeholders.
 - Demonstrated through exhibition; documentation should take shape within the form of treatise or oral presentation.
- What is the capstone?
 - What supports are needed for this process?
 - Should the construction of the capstone concept be a CPED-wide activity?
- What type of infrastructure is needed to support the PPD/EdD program?
 - Type of program faculty.
 - Program coordination.
 - Curriculum and length of instructional delivery.
- Practitioner and program excellence should be articulated as a shared set of attributes.
- What are the attributes of the successful practitioner/program graduate in terms of:
 - Commitments
 - Dispositions
 - Values
- If the context of the program within the institution and the context of the individual within the program are pivotal considerations, then these should typify the theme of the program experience.
- Thoughts on Performance Rubric/Best Practices:

- Rather than using data to drive decisions, students should be able to pursue purposeful practice.
- Rather than identifying problem areas within populations, students be able to identify challenges and opportunities in order to pursue purposeful practice.
- Rather than valuing the application of or applying theory in practice, the student should act with epistemological self-awareness.

Process Issues

- The taxonomic analysis does not represent institutional outcomes as much as it does program characteristics.
- Most of the outcomes are process-oriented, rather than knowledge or content-based.
- The existing main and secondary themes represent broad generalizations: what are the local factors, for example, that contextualize a theme such as Equity Stance?
- The themes should be represented in more actionable language.
- With regard to inquiry, the specifics of program content and delivery will vary from institution to institution.
- The capstone process should be flexible and conducted within meaningful, rich inquiry constructs.
- What are the indicators of best practice regarding the capstone?
- We should utilize backward design within this developmental process: leap ahead to the process of assessing programmatic and individual success and then map backward to the defining of program constructs and practitioner competencies.
- We should consider moving away from program and practitioner standards and consider designing “situations” (presumably cases) that can test practitioner performance.
 - Again, through backward design, we can then move toward designing rubrics that systematize the demonstration of program and individual quality.

Appendix E: Recommendations for Future Work

Moving Toward Measurable Outcomes: Possible Directions for CPED

Ellen Goldring (Vanderbilt) & Robert Yinger (Ohio)

1. *Enter into an agreement with the National Board to pilot some of the Principal Advanced Certification assessments and activities and scoring rubrics. .*

We are concerned about the lack of alignment between the CPED work and the advanced certification agenda, and we are thinking it would be a great help to the CPED institutions to get them 'out ahead' on this. We know not all EdD students in Educational Leadership will consider Principal Advanced Certification and many students may also be in central office positions or other non-school based positions, but we think the experience of working on the advanced certification activities could be a very valuable one.

At a minimum it would be important to know what are the practices and domains the advanced certification will assess and how those outcomes can be addressed, modeled and measured in the CPED degree programs and to see how CPED can pilot some of the measures and methodology.

2. *Work with the CPED institutions to decide on 3 outcome practices for school leaders and then design together the activity, the assessment and the scoring rubric for the 3 outcomes.*

Here, we are suggesting that the CPED decide on 3 of their own outcomes that are agreed upon by all the School Leadership groups and then design together the assessment activities (authentic practices) evidence, and scoring rubrics. Following the notion that professions do have a body of expertise that ALL in the profession need to know and be able to do, we do not think it is beyond the scope of the CPED initiative to work hard to arrive at consensus for the purposes of modeling and development, surrounding three specific, measurable outcomes of practices.

We would suggest that using decisions to drive and monitor instructional improvements, for example would be one. We cannot imagine there would be an EdD program that did not focus on this (or using data for school accountability). The CPED institutions could then design assessment activities and a shared, agreed upon scoring rubric for each of the 3 outcomes that program participants would implement at the appropriate time in their program of study (presumably when the program believes the student has had ample opportunity to learn and master the practice). We know there may be some push back on this approach but we think the benefits are 1) modeling that there is an agreed upon set of practices that all highly qualified leaders should be able to do, and 2) that is it possible to design and assess meaningful assessment activities that , outweigh the difficulty.

In this case next steps would include:

1. Working to reach consensus on 3 outcomes
2. Determine the purpose of the assessment (see below under issues)
3. Develop authentic assessment activity for each outcome
4. Operationalizing what it means to be highly proficient through novice or not proficient for each outcome and develop scoring rubric

5. Develop implementation plan-when does a student implement the assessment activity, how often, who is involved in judging the outcome, who collects the evidence and so on.
 6. Put into place a forum and process for sharing and providing feedback on the assessment process after it has been implemented – what is working, what is not.
3. Work with the group on the process of assessing outcomes (as listed above) but let each CPED institution choose up to 3 outcomes to implement the process on –and then group the institutions into working groups where there is overlap on the outcome they will be assessing.

Issues to Consider

What is the purpose of the assessment? Why these assessments? If there is to be an authentic activity the assessment should have some meaning and ‘count’ for something. Is it formative for the student and/or the program? Will it be required to receive a degree or move on to the ‘dissertation/capstone project’? Is it part of a student’s grade? Is it part of the capstone ‘project’ for degree purposes? Or, is this a development project at this point with no current plan for how the assessments will be used in the degree programs? In other words, I am asking about the evaluation and judgments that will be made with the assessments and their scoring. Are these decisions left to each institution?

To increase buy-in and application, my suggestion is that each institution be given the leeway to decide how they will use the outcome assessments in their program, but that they be used in a meaningful and authentic way. If this is the case, modifications in the assessment procedures may need to be made for different uses and purposes, but the overall design should not change much.

[1] Shulman, L.S., Golde, C.M., Bueschel, A.C. & Garabedian, K.J. (2006) Reclaiming Education’s Doctorates: A Critique and a Proposal. *Educational Researcher*. Vol. 35, No. 2, 25-32.

[2] We have adopted Wergin’s (2007) definition of “grassroots leadership” which he explains as “leadership in place,” or the pursuit of change without the pursuit of an administrative career in the institutional hierarchy by a non-administrative person such as a university faculty member.

[3] See Appendix B for a full description of the data collection and analysis for this project.