



Final Report
The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate
2007-2010

by
Jill A. Perry
David G. Imig

*Prepared for the Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching
2010*

Introduction

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) is a national effort sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CF) and the Council of Academic Deans in Research Education Institutions (CADREI). Its purpose is to strengthen the education doctorate. It engages some two-dozen colleges and universities. Those institutions have committed resources to work together to undertake a critical examination of the doctorate in education. The particular focus of the initiative is on the highest academic degree that leads to careers in professional practice - described as either the Professional Practice Degree (PPD) or the Ed.D. The intent of the project is to redesign the PPD or Ed.D. and to make it a stronger and more relevant degree for the advanced preparation of school practitioners and clinical faculty, academic leaders and professional staff for the nation's schools and colleges and the learning organizations that support them.

As Phase I of the initiative came to a close in 2009, the project directors touted the successes of participating institutions with regard to their transformation of the professional doctorate in education as well as their setting of an ambitious research agenda for the future. The following report outlines the past goals and objectives for the CPED initiative, the outcomes of the first three years, and a plan for research and development for the second phase. Additional information can be found on our website at <http://cpedinitiative.org>

Historical Perspective

By the turn of the 20th century, the legal, medical, and education professions had sought ways to define and establish respectable training programs for the preparation of practitioners by “attach[ing] themselves to the modern American university” (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 82) believing that formal study in an institution of higher education would provide better preparation for practitioners. During this time frame, doctoral education for education emerged.

In 1898, James Earl Russell sought to bring this new model of professional preparation to the nascent Teachers College at Columbia University, establishing a practitioner-focused research degree or Ph.D. Twenty-two years later, in 1920, the Graduate School of Education at Harvard College was established under the direction of Henry Holmes. Holmes, not an advocate of research nor a holder of an advanced degree, sought to increase Harvard's role in professional training by establishing the first doctorate of education, or Ed.D. The degree was meant to educate students who had a successful teaching experience, possessed a “working knowledge of biology, psychology and the social sciences” (Cremin, 1978, p. 15), and who sought a higher position in the school system. The Ed.D. aimed to offer a rigorous course of study that would enhance candidate's prior knowledge and skills and better prepare them to lead as school practitioners. Between 1900-1940 many institutions, such as Berkeley, Stanford, and Michigan established schools and colleges of education that offered the Ed.D. in addition to their existing Ph.D. degrees. Despite this growth, however, most schools of education struggled to establish an identity as a professional school and were engulfed in debate over the professional training degree.

Several reasons contributed to this struggle. First, having two degrees caused constant conflict between the “demands of theory and those of practice” (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 49). Second, the advancement of professional training was further complicated as schools of education found themselves enmeshed in demands from graduate schools of arts and sciences. Third, from the inception of both degrees in education, unclear goals and similar programmatic content have confused the degree purposes and plagued professionalization efforts. As a result, the Ed.D. was in direct competition with research doctorates that focused on education and challenged the knowledge base of the doctorate in education. Over time, as schools of education continued to wrestle with these issues, the distinction between the two degrees blurred which exacerbated the

difficulty of creating a profession of education. The central problem in distinguishing between the two was the issue of “high prestige of research [degrees] when compared to professional practice [degrees]” (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 150).

Compounding these problems were degree requirements that were similar, dissertation topics that were nearly identical, and students who increasingly chose the Ph.D., or transferred shortly after entering their Ed.D. program. The continued confusion and similarities between the two degrees, led Levine (2007) to contend, “from the very beginning, the clear differentiation between the degrees [was] blurred” (p. 40). As a result, defining what a doctorate in education represents has become nearly impossible. Rather than coming to a clear resolution, this confusion has “fragmented the field” of education and “loosened the bonds between professional practice and professional education” (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988, p. 117). Nearly eighty years of studies have examined every facet of the debate but failed to resolve the differences between them. A listing of the many studies undertaken since the early 1900s to establish clear differences between the two degrees and their inconclusive findings can be found in Appendix A.

Moving beyond the many studies of the Ed.D., the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) was launched in January 2007. Its purpose was to strengthen the Ed.D. through research and development. Following nearly two years of planning, the Carnegie Foundation and CADREI invited twenty-five schools and colleges of education to engage in a national, inter-institutional dialogue aimed at improving the preparation of advanced educational practitioners. The initiative focused on developing *stewards of practice* in doctoral education—professional practitioners who are committed to the highest standards and prepared to take on the challenges of teaching in and leading schools, serving as administrators and clinical faculty in two and four year colleges and universities, and leading learning organizations that serve education. To do this, the initiative sought to define what a steward of practice should know, value, and be able to do. The initiative also intended to design the course of study and to describe the experiences that can develop this type of practitioner. As a companion effort, the initiative sought to simultaneously strengthen the Ph.D. in education, with its goal of preparing *stewards of the discipline*, or those that “generate new knowledge, understand the intellectual history of the field, use the best ideas and practices in current work, and represent that knowledge to others both within and outside the field” (Richardson, 2006, p. 254).

Participation

The education schools (see Appendix B) invited to participate in CPED were transforming their colleges or schools, had shown a demonstrated commitment to the agenda and the principles or guidelines established, were willing to invest in a pilot or experimental program and share information with others, had the potential for showcasing their efforts to others, and could provide the administrative support and other resources for documentation, engagement and cooperation. Three additional institutions (including one that represented a state system) joined late in the first year. Each of the participating colleges and universities selected a particular program to serve as their experimental or pilot initiative. These programs were selected by campus leaders for their promise of showing the way for the examination and transformation of other programs in the education school. To accomplish this work, each school assembled a team that included faculty, administrators, and graduate students to undertake this journey. Each team was committed to envisioning new ways of preparing professional practitioners for schools and colleges and designing new programs to enable them to function effectively in the settings where they find themselves working. They were also prepared to examine recent advances in the learning sciences and human cognition, statistics and technology, the understanding of leadership and new ways of preparing professional practitioners for careers in teaching and service.

The education schools that were chosen to participate in this initiative were, and continue to be, committed to working together to strengthen every facet of their current doctoral programs – from candidate selection to the “capstone” experiences for advanced candidates, from the

assessment procedures used in the program to the curriculum that is offered. During the three-year project, participants were guided by the then recent work of the Carnegie Foundation that focused on the pursuit of excellence in doctoral education and critically examined the Ph.D. in seven fields of study (including education).

Though the goal of preparing better scholars and more skilled practitioners is a shared aspiration of the participants, the specific focus of CPED is to reclaim the education doctorate and to transform it into the degree of choice for the next generation of school and college leaders. To this end, the CPED project has been successful in the development of these components as well as the many other facets of doctoral programs—admissions, practitioner inquiry, and assessment—and has made great strides in producing institutional examples that others can look to as models of exemplary practice, in providing a clear definition of the education doctorate, in creating a set of principles that guide the delivery of the doctoral programs, and in offering a rubric of outcomes for candidates and programs. This exciting and innovative work can be summed up in the words of Richard De Lisi, Dean at the Rutgers Graduate School of Education. He said of Rutgers' participation,

"Rutgers has offered the Education Doctorate since 1930, but the School has made its most far-reaching revisions of the Doctorate through our participation in CPED and with the support of our colleagues in this programs. The insights we have gained through working with our partners have helped us to clearly differentiate between our Ph.D. and Ed.D. programs by strengthening the research preparation in the first and the practice preparation in the second. Every program has been touched in some way, and now we offer a new set of Ed.D. concentrations to our students."

In the second phase of CPED, member institutions will seek to test, refine, and explicate the policy implications of each accomplishment for the professional doctorate in education.

Three-Phase CPED Plan of Action

Over a three-year period, the CPED initiative asked the basic question: *What knowledge, skills, and dispositions should professionals working in education possess and be able to use?* Year-by-year, teams have worked together to deliberate and develop the answers to this question. The institutions have mapped backwards from those answers to determine what types of assessments, teaching, experiences, and scholarship need to be included in preparation programs to meet the needs of future practitioners.

Conceptual and Design Phase: 2007

During the first year, CPED institutions organized an intellectual community that engaged seriously and in a sustained way on the goals of the project. Faculty and graduate students drew heavily from work already undertaken on their campuses and organized into strands—educational administration, teacher education, and organizational leadership—to accommodate work already underway in these fields. They engaged one another in an exploration of the possibilities and challenges of their experimental programs with the goal of sharing as they undertook the transformation of programs. In addition, each institution began a process of documenting their challenges and describing their accomplishments.

June 2007 Convening. In the first year, the four central design-concepts—signature pedagogies, laboratories of practice, scholarship of teaching, and capstones—were introduced to members at two convening. The CPED initiative arrived at these design-concepts by examining the work of Lee Shulman and the Carnegie Foundation efforts at strengthening professional preparation. Signature pedagogies are “the types of teaching that organized the fundamental ways by which future practitioners are educated for their new profession” and include teaching how “to think, perform, act with integrity” (Shulman, 2005, p. 52). Laboratories of practice are “structured experiences, designed to teach ways of doing [and] provide an important opportunity for students

to view work in situ and to work alongside practicing professionals” (Perry & Imig, 2008). A scholarship of teaching is the “public account of some or all of the full act of teaching—vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher’s professional peers. It involves question-asking, inquiry, and investigation, particularly around issues of student learning” (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999). Finally, the capstone, as described by CPED, is a culminating project, different from the traditional six-chapter dissertation, that demonstrates understanding of core professional knowledge and the application of this knowledge to problems of practice (Perry & Imig, 2008).

The inaugural convening held at the Carnegie Foundation in June 2007, brought CPED members together with Pat Hutchings, Lee Shulman, and Chris Golde to learn about and discuss the notions of scholarship of teaching and laboratories of practice as well as the broader concerns of developing new, innovative professional preparation programs. The goals of the convening set the tone for developing an intellectual community, gaining a commitment of CPED sites to the “big ideas,” working on a distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D., building a set of design elements, and appreciating the work of others to enhance our learning community. Throughout the course of two and half days in June 2007, members discussed and deliberated on several big ideas and raised questions regarding the redesign of practitioner preparation. Among those questions were:

Candidate admissions – who are the candidates that come to the program? who can come? who should come? what experiences and attainments should they have? how do we draw people into the program?

Distinctions between Ed.D. and Ph. D.—should we differentiate between the types of faculty who teach in such programs and the types of scholarship in which they engage to make practice more important and better recognized?

Development of a signature pedagogy --what is a signature pedagogy that defines the field of education? Is there more than one? Should there be distinctive signature pedagogies for the Ph.D. and Ed.D. in Education?

Core courses—what types of methodological, theoretical/foundational studies do people who are successful in these fields need to engage in?

Capstone Experiences – what ought to be the set of capstone experiences for stewards of practice? where does the dissertation fit?

Building a Culture of Evidence –what is the evidence that we should gather to use to demonstrate to prospective candidates and others that what we do matters?

Designing laboratories of practice—is this a way to organize the "work-places" of the part-time Ed.D. students to make them "laboratories of practice"? can we expect such candidates to situate their scholarship and research in these laboratories?

Rethinking the dissertation—Are dissertations inconsistent with goals of the Ed.D.? Do we need to rethink the traditional five-chapter structure and put studies into a clear problem structure? Is there a way to get away from faculty being involved in doing double duty as Ed.D. and Ph.D. advisors?

Collaborative knowledge building-- are there innovative ways to engage candidates and faculty in professional learning communities that advance the CPED work? how do we create such intellectual communities when we have disparate groups of individuals in various times and places in a program?

Backwards planning-- can one start with what do we want students to know and be able to do? is there an effective way to identify program outcomes?

Strategic Planning – can we plan future actions based on a careful consideration of the environment and what it portends for teaching and learning?

Members returned to their home institutions with these ideas and a challenge to work with their faculty to incorporate the design concepts and big ideas into their pilot projects.

October 2007 Convening. The October 2007 convening was hosted by Peabody College at Vanderbilt University and served as a case for CPED members to examine. Members arrived enthusiastically committed to “recapturing the education doctorate” and to making it into the degree of choice for practitioners and professionals in education. The focus for this convening was the assessment of candidates and programs with particular attention to the capstone experience. Members closely examined the capstone used by the Peabody College school leadership program and sought to understand how faculty and students at Peabody define and use their capstone and the expectations held for both students and faculty. In addition, Lee Shulman discussed the practice of preparing students with signature pedagogies that are particular to the fields of study encompassed by the CPED work. Presentations by Professor James Guthrie and other Peabody faculty, as well as by recent graduates of the leadership program, provided illustrations of the “consultancy” capstone project undertaken with 2-4 students in a consultancy cohort. The characteristics of this capstone project included: problem finding, identifying the key issues a client faces; negotiating entry and understanding the organization on a formal/informal basis of power; and authenticating the problems, or identifying meaningful findings to resolve the problem(s).

Comments from Deans at CPED institutions

The major success of UVM's involvement in CPED's Phase I program has been our engagement in the national conversation about Ph.D. and Ed.D. graduate study as well as the opportunity to review our own work here at UVM in the current Ed.D. program using standards from the national framework. Finally, this relationship with CPED has promoted dialogue amongst our faculty about how we can support a two-tiered doctoral program at UVM

-Fayneese Miller, Dean, College of Education and Social Services, University of Vermont

During this first phase of CPED's work, the USC program has moved from a new experimental effort, first initiated in 2002, to a robust and established program that enrolls a cohort of approximately 150 students per year.

-Karen Symms Gallagher, Dean, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California

Our work in Phase I of CPED, resulted in a re-engineered Executive Doctorate in district level administration. The program includes a sequenced and aligned curriculum link to our outcomes of conceptual understanding and application, leadership acumen and inquiry-based practice. Our program components include a signature pedagogy that aligns with a problem-based approach; leadership socialization that includes embEd.D.ed fieldwork and residency requirements; and a focus on disciplined inquiry. Based on our experiences with current doctoral cohorts, we have redesigned the dissertation to be progressive, applied and aligned with the program of study (e.g., leadership of school social systems, leadership of teaching and learning, leadership of change and reform, and disciplined inquiry).

- Joan K. Smith, Dean, Jeannine Rainbolt College of Education at the University of Oklahoma

Members discussed the components of the Peabody capstone as well as capstone design components identified among member institutions including, problem framing at the University of Missouri-Columbia, a multiple lenses perspective to frame the capstone experience at the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Maryland's client-based project that incorporates systematic inquiry and collaborative skills. Central questions centered around answering, “What problem is your capstone trying to solve? How do we prepare someone for transformative leadership?” Members identified the following key considerations for the development of an alternative to the dissertation for the Ed.D..

The transfer problem – Can a new capstone encourage on-going action research by graduates in their workplace beyond the awarding of the degree? How do we increase the capacity and commitment of recent graduates to continue their study?

The relevance problem - Can a new capstone replace the traditional dissertation to promote greater relevance in the program with the work place?

The isolation problem - Project design, data gathering, analysis, reflection and writing in the traditional dissertation process is an isolated or highly individualized experience and not germane to the skills needed by professional practitioners in schools and other learning organizations. How can the capstone experience promote greater collaboration and partnership?

The teamwork problem - Can we build capstone learning communities that consist of several graduate students and more than one advisor so the capstone is not done individually, but rather the design is done together in a community of practice?

The time to completion of the degree problem - Can the learning community concept promote greater engagement and enable students to complete their degrees in a more timely manner?

The transparency problem - Can the capstone experience yield significant learning that is more transparent and public?

The engagement problem - Can the new capstone promote greater connection with stakeholders, constituencies and professional practitioners? Can the capstone address real problems that the profession is encountering?

The advisory load problem - Can new designs that depend on cohorts and thematic dissertations promote more reasonable advisory loads? Need to rethink what is a reasonable faculty/student relationship for what practitioners are trying to learn

The communication problem - Can the capstone experience provide more opportunities for candidates to make presentations that focus on new communication and persuasion skills? Are there new ways to present information and knowledge using new formats?

In addition to these considerations, Lee Shulman discussed the need to develop new forms of assessment in doctoral programs that are "low stakes, high yield"? Can we build new assessments that serve as milestones for tracking progress, and that develop multiple lenses for candidates to use in addressing the quality of schools and other learning organizations?

Shulman also discussed the need for and potential role of a signature pedagogy in education. Signature pedagogies are connected to implicit theories in-field of what it means to be a professional in the field. CPED members recognized the need for developing pedagogies that form the habits of hand, heart, and mind in practitioners. Members suggested that without creating programs in lock-step, there exists strong similarities in professional preparation programs that will allow for common signature pedagogies. For instance, signature pedagogies have to be pervasive and persistent. Though students often feel that they are moving from class to class through unrelated events, Shulman suggested that students should feel that the rules of engagement within the classroom are reasonably similar. In thinking about signature pedagogies, participants in the Nashville convening were asked: to consider: the program goals and pedagogies that would best help Ed.D. candidates to achieve those goals? What are the core texts of the field? What are the things that mature professionals in the field encounter that can serve as problems of practice? What kind of interpretative, critical reading of texts do they need to do? What type of reading analysis do they need? What kind of reasoning, problem-solving, decision-making do advanced professionals do and how can candidates get practice in doing so?

In addition, Shulman noted three identifiable characteristics of signature pedagogies—implementing case-based/problem-based learning in classes; combining field learning (labs of practice) with class learning; and, encouraging collaboration among faculty members that serve to move forward the CPED initiative on signature pedagogies for professional preparation.

A key outcome of the Peabody convening was a consortium commitment to documenting the process of developing a new degree for practitioner preparation by utilized a Logic Model—a framework by which each institution could document the inputs, activities,

outputs, outcomes, and impacts of their program design and development. As teams reflected on this model, they identified the outcomes and impacts that they hoped to accomplish with the CPED initiative. Table A below provides a list of the outcomes and impacts identified by CPED members.

Outcomes

Program will help the practitioner:

- Learn to problem-solve
- Develop a “habit of mind” that allows the leader to view every issue from an equity framework (among other frames)
- Have knowledge about the learning process
- Have ability to motivate others
- Be a reflective practitioner
- Know how to evaluate data
- Think outside the box
- Understand diversity
- Demonstrate ethical care in their leadership
- Be a critical inquiring practitioner.
- Effectively influence policy at a state/local level through understanding action and coalition building
- Engage in labs of practice to have authentic, diversity related activities that are repeated throughout experiences

Impacts

Practitioner who:

- Is a life long adult learner engaged in professional development
- Has a broad knowledge of the field
- Is able to guide learning
- Is able to use inquiry in politically astute ways
- Transfers skills to school community enabling a more caring environment that enhances a variety of student areas
- Keeps equity at the forefront of decision-making criteria
- Meets the needs of more students and creates honesty
- Gives equity a chance to be examined
- Improves educational practices
- Improves policy and removes barriers
- Reduces the achievement gap in local schools and communities

Table A: Outcomes and Impacts anticipated for CPED designed programs.

Camilla Benbow, Dean of the Peabody College of Education, gave the final presentation at the October 2007 CPED convening. She spoke about gaining institutional ‘buy-in’ to the changes this project is proposing for the educational doctorate and, specifically emphasized three areas of potential influence to promote the new education doctorate. First, Dean Benbow suggested that members provide a clear vision of the purpose and intent of the doctorate in education. Second, she suggested the importance of having the dean of the home college of education on-board with the proposed changes. Third, the education doctorate and the capstone should be viewed as an opportunity to build and provide for highly trained educators to better their institutions, not a problem waiting to be solved. Finally, she stressed the need for ethical and moral leadership based upon social justice and equity. “The challenges in education,” she suggested, “are real and formidable, but a new invigorated education doctorate can prepare and give vision to a new generation of educational leaders able to forge new alliances and new methodologies.”

Additional 2007 CPED events. Also during this first year, David Imig and Jill Perry presented the goals and ambitions of CPED to members at the AERA annual meeting in Chicago and to plenum members at the UCEA annual meeting in Washington DC. At the Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools, Imig and Perry gave a presentation that followed Shulman’s plenary presentation highlighting the CPED design process as well as the accomplishments of the University of Connecticut and Washington State University.

Experimental Phase: 2008

While individual campuses piloted new experimental programs, inter-institutional partnerships and other configurations of institutions enabled participating institutions to have and be critical friends during this experimental year. The campus-based experimental programs were viewed as “design experiments” with current practitioners and others engaged in examining every facet of the program and pressing the agenda of change and transformation. The goal for the second year of CPED was to produce “proofing sites” where innovative ways to prepare a new generation of accomplished teacher leaders, principals, curricula specialists, community college leaders, clinical faculty, and organizational professionals could be designed, tested, redesigned, and reexamined. Faculty from all institutions vigorously engaged in this process, both providing and receiving critical advice from each other about program designs, goals and outcomes. The following are statements that attest to the value of this collaborative work.

Our experiences at CPED have shaped the development of our new Ed.D. program. We have benefitted from the perspective and lessons of so many different institutions following a parallel path to better define the Ed.D.y. degree. Our Executive Ed.D.y. program is a better product for students and staff as a result of our participation in CPED. - Steven Staples, faculty member, The College of William & Mary

CPED has been very instrumental in providing a network of institutions engaged in reinvigorating the Ed.D.y. to prepare 21st century leaders. The opportunity to share and gather ideas has been meaningful to the work in our program area.- Gaetane Jean-Marie, faculty member, University of Oklahoma

The CPED convenings provide a unique opportunity for peer feedback and collaboration related to program development. This type of forum is not normally available, especially over an extended period of time. It is a unique opportunity.- Robert Rueda, faculty member, University of Southern California

CPED is a powerful collaboration of great minds; a collaboration with synergy. One person may have a great idea and that idea sparks and expands in the mind of another creating ideas and energy that could not exist on its own. The convening offers networking, collaboration and exposure to new ideas and tried and true experiences. The convenings are worth their weight in gold on a personal and professional level.- CPED Faculty member

Institutional Reports: Following the October discussion of documenting the process at each institution, teams were asked to engage the *logic model* and provide a detailed description of their redesign process and how they were defining and incorporating the design concepts. From these reports we learned about the progress that institutions were making towards developing programs geared toward preparing practitioners.

Signature pedagogies reflect “what counts as knowledge in a field and how things become known” (Shulman, 2005, p. 2). CPED teams were challenged to consider these epistemological issues as they designed their signature pedagogies. CPED teams sought to cultivate the habits of critical reading, thinking, and the curiosity that leads to inquiry. At Duquesne University, the team developed an inquiry process that takes the form of talking papers—annual student papers that outline their thoughts on key readings and eventually form the basis of the culminating project. At California State University, Fresno, faculty and students developed a list of crucial readings that serve as a frame for the qualifying examinations. The University of Connecticut educational leadership program focuses the first two semesters of their new program on creating consumers of research and on teaching about the role of both quantitative and qualitative research in the inquiry process, case-study write-up strategies, and question formulation.

Because professionals typically work with colleagues to solve real-life problems, developing practical skills for problem solving through collaboration is also a prominent signature pedagogy among CPED member institutions. The University of Nebraska–Lincoln's teaching, learning and teacher-education program uses the introductory seminar to “initiate and cultivate program continuity and community,” which begins by developing “a common language” between students and faculty. The University of Missouri–Columbia’s transformative collaboration uses action research in projects involving both faculty and students as researchers to look at problems in schools. At the University of Kentucky, the executive doctorate program faculty and students come together in a mixed-methods, research-based program to collaborate on scholarship. Challenge-cycles at the University of Maryland involve a cohort in thinking and making decision about practice-based problems.

Laboratories of practice are structured experiences, according to the University of Connecticut team, that are “messy, real-world practices,” which are designed to teach ways of doing. Such laboratories provide an important opportunity for students to view work in situ and to work alongside practicing professionals. Models come from other professional fields: one example is medical rounds, where students examine patients while being supervised by an attending physician. The teams analyzed their current fieldwork components during this year and discussed how they could be redesigned. Targeting districts (Houston); face-to-face meetings with state and district leaders (Kentucky); residencies and purposeful apprenticeships in the profession (Pennsylvania State); and rotations through rural, urban, and suburban settings (Oklahoma) were some of the strategies that were piloted.

The University of Missouri–Columbia recognized that most Ed.D. candidates work full-time in professional settings and made the students’ workplaces their laboratories. The student experience is evaluated by the “extent to which students are able to set problems of their own organization into action research.” Rutgers University followed the apprentice model of connecting students to practitioners in a learn-by-doing model. Northern Illinois University developed a series of “extended, embEd.D.ed, and integrated internship experiences” that provide students with “hands-on” experiences throughout the program. The University of Kentucky executive doctorate program has cohorts meet monthly with district and state-level professionals to gather field-based problems and learn from practitioners. CPED teams have vigorously experimented with these and other models of laboratories for professional practice doctorate programs and continue to test them as the initiative continues.

The scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) gives faculty and students a way to reflect on and critically think about their own teaching (whether as a teacher or as an administrator, they are going to teach). CPED teams deliberated and experimented with various forms of SoTL to enhance their programs and nurture good practice. Examples included team teaching that brings together faculty and practitioners at Virginia Commonwealth and Virginia Tech. University of Missouri–Columbia faculty investigating their own teaching practice; California State University, Fresno, is looking at a theory-of-action model to frame such an inquiry in its own faculty’s teaching. At Rutgers, faculty members are identifying a range of pedagogies to be used in their program. The University of Connecticut adult-learning-centered educational leadership program focuses on the attributes of the non-traditional student who is learning in challenging environments. Duquesne University has tied the scholarship of teaching and learning to their signature pedagogy and developed a model of systematic and intentional inquiry as a means of teaching and learning. CPED teams have decided that through investigating teaching as it leads to student learning and by engaging in faculty self-reflective exercises, steps can be taken towards creating a scholarship of teaching and learning for the preparation of *stewards of practice*.

New forms of *Capstones* are emerging as a result of CPED consortium conversations. For example, the program at the University of Southern California has introduced the idea of thematic dissertations, wherein students conduct individual investigations of field-based problems as part of a group organized around a set of related problems. The University of Houston has put together a candidacy paper task force, which is considering capstone models such as a needs analysis for educational institutions, the development of institutional-change plans, and a critical analysis of a school district program. Both the University of Missouri–Columbia and the University of Florida are considering the role that solving “real-world” problems might play in a capstone piece. As a result of the focus on problems of practice, some institutions have suggested that the dissertation committee should be broadened to include professional practitioner as well as academic members. Though CPED teams continue discussions about capstones, they have demonstrated a strong commitment to rethinking how degree candidates should demonstrate that they are ready to assume leadership positions in schools and other learning organizations.

June 2008 Convening: At the June convening held in Palo Alto, CA, posters that demonstrated the outcomes from the institutional reports were shared among members. The convening focused on three questions: How do we encourage the development of *stewards of practice*? How do we inspire new ideas around professionalism? How do we create a worldwide conversation? To begin this conversation, members heard from the Virginia Commonwealth University team that described their first Ed.D. in School Leadership and invited input relative to their signature pedagogy—the Case Study.

Lee Shulman and Chris Golde then took the group through a discussion of ways to define the Stewardship of Practice and the need to think about the preparation of stewards of the practice in ways that are very different from the ways of preparing doctoral students in the past. Because most practitioners come to doctoral study with a strong grounding in a knowledge base, Shulman and Golde encouraged the participants to think about how we prepare these individuals for the very specific domains of their profession. In the case of professional practice, Shulman and Golde outlined six domains where stewardship can occur.

1. ***Service:*** serving a community of learners
2. ***Understanding:*** knowledge base of practice – habits of mind
3. ***Technique:*** important skills and practices
4. ***Judgments:*** under inherent uncertainty
5. ***Transformational Evidence:*** transforming experience into evidence
6. ***Community collaboration:*** create professional communities to ensure constant reflection and accountability

Members were challenged to consider the question *How can we, as stewards of our profession, create programs, cultures, and communities with the integrity to prepare other stewards to prepare professionals?*

To further this discussion, teams broke into groups to begin to define a highly-qualified practitioner, or what they would want their graduates to know and be able to do. Below is a samples of what teams identified as the skills and knowledge necessary to be a highly-qualified practitioner.

- To master the essential skill-set
- To be an “activist scholar” who can identify and solve complex problems
- To understand adult development beyond learning theories
- To be sensitive to the culture of the setting, being aware of the ecology of the school/college

- To know how to conduct inquiry and action research
- To know how to build an argument based on evidence
- To know how to create relationships
- To know assessment and evaluation
- To be able to advocate for moral causes
- To think critically about the status quo
- To be able to interrogate/articulate assumptions
- To develop self-regulation processes
- To write well and have the conceptual knowledge of the field

During the final day of the June 2008 convening, members discussed the components of developing a program that would form a *steward of the practice*. There was much debate about whether programs needed a core curriculum or if students should be taught core competencies throughout the program. Teams did not come to a final decision but rather agreed that each program would be different based on the context of their universities and their student body. CPED participants also discussed the types of laboratories of practice they were developing in their programs. Examples included embedding field work into each course, bringing cohorts together four times during their program to work collaboratively on a problem of practice, rotating through different areas of a professional development school. They also talked about making assignments that include work developed between the student, the faculty, and a school community, and developing test sites that allow for experimenting with leadership skills in a safe environment.

The convening ended with encouragement to CPED members to continue to pursue the progress made in program development with the goal of offering real proofing sites in the final year.

October 2008 Convening: The October 2008 convening was hosted by the University of Southern California, a member institution that has served as a case for all CPED institutions in program design and institutional change. Dean Karen Symms-Gallagher, Dr. David Marsh, and Dr. Myron Dembo along with their colleagues engaged CPED members in three days of learning about their program and their change process with panels of USC faculty and students presenting to the participants. Discussions investigated the importance of inquiry in professional preparation programs as well as the ways to develop a capstone project that was both rigorous and demonstrative of student learning and served as both a summative and formative assessment of a highly-qualified practitioner. During the final day of the convening, members learned about the administrative processes necessary to make wide-spread institutional change including the governance, support and student issues related to change. The convening ended with a discussion of moving CPED into its final year.

Additional 2008 CPED events: Also during this second year, David Imig and Jill Perry presented updates of CPED progress at AACTE in Chicago, UCEA in Florida and AERA in New York. Attendees in these sessions were eager to learn of the change process as well as the outcomes of the CPED work. Several inquiries for joining the program were made and continued to be made throughout the year. Discussions of how to add a “second wave” to CPED were continuous but given the limited funding it did not seem possible to do during this year. During this second year, Dr. Imig and Ms. Perry also published an article in *Change Magazine* that provided an overview of the successes and challenges of the first year of CPED. This article also generated many emails and phone calls asking for advice on program development and further requests to join the membership.

Spencer Foundation Grant: Finally, during the second year of CPED, the initiative received \$75,000 in funding from the *Spencer Foundation* to identify outcomes of the program

for individual campuses and the network as a whole. The consortium identified six characteristics of graduates that should result from preparation in a CPED-influenced Ed.D. program. These characteristics—*equity stance, inquiry stance, leadership capabilities, commitment to continuous change, community engagement/social responsiveness, and harnessing human capital* (Imig, Perry, & Syed, 2009)—were generated from looking across each institution's programmatic outcomes and establishing commonalities. These characteristics will be tested, refined, and further developed in the second phase of the CPED initiative.

With this grant we would learn that all of the institutions have similar expectations for their candidates regardless of their field of study. We also would learn 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 assignments and professional engagements, assessments and capstones - lead to the particular outcomes CPED institutions identified or 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 *Spencer Foundation* investment, we now have an evolving set of "promising practices" for Ed.D. 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 Ed.D. 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 *Spencer Foundation* funded initiative contributed to the scholarship on the preparation of professional practitioners and substantiate the claims made in the original Shulman, Golde, Bueschel and Garabedian piece that appeared in the April 2006 *Educational Researcher*. In addition to contributing to the on-going debate regarding the potential of graduate schools of education 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.

Deliberation and Dissemination Phase 2009

During the culminating stage of the project, the information gained and the models developed began to be disseminated via conference presentations, published articles, and consultations with other schools of education. Organizational stakeholders in this effort, including CADREI, NAEd, AERA, AACTE and others, helped facilitate the widest possible dissemination of the successes and challenges of refashioning, strengthening and transforming professional practice doctorates in education. An effort was made to enable faculty and deans to understand the ways that institutions had engaged in the process and transformed their programs. A product of these efforts was the identification of the central issues that confront education schools as they transform programs and a set of design principles for further work.

June 2009 Convening. The June convening in Palo Alto, CA, opened with team members touting their successes and lessons learned by describing design concepts and program components and implementation efforts over the previous two and half years. Posters were shared and a summative report was made about commonalities in each area. Below is a summary of those key commonalities.

Capstone (there were five distinctive conditions or efforts that were identified):

- Use of non-traditional research methods, e.g. the use of action research

- Assignment of multiple advisors to guide action research capstones
- Research that leads to outcomes that are useful/practical
- Collaboration between "clients", faculty, and cohorts of students
- Programs with structural support to facilitate candidate engagement and completion

Inquiry:

- Successful projects are centered on university expectations but client needs
- Need to think conceptually about how pieces of inquiry come together
- Methods vary from capstone to capstone with a mixed methods approach a common approach
- addition to course work, there is need to practice inquiry in real settings
- Collaboration is essential
- Recognition that some faculty will not embrace the use of mixed methods

Laboratories of Practice:

- Must be something not replicable in the college classroom
- Traditional internships are not necessarily conducive the concept of labs of practice
- Identification of work has to be done in consultation with organizational leaders, colleagues, teachers and faculty, etc.
- Lab of practice is an extended internship that starts from the first course of the program. Labs of practice are sites where candidates make connections between their internship and final project.

Core courses:

- Courses and the required number of credit hours vary across CPED institutions, but they represent similar approaches.
- The program must be interdisciplinary
- Communication skills have to be emphasized
- Small departments are found to be both a challenging and ideal situation
- Capstone has to be part of the core
- Consultation approach to dissertation is done as a team

Signature Pedagogy:

- Signatures became localized to individual universities; signature pedagogies are a departure from a traditional approach
- Signatures have to focus on authentic settings
- Transformation and formation have to be included
- The signature pedagogy is a method used to instruct the cohorts
- Must be collaborative-- at the base of one's success as an leader

Assessment:

- There is no one best way to assess; should be constant and low-stakes
- What and how we measure and what it really measures has to be an ongoing process
- Faculty have to constantly focus on the impacts of the assessment design
- A major challenge is how we measure the longterm impact of the program. Can we find ways to measure the success of the program? Are the graduates effective?
- How do we move beyond traditional barriers and structures that do not necessarily engage students or are irrelevant to the community? Start with data collection prior to the recruitment of candidates.

- Who owns the programs?
- What should be the residency requirements for part-time PPD or Ed.D. candidates?
- If these programs are preparing community leaders, should candidates be required to live in particular communities?

The new president of the Carnegie Foundation, Anthony Bryk also addressed CPED members outlining his agenda for the Carnegie Foundation and the importance of a new entrepreneurial D-E-E-D model for research and development in education. He stressed that this new model could serve as a tool for CPED in several ways-- aiding the institutional design problem; building relationships with places in the field for experimentation and impact; addressing the public policy arena that view schools of education as the problem; and, for determining the high leverage things that leaders need to do.

On the second day, teams heard from Dr. Ellen Goldring (Professor of School Leadership at the Peabody College of Education at Vanderbilt) and Dr. Robert Yinger (Professor of Education at the University of Cincinnati School of Education) who reflected on the result of the outcomes data derived from the Spencer funded research. They both challenged members to consider how these outcomes would be tested both with programs and with practitioners to determine if the outcomes identified for both do indeed produce highly-qualified and effective practitioners. Teams responded by considering the need to scale the outcomes work down to the development of principles of best practice for the professional preparation programs. A discussion around this notion became the seed for the October convening.

Further discussions at the Palo Alto meeting focused on the challenges and strategies that consortium members have utilized to move their project designs forward at their institutions. One group looked at ways to connect with the local community to support and develop program designs. Ideas included use of an advisory boards and the engagement of alumni, use of incentives and rewards for faculty and participating partners and publically promoting the projects developed by Ed.D. students. Another group looked at the challenges of designing inquiry courses and discussed format (integrated or stand alone), delivery (team taught, interactive, weekend options), skills (ability to do versus ability to critique), and content (identify problems, question skills, evaluate data, synthesize information, and solve problems). A third group discussed the quality and impact of the new professional practice degree and determined the need for efficacy as the measure to be used to examine program quality. The fourth group looked at the capstone project and discussed the differences between a capstone (look at a gap in practice, engage alternative topics and formats, consider a group design) versus the traditional dissertation (gap in literature, traditional format, individual effort). The final group discussed the change strategies necessary for implementing such innovative change within traditional academia. Consensus showed that garnering resources upfront, having supportive leadership at the dean and departmental level, having a point person, having administrative support, communicating across multiple stakeholder groups, differentiating between conceptual, developmental, and implementation stages in program design, finding ways for faculty to work together throughout these phases of design and implementation and evaluation, using a stealth approach at times, and not "excessing" over goal setting were important strategies at most CPED institutions.

The convening ended with a discussion of case examples that teams brought with them. Discussions centered on the best ways to both develop and utilize cases in practitioner preparation programs. Members agreed that cases were useful tools for discussion and deliberation and for preparing leaders for real world problem solving that they find in their day-to-day and in their laboratory of practices.

October 2009 Convening. In October 2009, the final CPED (Phase I) convening was hosted by Duquesne University. Professor Rick McCown and Dean Olga Welch organized a two

and half day convening that allowed teams to share their vision for the future of CPED. Dean Welch discussed the importance of this redesign work for every child who deserves a high quality education and fails to receive it in today's schools. Teams were inspired by the work at Duquesne as well as by the accomplishments achieved by all members over the last three years.

The focus for this convening was the identification of principles of practice that can guide the further development of professional practice degrees. These principles were articulated in Palo Alto during the June 2009 convening and teams were asked to come to Pittsburgh with ten principles they believed were essential to their programs. The goal of this final convening was to come to consensus on the definition of a Professional Practice Doctorate degree (Ed.D.) and the central principles that should guide all programs. Members grouped into teams to discuss and deliberate a list of 35 principles with the goal of narrowing them down to ten. Over the course of one and half days, groups were in deep discussions working to define the Ed.D. and the central principles that guide preparation. On the final day, consortium members agreed upon the following *Working Principles for Professional Practice Doctorate* programs, to be tested during CPED Phase II:

We, the members of CPED, believe

“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.”

With this understanding, we have identified the following statements that will focus a research and development agendas to test, refine, and validate principles for the professional doctorate in education.

The Professional doctorate in education:

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

Teams were then asked: *How do we render the accounts of the CPED experience? What are the research and action agendas around these principles for Phase II of CPED?* Several ideas were generated:

- Look across institutions at similarities and distinctions.
- Start a student-generated data base that is evidence of how we work with principles
- Signature assessments: Define 3 that all institutions use and study their efficacy
- Strong formative aspect and summative; focus on capacities of students as they develop and then leave the program; student-tracking database; look at questions on how do students survive in hostile environments; how do students feel about their progress; how do admissions affect student experience?
- Evaluation: tracking longitudinal changes of grads; shifts within organizations and systems changes that result; changing dispositions around culture and diversity; IDI tool

- as pre and post to measure shifts on grad views and affects on decision-making; track student dispositions over time using 360 degree tool
- Content analysis of capstone process; guiding question of what impacts our grads are making on field

In the next phase of CPED, consortium members have committed to testing and refining these principles in collaboration with practitioners and other non/for profit stakeholders. They have shown commitment to keeping this initiative active and to providing empirical evidence that will end the eighty-year discussion of the distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D..

CPED results

Looking across the initial three years of the CPED initiative, it is apparent that much has been accomplished towards not only the distinction of the Ed.D. as a degree with separate intentions from those of the Ph.D., but also, members have come together to define what this degree entails in terms of preparation, in terms of goals, and in terms of results.

Signature pedagogies have been more deeply defined to include the habits of repetition, of hands on practice, of appreciation for adult learners, and of the need for expanding the knowledge and thinking of leaders. Laboratories of practice seek to expose candidates to various learning environments, to give extended time to practice, and to offer practitioner mentors to compliment theoretical learning to enable leaders to make informed decisions. Capstones are taking creative forms that support the type of work that practitioners engage in, allowing them to develop products that serve practitioner learning, local workplace and communities, and that offer the extant literature the a scholarly-practitioner's understanding of complex educational problems. In addition to advancing our design concepts, institutions have defined and developed inquiry preparation for the preparation of both consumers of research for informed decision making, and for scholarly-practitioners who engage in their own investigations. Admissions criteria have been expanded to include ways of gauging learning from the start to finish of programs. And assessments have been weaved throughout the program to allow for understanding of student formation and progress. Mari Koerner, Dean, Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University summed up ASU's participation in this three year process by saying,

"Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University has found that participation in CPED has provided the opportunity for our faculty to take part in the exchange of ideas with faculty and administrators from other institutions and be leaders in developing a new vision of the Education Doctorate. This broad perspective allows us to evaluate our pedagogy and coursework more effectively as we continuously work to improve our newly formed program."

The results of the first three years of CPED have provided much more than a simple understanding of the distinction between the two doctoral degrees. Rather, the consortium has actively engaged the call for reclaiming the doctorate and labeled it the degree of choice for Scholarly-Practitioners. "Since the early 1900s, research that has sought to distinguish the Ed.D. from the Ph.D. has focused primarily on the types of curriculum, nature of research training, the structure of examinations and dissertations, and the career aspirations of graduates. These studies have produced ample evidence that from the inception of each degree in education, no clear understanding of each has prevailed. Yet, despite a near-century of studies, the evidence has done little to quell the endless confusion and calls for distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. Perhaps this debate calls for more directed action.

Not until recently, has any scholar or group attempted to make the distinction of the two through a concerted effort to change each degree. The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate is the first national effort that has undertaken the distinction of the two degrees through

clear examination of the purpose and goals of the Ed.D. with the secondary goal of strengthening the Ph.D. With the development of programs that incorporate new ways of thinking about professional preparation—such as the infusion of strong inquiry skills focused on problems of practice, the development of decision-making skills in uncertain circumstances, and the use of student work places as laboratories in which to test and develop their skills—these CPED-influenced Ed.D. degrees seek first to understand the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for successful practice; and second, to develop programs that will prepare teacher, school, and university leaders to be successful in practice-oriented environments. In the coming years, as the twenty-five CPED institutions design and implement these new professional preparation programs, the evidence will lie in the success of their graduates in educational institutions. In the meantime, CPED will continue to test and refine its work to ensure that the Ed.D. is distinguished as the preferred degree for educational practitioners" (Perry, in press).

Phase II

After three years of productive discussions and hard work, CPED has ended its initial three years with many accomplishments. We have defined the professional practice doctorate in education. We have defined the central components that should be included in these programs. We have developed several models around the country that are preparing practitioners in innovative ways. We have produced several articles about the work and several books are in the works.

All this work demonstrates that CPED is by no means at an ending. Rather, it is at the beginning of a new phase where the definition of the Ed.D. and the working principles must be tested and refined and the policy implications must be explicated. 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. CPED has taken the lead in this effort and seeks to continue this work.

To implement Phase II, the CPED leadership is currently seeking grant funds that will support both infrastructure and R&D projects at the twenty-five institutions. The Carnegie Foundation and Tony Bryk have offered modest support for CPED’s continued work, namely continued use of the Carnegie Foundation name and use of Foundation space during convenings. In addition, CADREI has offered to continue to oversee the initiative and support efforts to disseminate findings throughout its membership. The twenty-five member institutions have shown a strong commitment to continuing this work for the next several years and are willing to continue supporting their primary investigators research and travel.

Activities that will take place during Phase II include:

1. the evaluation of CPED,
2. the development of a new governance and operations structure,
3. the redesign of a website that will serve as a central point for researchers, practitioners, policy makers, and other leadership stakeholders, and
4. A large-scale research and development effort that will test and refine the result of first phase of CPED.

In sum, the seed for rethinking how our nation prepares educational leaders that was sparked and planted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has flourished

into a national initiative that is being followed and replicated by many outside of the consortium. Indeed, "the Carnegie connection has given legitimacy and visibility to our new program and has helped in attracting faculty and administrative support" (Willis Hawley, faculty member, University of Maryland). As CPED moves into its second phase, we look forward to a continued and productive relationship with the Foundation as we test our program designs and disseminate our findings.

Appendix A: A Chronology of the Ed.D. (Perry, in press)

Date	Who	Event	Results
1893	Teachers College, J. Russell	First Ph.D. in Education	To develop a professional degree
1920	Harvard Graduate School of Education, Henry Holmes	First Ed.D. in Education	To establish independence from School of Arts and Sciences
1930	Monroe, W.	Survey of 6 institutions with Ed.D. & Ph.D. programs	Curriculum between the two very similar with small difference
1931	Freeman, F.N.	Extended Monroe study to 13 institutions	Ed.D. served to “organize existing knowledge instead of discovering new truths” (p.1)
1934	Teachers College, William Russell	Develops Ed.D.	Attempts to establish independence and follow national trends
1930-1940	EdD proliferation	Stanford, Berkeley, Michigan, etc all develop Ed.D.	
1963	Eells, W.C.	Survey of characteristics of each degree—admissions, nature of exams & dissertation, classification of each degree	Determined the degrees are indistinguishable
1964	AACTE & Ludlow, H.G.	Survey of abilities, career motivation, & job satisfaction in graduates at 91 institutions	Ph.D. “intended to be an academic-research degree”; Ed.D. “intended to be a practitioner professional degree” (p. 22). No difference in intelligence or ability
1966	AACTE & Brown, L.D.	Follow up to Ludlow study to determine similarities and difference of degree holders	Despite increase in degrees awarded, most graduates went back to prior job
1983	Anderson, D.G.	Study of his academic department at Univ. of Washington to determine similarities and differences between degrees—program requirements and job aspirations	Strong similarity in admission preparation and graduation requirements; However, Ph.D. considered to be scholarly while Ed.D. viewed as professional degree.
1985	Dill & Morrison	Study of research requirements at 81 institutions	Found methods of inquiry similar
1988	Clifford, G.J. & Guthrie, J.W.	Study examined Ed Schools in the US	Call for elimination of Ph.D. to fully professionalize education and make Ed.D. degree of choice
1991	Brown, L.D.	Response to Clifford & Guthrie utilizing historical data on both degrees	Flux in both suggest each are valid degrees
1993	Osguthorpe & Wong	Study of trends in doctoral education	Found no trend in moving to offer on or other, Ed.D. more likely found at comprehensive institutions. Called for national discussion to distinguish
1998	Deering, T.E.	Examined dissertations, research taught, and utilization of each degree at 50 institutions	Dissertation differences consistent with purpose of each degree— Ph.D. creates knowledge; Ed.D. investigates practical issues; both taught qualitative and quantitative methods
2006	Shulman, Golde, Bueschel & Garabedian	Response to work of CID; historical review of doctoral preparation	Called for reclaiming of the Ed.D. as the professional practice degree in education
2007	Levine, A.	Response to Shulman et al.	Six disincentives that will keep

			schools of Ed from distinguishing.
2007	Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate	Consortium to rethink the EdD	25 College and schools of education come together to redesign purpose and goals of EdD. Outcomes include definition of Ed.D., working principles for programs, and characteristics of graduates

APPENDIX B: CPED Institutions

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Type</i>	<i>CPED Focus Area</i>
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	School 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 C:

Working Principles for the Professional Practice Doctorate in Education

Developed by The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate

We, the members of CPED, believe

“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.”

With this understanding, we have identified the following statements that will focus a research and development agendas to test, refine, and validate principles for the professional doctorate in education.

The Professional doctorate in education:

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

Bibliography

- Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 55-58.
- Brown, L. D. (1966). *Doctoral graduates in education. An inquiry into their motives, aspirations, and perceptions of the program*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J.W. (1990). *Ed school: A brief for a professional education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Cremin, L. (1978). *The education of the educating professions*. Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 243-248.
- Dill, D. D., & Fridman, C.P. (1978). *An analysis of frameworks for research on change and innovation in higher education*. Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J.L. (1985). Ed.D. and Ph.D. research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *Review of Higher Education*, 8(2), 169-182.
- Freeman, F. N. (1931). *Practices of American universities in granting higher degrees in education: A series of official statements* (Vol. 19). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L.S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change*, October/November, 10-15.
- Imig, D., Perry, J.A., & Syed, S. (2009). *Creating rubrics for the assessment of the Ed.D.: Narrative report to the Spencer Foundation*. College Park, MD: Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York, NY: The Education Schools Project.
- Levine, A. (2007). *Educating researchers*. New York, NY: The Education Schools Project.
- Ludlow, H. G. (1964). *The Doctorate in Education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The Ph.D. versus the Ed.D.: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education*, 18(1), 47-63.
- Perry, J. A., & Imig, D.G. (2008). A stewardship of practice in education. *Change* November/December, 42-48.
- Richardson, V. (2006). Doctoral education in education. In C. M. Golde, & Walker, G.E. (Ed.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline* (pp. 251-268). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52-59.
- Shulman, L. S., Golde, C.M., Bueschel, A.C., & Garabedian, K.J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25-32.

