

**FIPSE Grant: P116B100134**  
**Project Title: Redesign of the Professional Practice Doctorate in Education**  
**by the CARNEGIE PROJECT ON THE EDUCATION DOCTORATE (CPED)**  
**Final Report September 2014**

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conceptualized the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) to “reclaim” the education doctorate (Ed.D.) and *make it a stronger and more relevant degree for the advanced preparation of practitioners* (Author, 2011, 2012; Author & Imig, 2008). Shulman, Golde, Bueschel and Garabedian (2006) envisioned CPED as a grassroots movement of individuals from various colleges of education who would work together to change the status and purpose of the Ed.D. To Shulman et al., CPED members would draw on their own experiences, values, and visions about what doctoral programs should entail and use these to design distinct programs.

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

1. Delineate a clear distinction between the professional practice doctorate in education (Ed.D.) and the education research doctorate (Ph.D.).
2. Improve the efficacy and efficiency of programs leading to the Ed.D.

To guide this work, members collaboratively developed a working definition of the Ed.D. (the first since its inception at Harvard University in 1920). The CPED definition of the education doctorate is:

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.

To accomplish these goals, faculty members in the Consortium created a guiding framework that consists of six design-concepts and six principles for program development. The six design-concepts are 1) Scholarly Practitioner, graduates who are individuals capable of blending their practical wisdom with their professional skills and knowledge to name, frame, and solve problems of practice. 2) Signature pedagogy is the pervasive set of practices used to prepare scholarly practitioners for all aspects of their professional work: “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” (Shulman, 2005, p.52). 3) Inquiry in Practice is the process of posing significant questions that focus on complex problems of practice. 4) Laboratories of Practice are settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other. 5) Problem of practice is as a persistent, contextualized, and specific issue embedded in the work of a professional practitioner, the addressing of which has the potential to result in improved understanding, experience, and outcomes. 6) The Dissertation in Practice a scholarly endeavor that impacts a complex problem of practice. These design-concepts offer tools for the development of Ed.D. programs which are grounded in the framework of a set of working principles which were created by Consortium members (CPED, 2009):

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.

CPED faculty members created these principles as a response to move the Consortium away from a prescriptive program model, toward a framework that honored local context yet supported commonality and quality across institutions. As a result, the new definition of the Ed.D., the design-concepts and principles for program development have allowed CPED to be the first action-oriented effort working to and distinguish and define the Ed.D. as rigorous and relevant degree for professional practice (Author, 2011, 2012; Author & Imig, 2008).

In 2010, the CPED Consortium received a \$700,000 U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE) grant to study how twenty-one of its original member schools of education changed their Ed.D. programs as a result of being part of the CPED. Specifically, the FIPSE-funded research project sought to use a multi-case analysis to answer the following research questions:

1. What has been CPED's impact on doctoral preparation, has it been perceived as an innovation?
2. What do the Professional Practice Doctorates look like and how do they differ from what was offered before?
3. How did the college/school make and diffuse these changes?

#### 4. What are the lessons learned?

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

### **Theoretical Frame**

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

Rogers' *Diffusion of Innovation* model and his perspective on four elements of change: defining of the innovation; the means of communication; time necessary to adapt, adopt, or reject the innovation; and social system were chosen to help the researchers understand if and how institutions viewed CPED design-concepts and principles as innovations and if Ed.D. programs

were changed utilizing the CPED framework. Rogers' elements of diffusion offered a lens for understanding change within a complex system such as a school of education.

### **Methodology and Data Sources**

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

Data were analyzed in a two-phase process: first, individual case writing and then cross-case analysis. In the first stage, the teams of two researchers constructed case studies from the transcripts of their interviews, observations, and artifacts. The researchers followed a structured analysis plan that began with a reading and re-reading of all data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Then the researchers coded their data (primarily the interviews and observations) with a set of predetermined codes based on Roger's theory and on the research questions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Fifty-nine codes were provided and grouped into six categories: 1) organizational changes, 2) faculty perceptions of their roles, their engagement, and the redesign elements, 3) CPED program design concepts and principles, 4) student perceptions, intentions, and outcomes, 5) curriculum design, and 6) learning environment. Researchers were encouraged to add more codes for their individual analyses as they emerged naturally from the data. .

To begin, the researchers were asked to perform a sample coding. Research team partners each coded one of their transcripts and then cross-check their coding together. Discrepancies were discussed until 80% agreement was maintained (Miles & Huberman, 1994). After consistency was established, the research teams were encouraged to continue coding the rest of their case data. After all the interviews and observations were coded, the researchers performed a categorical analysis. They developed categories and subcategories and defined the properties and dimensions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) for each. They then related the categories and subcategories to one another and identified the conditions, actions, interactions and consequences of each phenomenon. They used this deductive process until the data had “run its course” and categories were saturated (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 62). Research teams then made assertions to answer each of the research questions for their individual cases. Researchers then wrote individual case reports that followed an organized outline constructed from the research questions to create consistency across the 21 reports (Yin, 2003). Each report explained CPED’s impact on doctoral preparation, and identified the changes that were made and how, and the lessons learned by various individuals

The second layer of analysis entailed three researchers conducting a cross-case analysis across the twenty-one case reports. The researchers applied codes, developed categories, merged categories into themes, and from these created a table with assertions. Tables were then merged so that similarities and differences could be seen both within and across institutions. Through continued comparison and adjustment, findings surfaced and lead to assertions aimed at answering each of the research questions (Stake, 2006).

## **Discussion of Results**

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

### **Impact on Schools of Education**

The cross-case analysis revealed that CPED has impacted the twenty-one schools of education in terms of policies, faculty positions and understanding of the Ed.D. degree. Below is an explanation of each of these.

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

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

Externally, institutions reported facing pressure from multiple sources. State level governance wanted improvement in the preparation educational leaders, districts and organizations were asking for well trained individuals and research partners, and practitioner advisory groups wanted programs that would provide them with the leaders they needed. Pressures caused institutions to investigate their programs through self-studies and internal reviews. Some institutions found that students and graduates wanted programmatic changes that would better help them gain leadership abilities, specifically around the dissertation. However, in a few cases, programmatic change was not agreed to by state legislatures and, as a result a traditional program continued while a CPED-influence program was created alongside it.

CPED offered direction for change that would allow these issues to be addressed and to establish new policies for doctoral preparation that were grounded in a national effort. Resulting policy changes included:

- *Time to degree*: moving from 6-10 years down to 3-4 years where dissertation work is included in the program timeframe.
- *Number of degree credits*: moving from the traditional Ph.D. number of requirements to 42 – 60 credits beyond the masters.

- *Dissertation format:* moving from a traditional five-chapter, lengthy traditional dissertation to various designs, shorter lengths, varied types of research, and a new name—such as capstone and dissertation in practice).
- *Dissertation oversight:* moving from traditional committees composed of only tenure-track faculty to including practitioners, reducing committee size, allowing students to execute and author research together, advising of students as groups rather than one-to-one.
- *Faculty teaching:* moving from traditional classroom format to meeting more frequently (including meeting in informal settings). When and where faculty taught changed including summer intensive sessions, weekend teaching, and on-line and hybrid formats.
- *Faculty advising:* moving from a traditional apprentice model to a more egalitarian and communal situation where faculty and students collaborate in learning. In most cases, group advising became a more manageable means to working with a larger number of Ed.D. candidates.

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

*Ed.D. as a professional degree.* As noted above, the primary reasons to distinguish the Ed.D. as a professional degree centered on image and quality. Historically viewed as a

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

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

*Types of faculty positions.* Emerging from the data were two notions around faculty hiring. First, though not present across all cases, was the hiring of clinical faculty to have a role in Ed.D. programs and fill non-tenure track roles. Several institutions noted clinical faculty to be central to designing their professional preparation doctorate and teaching in their programs.

These individuals were highly valued because of their strong connection to the world of practice combined with faculty experience and their professional contacts. They served as liaisons between the school of education and districts or educational organizations. Clinical faculty members were also given roles on dissertation committees serving as guides to help students apply research to solve problems in practice.

A second change in positions frequently seen across CPED institutions was the role of assistant faculty members. Junior faculty members were hired into tenure-track positions with intent of having them heavily involved in or even leading the change effort for the Ed.D. program design. The data suggested that new tenure-track faculty were chosen to lead and be involved in programs because it was believed they would be invested in the institution and more open to change than some of the more established faculty members. Assistant faculty members were viewed as having more energy and ambition, as well as, vision for change. A few interviewees from across a handful of institutions noted, however, that giving this kind of work to junior faculty members could be detrimental to their promotion and tenure as well as the change process itself. Assistant faculty members had little institutional knowledge (e.g., how to work around the system), voice, or resources to get things accomplished. In addition, they were encumbered with the responsibilities of the tenure process.

*Resistance.* Resistance to change from faculty was present in most of the cases and appeared in the forms of non-interest, non-involvement and pushback on change ideas. In the majority of the cases, a minority of faculty at some point in the change process expressed resistance to redesigning the Ed.D., either its purpose or program design. In some cases, resistance resulted from the decision-making process and how the institution became involved in CPED. Rogers (1995) suggests, *who* makes the decision to adopt an innovation has direct impact

on the willingness of constituents to adopt it. At institutions where the dean made the decision to join CPED without consulting or collaborating with faculty first, a great degree of resistance could be found among those who were not invited to lead the effort. At institutions where faculty members were part of the decision-making process, they were more engaged in the change effort. Resistance also came from faculty members who were not as involved in the Ed.D. redesign process and from those not chosen to serve as liaisons between CPED and their home institutions. Many cases revealed that those not close to the effort, or as familiar with CPED principles and design-concepts, claimed they could not see the immediate difference in the CPED-influenced Ed.D.. In some cases, this was because traditional Ed.D. programs were still being implemented alongside CPED-influenced Ed.D. programs making distinctions harder to see from the outside. In other cases, change was simply resisted because faculty members who were not directly involved were less aware of discussions about CPED and CPED ideas.

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

*Cachet.* For the institutions examined in this study, participating in the CPED also brought a certain level of cachet that supported their Ed.D. redesign and resulted in impactful changes. This cachet came in the form of name recognition and networking. The Carnegie

Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has a long history of success in reforms and members had no reason to believe this project would be any different. Having the Carnegie name attached to the project was an advantage. Members saw value in having direct interaction with individuals who had experience leading reform efforts in higher education. They found the ideas of Dr. Lee Shulman, President-Emeritus, and his Carnegie colleagues to be extremely useful and they valued CPED's leadership, under Dr. David Imig, President-Emeritus of AACTE, who arranged for opportunities for them to interact with and develop ideas about the Ed.D. with like-minded individuals at bi-annual meetings. Such advantages brought ownership, legitimacy and validation to reforming the Ed.D.. Faculty and deans also viewed the initiative as one grounded in research offering "Shulman's theoretical research base," as one dean noted, adding the project was not a "fly by night" reform.

A second form of cachet came as the potential to network with other schools of education around the United States that were grappling with the same issues. Though not a usual practice in higher education, faculty and deans who participated directly in CPED convenings expressed a sense of security and validation as they realized that their "ideas aligned with others" (dean participant). Having the opportunity to comfortably discuss the real issues that faced the Ed.D. degree as well as programmatic problems and solutions with peers provided a kind of professional development that faculty had not had before.

In sum, CPED was a reform effort that met challenges and quelled discontent by pushing change from the inside out. CPED offered deans and faculty at member institutions opportunities to distinguish their Ed.D. degrees and programs from their Ph.D.s. The collaborative nature of convenings engaged them in a respectable, national discussion about doctoral work, helped them see what others were doing, encouraged them to make changes, and confirmed their progress

toward distinction. Rogers (1995) calls these attributes of an innovation *compatibility*, *trialability* and *observability* and are the means to attract adopters. In the twenty-one cases, CPED as an innovation provided compatible answers to challenges institutions were facing in a constructive and flexible manner. Individuals learned from each other at bi-annual convenings, worked together, and created and implemented CPED's principles and design concepts into their programs. Compatibility, trialability and observability lead to changes across member institutions.

### **Program-level Change**

The data revealed that involvement in CPED caused programmatic changes and because of these, Ed.D.s now look different and are distinct from Ph.D. programs and degrees. CPED affected all aspects of program development from admissions, to the type of courses offered, to course delivery, to support structures, and to the look and feel of the dissertation. However, even with these changes programs did not become clones of each other (Shulman et al., 2006). Institutions were able to use their own experiences, values, expertise and visions to design or redesign their programs. CPED member schools of education incorporated CPED's concepts and principles; however, how these were incorporated varied based on where an institution was located and where a program was in the design or redesign process.

*Program Design.* The third element of Rogers' (1995) *Diffusion of Innovation* model is the role of time in the change process because it matters to both the decision making process and the rate of adoption or rejection, of an innovation. When it came to design changes, time mattered. Data show programs were at varying phases of development—from starting fresh, to redesigning an older program, to having already begun the redesign before joining CPED—and

which determined what they sought from membership in CPED. The data reveal three stages of program design development:

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

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

*Admissions:* CPED affected admission policies by helping to clarify the type of individual that was admitted and what was required of applicants. For example, policies refocused on admitting candidates working in PK-20 education or organizations that supported

it, who had several years experience and planned to remain in a work setting. The data also noted changing admissions policies to admit a more diverse student body. Wanting to attract top working professionals, some institutions waived GRE requirements in lieu of more authentic demonstrations of professional knowledge and leadership. Some admissions policies also required students to indicate a problem in practice that they intended to study and improve during their program. Different types of essays and writing samples, ones that focused on problems of practice or professional writing (versus academic writing), were changed requirements. Finally, a small number of institutions asked applicants to provide permission from their professional institutions to make doctoral study an integral part of their work—offering time off for class, studying or writing.

*Cohorts.* Attrition rates have been a concern for institutions of higher learning and, as noted earlier, because of the confusion between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. there had been many ABDs. Failure to complete doctoral programs was multifaceted for working professions who maintain a full-time position as they pursue their degrees. Working on a doctorate requires sacrifice. In the words of a student, “I think that working in the field and doing this [program] at the same time is the best possible combination, even though it makes all of us crazy.” In addition, lack of advising post-course work often leaves working professionals without the contact needed to remain engaged in study. To reduce attrition, CPED-influenced programs use a cohort structure which range in size across member institutions from 12 to 150 students. Cohorts are seen as a means to offer support and structure from orientation through to dissertation defense because students stay together through most of their program and, many cases, are expected to finish together. Additionally, at some point in the program, students are often broken into smaller groups (5-9 students) to facilitate faculty advising. These groups have a faculty mentor and in some cases,

these faculty members follow them through to the dissertation phase and serve as their chair.

These smaller groups have varied names including: *Structured Seminars*, *Laboratories of Practice*, and *Leaders Scholar Communities* and in multiple cases these groups contribute to the growing retention and graduation rate reported.

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

*Courses.* CPED-influenced programs graduate students in two to four years. Consortium members decided early on that this time frame supported what they had learned from self-studies, that practitioners had limited time and funds to commit to doctoral programs. However, the data showed that at several institutions, this quick completion time was a challenge for students. Being working professionals with family commitments, students noted troubles balancing these obligations with doctoral study. At institutions where the short timeframe was successful, programs were cohesive, with courses building upon one another, and activities were related to students professional lives and needs and often the dissertation was started in the first year.

All CPED-influenced programs require core/signature courses that are taken in a sequential order along with electives (which in some, but not all, programs lead to principal or superintendent certification). This clearly laid out sequence indicates to students where they are headed and the time they need to be committed to the program. Across the consortium both core

and elective courses are offered in a variety of formats that support institutional logistics and the needs of busy, working professionals. Courses are offered face-to-face, in hybrid fashion, online, and by video-conferencing. As opposed to the early morning or afternoon courses offered to Ph.D. students, courses in CPED-influenced programs take advantage of students' off time— evenings, weekends, summers. Courses also fit into professional schedules, meeting online or monthly. Additionally, at some institutions courses are offered at students' work sites or in their districts. As one member noted their faculty, "bring the college to the people."

Aligned with CPED's principles courses are designed to honor professional knowledge and practice, transform thinking, promote issues of equity and social justice, and connect theory and methodology to practice. At CPED-influenced programs courses and coursework are based on the needs of adult learners, encouraging students to be responsible for their own learning. Courses are enlightening, practical, and authentic; that is, grounded in the real world needs and experiences of practitioners. In the words of one faculty member, "...it's grounded in professional practice, but at the same time informed by outside perspectives." Examples of this can be seen in field-embedded classes, case analyses, and action research. Programs demonstrated that students learn in laboratories of practice (often their work setting) by doing and applying what they learn in their courses and reporting back through coursework. Courses are designed to scaffold learning and be closely tied to dissertation work. In many programs, dissertation work begins on day one, in course one.

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

sometimes, practitioners co-teach with faculty. At some institutions two courses are blended together and co-taught by faculty to provide interdisciplinary understanding.

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

Articulating the benefit of methodological knowledge, faculty members from the one institution said they wanted their students to become sound decision-makers and problem-solvers. Aligned with CPED’s principles, developing students into problem-solvers was a common theme among faculty interviewed. To accomplish this goal, program content encourages students to apply what they learn to problems in their practice setting. When it comes to method courses, instructors provide understandable information in increments or, use a “just in time” approach. Examples of this include gap analysis, cycles of action research, and the research phases presented below by a faculty member from one institution:

- Phase 1: Students complete research and inquiry coursework that focuses on epistemological perspectives and understanding of approaches to systematic inquiry (first year coursework, research design (fall), quantitative analysis (fall) and qualitative analysis (spring)).

- Phase 2: Students explore theories and frameworks related to the field of educational leadership to gain lenses through which to understand their identified problems of practice (coursework focuses upon leadership, social justice, professional development, educational policy, and research methods).
- Phase 3: Students complete a capstone project that applies field-based inquiry, using professional and theoretical knowledge, to understand a problem of practice.

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

- writing boot camps - to both improve students' academic writing and provide time for students to write academically
- modules - to allow online flexible learning
- case-based learning - to develop thinking about authentic problems of practice
- project-based learning - to encourage collaborative efforts around problems of practice
- guest speaker colloquiums - to expose students to practitioners and academics who have addressed problems of practice
- international trips – to broaden students' perspectives of education and leadership

*Learning Environments.* In CPED-institutions learning environments vary; however, most are collaborative and constructivist in nature and designed to cross the university-practice divide. Even though some direct instruction and lecture still takes place, most environments are complimented with internships or laboratories of practice so students can learn from more

knowledgeable others, with embedded field-work so students can learn from practice and with peer-to-peer collaboration to support learning. In one faculty member's words, "students take their learning back to their school sites, because it's not simply a theory-based program."

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

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

and alternatives of current policy initiatives in education. In most instances students report their findings back to their constituents.

### **Impact on Individuals**

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

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

More frequently, however, it was the school of education dean who was directly involved. CPED gave deans new ways to bargain and collaborate across, as well as outside, of their organization. As a first indication of involvement, the dean of each school of education who applied to be part of the first CPED cohort had to sign an agreement to participate and offer support, which meant committing funds for faculty to attend bi-annual convenings and sometimes a graduate assistant. As noted above, whether the dean chose to join CPED in consultation with the faculty was critical to how change ideas were eventually accepted and diffused. Exemplifying Rogers' (1995) notion of the importance of collaborative decision-making, deans who acted alone in making the decision to join CPED reported continued lingering fallout; whereas deans who formed a faculty-led team to develop the CPED proposal and program redesign plan saw more success.

CPED offered deans a level of cachet that allowed them to introduce the change ideas to their upper administration with ease. As a result, they could provide financial support for faculty and sometimes graduate students to attend the bi-annual convenings as well as support the design or redesign process. Occasionally the dean and/or an associate dean attended convenings as well. In addition, several deans were able to host a CPED convening on their campus, a custom that continues within the consortium. Having the dean's support both financial and through advocacy to upper administration and among reluctant faculty has helped institutions be successful in their Ed.D. redesign efforts. In several cases, where the original dean has left the school of education since the admission into CPED, faculty reported this departure meant less or a loss of support for the Ed.D. redesign and participation in CPED.

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

*Faculty.* Both the faculty member who was directly engaged with the CPED consortium (known as the *principal investigator* and who served as the liaison between CPED and their home campus) as well as their home institution colleagues who worked with the program redesign were impacted by CPED. On the one hand, CPED provided a national network and framework within which faculty learned and contributed. This network of like-minded individuals offered new ways of thinking about program design, assessments, and ways to work

within restrictive university policies. For example, faculty members learned how to pilot program features and gather data to show success before seeking approval from university governance. They learned how to develop group advising and dissertation committee structures. They were able to do these because they could, “see what others were doing” (faculty participant). Faculty members involved in CPED also offered constructive criticism to help their colleagues improve their designs. This kind of sharing, contributing and learning across a diverse group of faculty offered an unfamiliar but welcomed model of professional development and support to enact programmatic changes.

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

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

programs of study with students moving at a quicker pace has simply required more of faculty member's time.

Consequently, a frequently heard theme in the data was flexibility. Faculty members noted the continual need to be open to revision as their Ed.D. programs are implemented. This was especially true when program leaders and participants retire or move away and new colleagues are hired. As one interviewee noted, "it is interesting to watch faculty who advocate change in PK-12 settings figure out how to make changes in their own university workplaces that are typically conservative in terms of change."

The cross-case analysis revealed that in some departments, faculty members received stipends for developing or teaching new courses, had a course buyout, or were provided a graduate assistant to help them with their work. At other schools, little or no remuneration was offered. Yet despite the benefits of remuneration, financial encouragement was not the main reason faculty members became invested in the CPED-influenced Ed.D. redesign. Rather, a majority of faculty across institutions cared deeply about understanding what it was that practitioner students in Ed.D. programs wanted and needed in terms of their preparation and professional goals. Whether leading the redesign effort or serving as part of the faculty team, developing a new or revising an existing doctoral degree required new ways of thinking, teaching and advising. Faculty involved in the Ed.D. redesign process have been encouraged by what they see their students learning and accomplishing as a result of program changes.

Changes in faculty roles and time commitments produced ongoing challenges for several institutions. For example, faculty members who were not directly involved in CPED meetings yet were affected by change results frequently resisted the changes to their role and time commitments. Their lack of support could frequently slow the design/redesign process in the

department or school of education democratic system. Responses to resisting faculty have ranged from letting them staying out of program design or redesign to inviting them to dissertation defenses so they could see the types and quality of research students were performing, and in turn, want to get involved. Another example included junior, tenure-track faculty who were appointed to be principal investigators and who often struggled to understand how this programmatic work and work with CPED fits into their tenure/reward process. Equally, data revealed that practitioners who were hired as clinical faculty in some cases did not feel welcomed into academic departments.

*Students.* Students in CPED-influenced programs explained that clearer distinctions between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. made it clear that the Ed.D. was their degree of choice for a variety of reasons.. Overwhelmingly, students were drawn to and pleased with their program's foci on their own problems of practice and professional goals, seeing immediate relevance to their workplaces. Students welcomed the use of their practitioner knowledge and professional opinions in their classes. Students benefited from and welcomed the extended communication and interaction with faculty and with the members of their cohort both in terms of knowledge and encouragement.

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

knowing that their school or program were involved in CPED, students could feel the shift in focus and purpose of Ed.D. programs.

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

### **Implications and Further Research**

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

In the meantime, even with lessons emerging more lines of research need to be developed. The institutions studied were part of the original cohort admitted in 2007. Since then, membership in CPED has increased to 86 schools of education and programs have continued to

evolve and grow. Future studies can explore how and if changes at these 21 schools of education maintain or, slip back into old ways of thinking about the Ed.D. over time. Research also needs to investigate the challenges and benefits of newly designed programs in this economically challenged environment. More study about newer members and their ability to create and maintain similar changes is needed. Finally, and perhaps more crucial in today's political climate, CPED has been in existence long enough to investigate the impact CPED-influenced program graduates on their work environments and in practice. With more member programs developing and more graduates emerging, CPED is ripe for gathering evidence that has the potential to alter policies around leadership in education. These challenges and insights may be just what the Ed.D. needs to be distinct and reclaimed.

### **Additional Products**

In addition to the above report, the CPED FIPSE research has resulted in publications and presentations (see appendix A); an EdD quality program recognition process (see Appendix B); and several “products” that offer lessons learned and “best practices” for EdD program development to be disseminated via the CPED website (see Appendix C).

## Appendix A: Publications & Presentations

### Publications

Zambo, R., Zambo, D., Buss, R.R., Perry, J.A., & Williams, T.R. (2013 & 2014). Seven years after the call: students' and graduates' perceptions of the re-envisioned EdD. *Innovative Higher Education*. Published first online May 2013  
DOI 10.1007/s10755-013-9262-3; in hard copy February 2014 Vol. 39. Issue 2

### Paper Submitted

Perry, J.A., Zambo, D., & Wunder, S. (under revisions). Understanding How Schools of Education have Redesigned the Doctorate of Education. *Journal of School Public Relations*.

Zambo, D., Buss, R.D., Zambo, R. & Perry, J.A. (in submission). Researching the Researchers: The Influence of a Sense of Belonging on Faculty and Student Research Volunteers Conducting Case Study Research submitted to *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*.

### Presentations Done

Zambo, D., Perry, J.A., Imig, D, & Wunder, S. (July 2013). *The Education Doctorate, Grassroots Changes, and Future Aspirations: The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate's Work to Reinvasion the Ed.D.* Paper presented at the Annual Conference British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society, Edinburgh, UK.

Buss, R. R., Zambo, R., Zambo, D., Perry, J. A., & Williams, T. R. (April 2013). *Faculty members' responses to implementing redesigned EdD programs*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Zambo; R., Zambo, D., Buss, R.R., Perry, J.A., & Williams, T.R. (April 2013). *Students' Perceptions of the Re-Envisioned EdD*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Perry, J.A. (December, 2013) Transforming the EdD: Making It the Degree of Choice for Professional Practitioners. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of Council of Graduate Schools, San Diego, CA

Zambo, D., Buss, R., Perry, J.A., & Zambo. R. (April 2014) Researching the Researchers: The Influence of a Sense of Belonging to CPED on Faculty and Student Research Volunteers, American Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA

Perry, J.A., Zambo, D., Wunder, S. (April 2014). Understanding how Schools of Education have Redesigned the Doctorate of Education. American Educational Research Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Perry, J., Zambo, D. & Imig, D. (2014) The Education Doctorate, Grassroots Changes, and Future Aspirations: The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate's Work to Reinvasion the Ed.D. in the USA Adelaide (accepted but unable to attend)

### **Presentations Upcoming**

Perry J.A. & Imig, D. (September 2014). Transforming the EdD: Making It the Degree of Choice for Professional Practitioners. Presentation at the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Washington, DC.

Perry, J.A., Zambo, D., Wunder, S. (November 2014) Changing Schools of Education through EdD Program Redesign. Paper to be presented at Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC.

Perry, J.A., Zambo, D., Wunder, S. (November 2014) Changing Schools of Education through EdD Program Redesign. Paper to be presented at University Council of Education Administrators, Washington, DC.

## Appendix B: CPED Program Quality Recognition Process



### CARNEGIE PROJECT ON THE EDUCATION DOCTORATE

#### Framework for Recognition of EdD Programs

March 2014

### Preamble

Through the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) initiative, a set of Working Principles have been developed to clarify a stance on the Doctorate of Education. The *Working Principles* and *Design Concepts* provides a set of features or characteristics of EdD programs which adhere to this particular stance or perspective. The CPED professional doctorate in education is intentionally framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice, promotes collaboration, and uses field-based opportunities to analyze high-leverage problems of practice. It emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

As CPED members looked to the future, plans to organize into a formal entity led to conversations about the recognition process required to set apart EdD programs that adhere to or are in the process of applying CPED *Working Principles* to the development, implementation and improvement of their CPED affiliated degree programs.

As such, CPED continues to define a developmental continuum to be utilized to determine the degree to which a program is systematically moving towards, has implemented, and/or maintained fidelity to the *Working Principles*, *Design Concepts*, and overall perspectives on the EdD. This effort in no way is meant to be overly rigid or exclusionary. In addition, the matrix of standards and criteria are not intended to serve as - or supersede - national, state, or professional organization accreditation processes and procedures. Indeed, the CPED recognition process could enhance an accreditation review.

It is with this background that a task force was convened to draft a set of guidelines and criteria which could be applied to existing programs and used to determine whether a program should be recognized as a CPED EdD program.

### Introduction

CPED member institutions are committed to improve doctoral education for the preparation of scholarly practitioners through national conversations focused on “reclaiming, reframing, and redesigning” the professional Doctor of Education (EdD). The recognition process recognizes those doctoral programs that have embraced and implemented CPED ideals, serving as a mechanism for external constituencies to distinguish EdD programs. Active CPED member

institutions have their program reviewed for consistency with the CPED *Working Principles* (2009), which includes applying the CPED *Design Concepts* (2010) as a means to enact them. CPED-recognized programs use continuous improvement data to demonstrate the impact of their program, students, and alumni.

### **Objectives for Recognition**

With this understanding in mind, the CPED recognition process is designed to:

- Articulate the nature and function of the doctorate of education for scholarly leaders in practice-based settings;
- Demonstrate effectiveness that adheres to the CPED *Working Principles* and *Design Concepts*;
- Provide a framework for continuous program improvement;
- Recognize differing phases of program development; and
- Expect active participation and contributions by member institutions to CPED organizational activities and initiatives.

### **CPED Design Concepts**

The professional Doctor of Education (EdD) emphasizes the practical application of disciplined inquiry and theory in education, with a goal of preparing *Scholarly Practitioners* to identify potential solutions to high-leverage problems of practice in various settings. They collaborate with key stakeholders, including P-12 and post-secondary institutions, the community, and individuals, and apply appropriate and specific practices, to generate new knowledge, and to assume responsibility for the stewardship of the profession. They work for change and equitable and socially just outcomes and disseminate their work in multiple ways.

*Scholarly Practitioners* blend practical wisdom with professional skills and knowledge to name, frame, and generate and test solutions to high-leverage problems of practice. They use disciplined inquiry and applied theories as tools for change to advance equitable and socially just outcomes. They disseminate their work in multiple ways, and they demonstrate a commitment to resolve problems of practice by collaborating with key stakeholders, including P-12 and post-secondary institutions, the community, and individuals.

To prepare these individuals, their programs use a *Signature Pedagogy* consisting of three dimensions that prepares scholarly practitioners for all aspects of professional work. First, teaching is deliberate, pervasive, and persistent. It challenges assumptions, engages in action, and requires ongoing assessment and accountability. Second, teaching and learning at CPED-influenced programs are grounded in theory, research, and address high-leverage problems of practice. Third, teaching helps students develop a critical and professional stance that includes a moral and ethical imperative for equity and social justice. In sum, a *Signature Pedagogy* is a kind of teaching that leads to habits of mind, hand, and heart.

Professional doctoral programs in education situate scholarly activities in *Laboratories of Practice* to ensure that theory and practice inform and enrich each other. They address high-leverage problems of practice where ideas—formed by the intersection of theory, inquiry, and practice—can be implemented, measured, and analyzed for impact on identified

problems. *Laboratories of Practice* facilitate transformative and generative learning that may be measured by the development of scholarly expertise and implementation of effective practices.

Finally, doctoral programs in education utilize an *Inquiry as Practice* model of scholarship, a model of inquiry that promotes students' ability to use data to inform decision-making and enhance practice. As such, *Inquiry as Practice* requires the ability to gather, organize, judge, aggregate, and analyze situations, literature, and data with a critical lens. To that end, the *Dissertation in Practice* is the culminating experience of professional doctoral programs in education. The *Dissertation in Practice* attempts to develop, test, or advance solutions to a high-leverage problem of practice. *Dissertations in Practice* focus on generative impact, highlighting the doctoral candidate's ability "to think, to perform, and to act with integrity" (Shulman, 2005, p. 52).

### **Framework for Recognition of EdD Programs**

The following framework will be used to determine qualifications for CPED recognition:

#### **Institutional Requirements**

1. The institution must be accredited by a regional accrediting association recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation and the U.S. Department of Education.
2. In order for a program to participate in the recognition review process, the institution must be a member in good standing of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate.

#### **Curricular Requirements**

3. The program intentionally aligns its mission with its learning outcomes, curriculum, and assessment methods as appropriate to the field of study.
4. The program's learning goals and outcomes align with the CPED *Working Principles* (2009), which state that a professional doctoral program in education:
  - a. Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex and high-leverage problems of practice;
  - b. Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities;
  - c. Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships;
  - d. Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions;
  - e. Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry; and
  - f. Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

#### **Structural Requirements**

5. The program uses the CPED *Design Concepts* (2010) to demonstrate quality and continuous improvement.

6. The program intentionally engages field-based practitioners in areas related to the concentration(s) of the degree program to provide formative feedback.
7. The program's faculty and students actively participate in various forms of scholarship (discovery, application, integration, and teaching) consistent with the CPED *Working Principles* (2009).
8. The program demonstrates an ongoing commitment to actively participate in CPED initiatives and actively maintain an affiliation network to assist faculty, students, and scholarly practitioners.

#### ***Data Requirements***

9. The program collects and reports data to the CPED consortium annually concerning basic program input and output statistics and ways the program and its graduates have an impact on high-leverage problems of practice.

#### **Summary/Conclusion**

Programs that participate in review for recognition must meet the criteria established by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. CPED recognition includes certain benefits such as a) use of the CPED logo on institutional web pages and other marketing materials; b) access to grant-funding opportunities; c) access to materials and resources offered by CPED developed through support from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Spencer Foundation, and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE); and d) participation in a national dialogue concerning various aspects of educational policy through the CPED network of scholars, researchers, and practitioners.

#### **Recognition Process**

Schools and Colleges of Education intending to seek recognition of their professional doctoral program in education should review the extended "CPED Guide for Program Recognition" [*under development*] and complete the "CPED Application for Recognition" form [*under development*]. While CPED membership extends across an entire academic institution, recognition is extended to individual academic programs within CPED member institutions. Therefore, a separate application must be complete for every degree program seeking recognition.

## Appendix C: CPED-FIPSE Learning Products

**Product title:** Student Writing

**Product team:** Alisa Belzer, Rutgers University; Martin Reardon, Eastern Carolina University; Chris Ray, North Dakota State University

**Overview:** To respond to student writing challenges, the team plans to develop the following products:

- A literature review on graduate student writing that synthesizes what is known about their challenges and results of interventions designed to address them.
- A faculty development design plan that can be implemented at CPED institutions to support knowledge and skill development related to the development of graduate student writing skills. Topics could include construction of assignments that embed writing support, how to give writing feedback, scaffolding peer review, using a common writing rubric throughout the program, how to take an improvement science approach to addressing student writing problems in the institution, and others as identified by the literature review.
- Tools to be used by faculty (e.g. writing rubrics and protocols) and distributed to students (various text and web-based writing improvement resources and tips).
- A research plan/funding proposal to investigate the implementation issues and effectiveness of Products 2 and 3 to be carried out in AY 2014-2015.

---

**Product title:** Research Courses

**Product team:** Ed Bengtson, University of Arkansas; Stephanie J. Jones, Texas Tech University

**Overview:** The products from this study will include:

- One or two publications (peer review articles/white papers) that speak to the examination findings. Manuscripts will target journals/audiences that are accessible and related to issues in higher education and/or the specific fields that the examined programs are nested (e.g., higher education, educational leadership, teacher education, etc.).
- One to two presentations at conferences that either have sigs focusing on the professional doctorate or focusing on teaching and learning in the fields that have Ed.D. as a degree offering.
- A video/slide show with voice over that could be linked to the CPED website. This presentation would highlight the findings of the inquiry and hopefully could serve as a catalyst for those institutions wanting to change their approach to research course offerings for the Ed.D.
- A minimum of one webinar on the findings of our analyses of the data on needed research competencies for successful completion of the dissertations in practice.

- White paper on the differences in research skills preparation for students in Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs.

**Product title:** Cohort Development

**Product team:** Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, University of Kentucky; Bryan Maughan, University of Idaho

**Overview:** Because cohorts are increasingly popular management tools for recruiting students into professional education programs, for organizing their learning experiences, for retaining students, and for promoting performance-based outcomes, the team plans to deliver the following three products:

- A guide for program developers about developing cohorts based on a comprehensive review of literature and descriptions of “what works” in CPED-affiliated programs as reported in case-study reports.
- A report of “what worked” according to doctoral students who participated in CPED-affiliated program(s).
- A review of innovative technology tools recommended in the literature and used in CPED-affiliated programs reported in case-study reports and other PPD programs as found through Internet search.

**Product title:** Action Research

**Product team:** Ray Buss and Debby Zambo, Arizona State University

**Overview:** Based on the team members' experience developing *scholarly and influential practitioners* and their use of action research aimed at solving *problems of practice* situated in *laboratories of practice*, they plan to develop two products: (a) an *Action Research Guide* that can be used by EdD students writing action research dissertations and (b) a complementary ‘guide’ that can be used by faculty who mentor these students.

**Product title:** Professional Development Cases on EdD Program Redesign

**Product team:** Gary M. Crow, Indiana University; Terry Astuto, New York University; Douglas Hesbol, University of Denver; Kristina Hesbol, University of Denver; John Lee, Fordham University

**Overview:** The team seeks to develop a series of professional development cases based on the FIPSE research conducted by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. The cases will focus on various issues of university preparation program redesign related to the education doctorate (See below for possible topics). The cases, although anonymous, will use data from the FIPSE research so that cases are based on actual experiences of program redesign.

---

**Product title:** Program Development

**Product team:** Stephanie J. Jones, Texas Tech University; Deborah Peterson, Portland State University

**Overview:** The products from this study will include:

- Two publications (peer review articles/white papers; one K-12 focused and one higher education focused) that speak to the adoption of an equity, ethics, and social justice focus in redesigned CPED programs. Of specific interest is how programs evaluate the decision to integrate the principle or not and the impact of this decision on program development. Manuscripts will target journals/audiences that are accessible and related to issues in K-12 and higher education or comparable environments that can benefit from the study outcomes.
- Minimum of two presentations at conferences that either have a focus on the professional doctorate or focusing on teaching and learning in the fields that have Ed.D. as a degree offering.
- Webinars on the findings of our analyses of program development among CPED Phase I and II member institutions, and their adoption of an equity, ethics, and social justice frame. Of specific focus will be the challenges faced by the institutions, along with best practices in program development that have evolved in the redesign of their professional doctorate. Other topics of interest may emerge throughout data analyses.

---

**Product title:** Supports for the Education Doctorate of Practice

**Product team:** Stephanie J. Jones, Texas Tech University; Lori Mueller, Southeast Missouri State University

**Overview:** The proposed products from this study will include:

- Two publications (peer review articles/white papers - higher education focused) that speak to organizational change, support systems for change, program implementation, and change leadership. Manuscripts will target journals/audiences that are accessible and related to issues in higher education or comparable environments that can benefit from the study outcomes.
- Minimum of one presentation at a conference that either has a focus on leading change, support systems for change, and/or program implementation.
- Webinars on change leadership. Of specific focus will be a list of best practices that will be shared on how to lead change through philosophical differences and faculty resistance at institutions that are trying to implement the CPED framework. Other topics of interest may emerge throughout data analyses.

---

**Product title:** Dissertation in Practice

**Product team:** Martin Reardon, Eastern Carolina University; Alisa Belzer, Rutgers University; Christopher Ray, North Dakota State University

**Overview:** To address the extent to which alternative formats for post-conventional dissertations in practice are appropriate, we are proposing to develop the following products:

- A synthesis of the findings from the FIPSE research teams regarding the format of the dissertation in practice specifically, or the effectiveness or limitations associated with the dissertation in practice as a culminating experience for the CPED-aligned EdD.
- An overview of alternative dissertations formats at the doctoral level, whether from CPED-aligned EdD programs or from conventional EdD or PhD programs.
- A menu of suggested alternative dissertation formats tailored to three approaches to problems of practice among CPED-aligned programs (action research, program evaluation, policy research).
- A research plan/funding proposal to set up a CPED Virtual Clearinghouse to which both conventional and post-conventional dissertations in practice may be submitted by member institutions or individual graduates for potential posting for reference and further research during AY 2014-2015.

---

**Product title:** The Professional Practice Doctorate: Dissertation in Practice, Definition and Discourse

**Product team:** Valerie A. Storey, University of Central Florida; Bryan Maughan, University of Idaho

**Overview: The team plans to develop the following products:**

- Faculty guide to the DiP
- Student guide to the DiP

A thorough reference list and also examples or models to illustrate the guides will complement both guides. Upon completion the guides will be piloted.

### References

- Perry, J. A. (2012a). To Ed.D. or not to Ed.D? *Kappan*, 94(1), 41–44.
- Perry, J. A. (2012b). What history reveals about the education doctorate. In M. Macintyre Latta & S. Wunder (Eds.), *Placing practitioner knowledge at the center of teacher education: Rethinking the policies and practices of the education doctorate* (pp. 51–72). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Perry, J. A., & Imig, D.G. (2008). A stewardship of practice in education. *Change* November/December, 42-48.
- Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2009). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education*. College Park, MD: Author.
- Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2010). *Definitions CPED Design Concepts*. College Park, MD: Author.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory*. Chicago: Adline.
- Golde, C. M., & Walker, G.E. (2006). *Envisioning the future of doctoral education: Preparing stewards of the discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovations* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press
- Shulman, L.S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, (134), 3.
- 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.

- 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.
- Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Walker, G. E., Golde, C.M., Jones, L., Conklin Bueschel, A., & Hutchings, P. (2008). *The formation of scholars: Rethinking doctoral education for the twenty-first century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Zaltman, G., & Duncan, R. (1977). *Strategies for planned change*. New York, NY: Wiley Interscience.