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Henry Holmes, Dean of Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, created the Ed.D. in 1920 to “train the [school] leaders” (Powell, 1980, p. 144). In reaction to this, and because he felt the Ph.D. was not meeting the needs of practicing educators, Dean William Fletcher Russell established an Ed.D. at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1934 and offered coursework, “covering issues common to workers in the educational field” (Cremin, 1978, pp. 15-16). This beginning, lead other universities to establish their own Ed.D. programs. However, when examined closely it was evident that many of these Ed.D.s looked much like Ph.D.s. Instead of meeting its purpose, to prepare school leaders and improve practice, the Ed.D. was preparing scholars. This was problematic but in its long history, conversations surrounding the Ed.D.’s function and purpose rarely left the walls of academia. Even though scholars (Anderson, 1983; Brown, 1966, 1991; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Deering, 1998; Dill & Morrison, 1985; Freeman, 1931) surveyed and interviewed doctoral students to learn about their career aspirations, looked at the amount of credits taken, and analyzed dissertation topics, few discoveries transferred into programs. In other words, even though research showed students in Ed.D. programs had distinct goals (e.g. career mobility, context improvement, faculty positions) and unique needs (time to degree, serve practice) it was evident that no distinction was made
between their needs and the needs of Ph.D. students. Given this it was concluded that one, the other, or both degrees be eliminated. Since its inception at Harvard University 90 years ago, the Ed.D. has suffered from an identity crises and no group actively sought to act on what the research said or to make distinctions to redesign the Ed.D. and make it a professional preparation degree aimed at meeting the needs of working professionals.

This changed in 2006 when Shulman Golde, Bueschel, & Garabedian re-opened the debate and moved it in a new direction – a direction of action. Instead of merely talking about distinctions these scholars suggested colleges of education come together and redesign their programs. They suggested this because they understood the history of the Ed.D. and felt it to be a chronic and crippling problem. In their words, “Unless we face these issues squarely and with purposeful action, schools of education risk becoming increasingly impotent in carrying out their primary missions—the advancement of knowledge and the preparation of quality practitioners” (p. 25).

Despite this warning and need, there were skeptics. For example, Evans (2007) questioned the conceptual validity of being able to make a distinction. Instead of seeing colleges of education open to change Evans felt that they were overly reliant on policies that see ‘what is as what ought to be.’ To Evans the call needed clarity, especially in terms of praxis and the development of practitioners. In a similar vein, Levine (2007) noted that change would likely be an “impossible mission for schools of education” (p. 43) and articulated a list of reasons as to why including finances (schools/colleges of education keep the university financially afloat), policies (the ease of gaining state approval for Ed.D.s as opposed to Ph.D.s), and the Ph.D.’s prestige. These criticisms of inertia were distressing and in 2007, the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate
(CPED) undertook the challenge to transform doctoral education and re-envision and redesign the Ed.D.

This paper will discuss the development and impact of this initiative. To accomplish this data from a cross-cases analysis based on cases from 21 institutions and two surveys will be presented along with future efforts being considered to align CPED’s work with Improvement Science, a methodology that suggests that success comes from improvement cycles that develop, test, and implement change (Langley et al, 2009).

The Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate

In 2007, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conceptualized CPED to “reclaim” the education doctorate and make it a stronger and more relevant degree for the advanced preparation of practitioners (Perry, 2011, 2012; Perry & Imig, 2008). Shulman (2007) envisioned CPED as a grassroots movement of individuals from various colleges of education who would work together to change the Ed.D.’s status and purpose. To Shulman, CPED members would draw on their own experiences, values, and visions about what doctoral programs should entail and use these to design their programs. CPED members would have commonalities but they would not be monolithic clones of each other.

With this in mind, CPED become the first action-oriented effort seeking to distinguish and define the Ed.D. (Perry, 2011, 2012; Perry & Imig, 2008). CPED is comprised of administrators, faculty, student-practitioners, and graduate scholarly practitioners from 56 schools of education. CPED members come from large and small, public and private institutions and research intensive and teaching intensive institutions in
both urban and rural settings. CPED leaders and its members convene at least twice a year to reaffirm their vision, develop ideas, and engage in critical dialogue. Key to this work, are open communication channels and a willingness to challenge the status quo and think differently about doctoral preparation (Kezar & Lester, 2012).

Another important component of CPED has been adoption of six guiding principles aimed at guiding program development and five design features to serve as core components. The principles focus on developing students’ communication capabilities, inquiry skills, and ability to work for social justice and change. See Appendix A for the Principles.

Design features capture CPED’s vision to prepare scholarly practitioners, or individuals capable of blending their practical wisdom with their professional knowledge to identify, frame, and solve the problems of practice they face (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2010). To accomplish this, CPED-influenced programs utilize signature pedagogy or a set of pervasive practices aimed at preparing scholarly practitioners for the varied and complex aspects of their professional work (Shulman, 2005). In some institutions, signature pedagogies are constituted by courses infused with social justice, whereas in others they are the use of action research throughout the program.

CPED-influenced programs also focus on inquiry as practice or have students ask significant questions and gather, organize, and analyze situations with respect to the research literature and a critical lens (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2010). In some institutions, this inquiry is conducted with regard to a student’s own
context, whereas in others it extends beyond immediate contexts to district or organizational data sets.

Laboratories of practice are used as learning contexts where theory and practice inform and enrich each other. Laboratories of practice are aimed at facilitating transformative and generative learning that is measured by the development of scholarly expertise and implementation of practice (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2010). In some programs, these laboratories are students’ workplace settings, whereas in others they may be opportunities for students to intern with other professionals or travel abroad to learn more about cultural influences on education.

A dissertation in practice is the culminating experience of students in CPED-influenced programs that allows scholarly practitioners to demonstrate their abilities to solve problems of practice with integrity (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate) 2010; Shulman, 2005). In some programs dissertations are constituted by cycles of action research that culminate in an action research dissertation, whereas in others dissertations are self-reflective and portfolio-like assessments. These design features and principles are commonalities that run through newly designed and redesigned CPED-influenced programs. However, as noted earlier, great diversity exists within and between programs.

CPED’s Second Phase

In 2010, CPED entered into its second phase with support from a U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant. The grant was secured to understand if CPED’s principles and design features were being enacted and if and how changes were made in twenty-one of its original twenty-five member institutions. The study’s goals were to:
1. Document and evaluate change in the organizational structures of graduate schools to accommodate new professional practice degrees for school and college leaders.

2. Document and evaluate change in the signature learning processes, learning environments, and patterns of engagement of faculty and candidates in Ed.D. programs that participate in CPED.

3. Document and evaluate fidelity to the set of guiding principles developed in Phase I.

4. Understand lessons learned in the process of implementing change.

To determine if these changes had occurred researchers (1 faculty member and 1 student or graduate from a CPED institution) went to each of CPED’s Phase 1 members and gathered artifacts, conducted interviews with administrators, faculty, students, and graduates, and did observations of classes and other related things. There were also two online surveys sent to faculty and students in CPED-influenced institutions.

Methodology

The FIPSE study utilized a mixed methods design. Data consisted of 21 case studies and 2 online surveys. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved all data collection tools and procedures.

Analysis

Surveys were analyzed using SPSS. The student survey contained both opened- and closed ended items. Closed-items focused on 7 constructs (that aligned to CPED’s principles) and SPSS was used to compute Cronbach’s alpha, overall means, and standard deviations. To honor and explore variance across programs a repeated measures ANOVA
was also performed. Opened-ended items were analyzed using a constant comparative approach (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

The faculty survey also contained both opened- and closed ended items. Close-items focused on 5 constructs (revisions, outcomes, use of principles, conceptualization, and communication channels) and SPSS was used to compute regression procedures following data reduction and reliability analyses. Like the student survey opened-ended items were analyzed using a constant comparative approach (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

Analysis of data (artifacts, interviews, and observations) collected to write cases involved two levels. The first level was aimed at revealing the change process at each institution and providing the story of change so research questions 1 – 4 could be answered. Figure 1 provides the analysis plan used for this level of analysis.

The second level of analysis is a cross-case analysis that is looking at all 21 institutions. The cross-case analysis was aimed at answering research question 5.

The cross case analysis is in progress. It is aimed at finding commonalities and complexities within and across CPED institutions. To date 19 cases have been analyzed with procedures aimed at ensuring credibility/trustworthiness/validity/reliability. Layers to the process have included:

- Cases read reread
- Cases examined for answers to RQs
- Matrix created for each case
- From matrices and cases themes developed and from these preliminary claims made
• Working on substantiating claims with cases and developing percentages

Results

Preliminary assertions are provided in the tables on the following pages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims</th>
<th>RQ1-Impact</th>
<th>RQ2-Changes</th>
<th>RQ3-How Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>CPED has impacted institutional policies related to doctoral study that support the EdD as a professional degree.</td>
<td>CPED contributed to change at the institutional level abate in varying ways at different institutions. CPED opened communication channels, helped institutions distinguish the EdD from the PhD, and helped institutions meet varying demands.</td>
<td>All changes were made considerate of and within the local context either by intention and/or necessity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted the ways programs are designed—collaborative (going beyond departments), flexible (to meet student needs) and transparent (involving outsiders in design process/understanding).</td>
<td></td>
<td>All institutions provided support at various administrative levels for the redesign or development of an EdD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted how internal and external problems are addressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I institutions joined CPED and learned from and contributed to additional institutions through attendance at and participation in CPED convenings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has offered a level of cache and access to national thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As an outside reform, CPED has also met with resistance from faculty which suggests early and full engagement necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmatic</strong></td>
<td>CPED has impacted the time to degree for professional practice preparation.</td>
<td>CPED provided programmatic information in the form of principles and design features and depending on where a program was in the design/implementation process, this information was used in different ways.</td>
<td>Circumstances varied when institutions and programs considered CPED-influenced EdDs and, consequently, there was not one timeline that describes all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted the nature of community building and socialization for practitioners.</td>
<td>CPED helped administrators, faculty, and students gain a vision of the EdD as a distinct</td>
<td>Most CPED-influenced EdD programs developed structures that are cohort-based and condensed in terms of years to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED has impacted the way programs are designed—with intention and continuous improvement resulting in new student “product”, new roles for research, and integration with practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree from the PhD, see the EdD as a rigorous degree, and have discourse (a vocabulary) to explain and enact this distinction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED’s principles and design features are being incorporated in all programs but in varying ways and with varying levels of understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED caused programmatic changes in terms of signature learning processes, learning environments, dissertations, committees, and patterns of engagement. However, changes are varied and contextual. They are based on students’ needs, administrator and faculty commitments, and resources available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED helped program developers understand the unique needs of scholarly practitioners and convenings (and other means) provided a place to voice common concerns as to how to get students to become these individuals (e.g. improving student writing, defining their research needs, dissertations). Debates are ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED prompted programs to collect data and use data to make modifications to ensure practical rigor and quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED encouraged individuality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even though these were never set as demands all CPED programs use a cohort structure, have core courses, and use technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many programs are being developed as they are being implemented (or being built while the plane is being flown) and CPED appears to be helping completion compared to previous EdD and typical PhD programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I institutions responded to resistance from faculty in a variety of ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I institutions provided guidance and encouragement to get the EdD underway through various means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many Phase I institutions were committed to meeting the CPED intent to both distinguish the EdD from the PhD and to strengthen both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students in many CPED influenced programs often provide input into their programs and this helps faculty better meet their needs (design appropriate courses and experiences).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>CPED has offered the Dean new ways to bargain and collaborate across organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted the types of positions hired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted faculty role – in organization (change), with students and with colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted policies governing faculty work environment, workload, and reward structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has created a means to remove resistors to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has offered faculty new gains in terms of access to practical/professional knowledge from students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has offered faculty a national network and framework within which they can both learn and contribute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CPED has impacted the way students view doctoral training in these programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty who engaged with CPED felt that they gained opportunities to network with like-minded individuals and contribute to a national debate.

At some institutions CPED provided information to faculty and this information spread through various communication channels.

At some institutions CPED expanded the thinking of faculty members.

At some institutions CPED encouraged administrators and faculty to be reflective.

At some institutions CPED provided support to enact programmatic changes.

At some institutions faculty felt change was a democratic process but at others it was not.

At some institutions programs changed and faculty not on board with changes stopped working in these programs.

Some untenured faculty who are dedicated to working with CPED struggle to understand how programmatic work and work with CPED fits into their tenure/reward process.

Although recruited into programs to provide a practitioner perspective not all clinical faculty felt...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>relation to their professional practices.</th>
<th>a part of the program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPED has impacted the way student knowledge and opinions are valued in programs.</td>
<td>Students in nearly all CPED influenced programs perceive that their programs were meeting their needs and honoring them as professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED has impacted how students view the cohort experience, as communities of scholar practitioners.</td>
<td>Students in most CPED influenced programs had heard of the principles and design features but this knowledge was limited at some institutions. To students the CPED influence was like an underlying current rather than a full-fledged force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED’s impact on programs has brought new light to understanding student needs.</td>
<td>Students in many CPED influence programs understood their programs were new and were willing to live with the challenges of change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPED has had varying affect on students in terms of cache.</td>
<td>Students in many CPED influence programs felt they had a voice – faculty listened to them and were responsive to their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students in most CPED influence programs were grateful to have coursework focus on their needs and be applicable to their contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There was not much mention of student involvement in CPED or convenings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At a Glance Analysis Plan for Individual Cases

**Review Raw Data**
(Read raw transcripts—confirm you have all of your transcripts; remove names and identifiers; note any initial thoughts about your case.)

**Initial Coding**
Code transcripts (via your choice) utilizing the coding list that were developed from Rogers theoretical propositions

**Second Coding**
Have your partner cross-check your coding and discuss any discrepancies

**Categorical Analysis**
A. Develop categories and subcategories and define their properties and dimensions (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 124). Move data into these categories

B. Relate categories and subcategories to one another to identify the conditions, actions, interactions and consequences of each phenomenon (Glauser & Strauss, 1967)

**Reveal Themes and Patterns**
Create relational statements that link the themes and patterns

**Making Assertions**
Relate themes and patterns to theoretical propositions and research questions to make bold assertions about emerging themes and patterns

**Memoing**
Write up ideas to identify the interactions among themes and statements (Miles and Huberman, 1994)

**Narrative Case Report***
Follow the given case report frame in order to clarify the shape and direction of emergent themes and patterns

*See Yin (2003) resource regarding use of Chronologies for this report

**On-going Things to do Through the Entire Analytic Process to Ensure Validity and Reliability**
Establish that your analysis and the assertions from it are credible and trustworthy. Ways to establish credibility and trust include:

- constantly compare your codes/themes to your data to make sure there is not a drift in your analysis or shift in your interpretation of codes
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