2017

Outcomes, perceptions, and experiences in one CPED-aligned educational doctorate (EdD) program

Jolene Kay Farley Teske
University of Northern Iowa

OUTCOMES, PERCEPTIONS, AND EXPERIENCES IN ONE CPED-ALIGNED EDUCATIONAL DOCTORATE (EdD) PROGRAM

An Abstract of a Dissertation

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Approved:

_____

Dr. Audrey Rule, Committee Chair

_____

Dr. Kavita Dhanwada
Dean of the Graduate College

Jolene Kay Farley Teske

University of Northern Iowa

July, 2017

ABSTRACT

EdD programming has been questioned because of lack of clarity in the initial degree construction and confusion regarding its unique focus on enhancing practice. An improved, coherent focus was developed through the Carnegie Project on the Educational Doctorate (CPED). To understand the changes happening in CPED-influenced EdD programs, studies conducted within these newly-revised programs are vital.

The current mixed-methods study explored perceptions of education doctoral (EdD) students in a CPED-Influenced program at one Midwestern university (n=36 for survey; n=8 for interviews). The research questions examined: (a) the successful completion of outcomes in the program; (b) the influence of the seven outcomes on the students in the program; and (c) being a full-time or part-time student in the program.

In the first data collection phase, survey participants rated themselves at the average (3.07) to slightly above average (4.08) level for all seven outcomes, showing students perceived program outcomes as being met. The highest level of proficiency rated was the outcome Research in Practice (4.08), and the lowest was the outcome Organizational Change (3.07).

In comparing old program students to new program students, there were no significant differences in their perceptions of proficiency for program outcomes. There were no significant differences between full and part-time students in their perceptions of proficiency for program outcomes; however, calculations of specific benchmark revealed one significant difference and a medium effect size (Cohen's d= 0.59) favoring full-time

students for the benchmark “Students understand program delivery models and their implications for practice.”

The second and third data collection were conducted through qualitative interviews. Emerging themes included the transformative change in the ways students think, invested and professional faculty members acting as mentors, collaboration with and diversity among peers, flexibility of the programming structure and course requirements, the focus on quality research in practice, and the application of learning.

Many advantages and a few disadvantages were identified for both full-time and part-time students; however, satisfaction with the option to be full-time or part-time was the primary finding.

OUTCOMES, PERCEPTIONS, AND EXPERIENCES IN ONE CPED-ALIGNED EDUCATIONAL DOCTORATE (EdD) PROGRAM

A Dissertation

Submitted

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Approved:

_____

Dr. Audrey Rule, Chair

_____

Dr. Windee Weiss, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Susan Etscheidt, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Rodney Deiser, Committee Member

_____

Dr. Mary Herring, Committee Member

Jolene Kay Farley Teske

University of Northern Iowa

July, 2017

DEDICATION

With love,

to my dad and mom, Joe and Jean Farley:

The most influential of all educational factors is the conversation in a child's home.
William Temple

and to my children, Miquela and Cauy:

Do not go where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail.
Ralph Waldo Emerson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Academics abound in all types of advanced degree programs. While the word *academics* could encompass a milieu of variations, there is one universal characteristic: the commitment to lifelong learning. That dedication can be found within the community of the Educational Doctorate (EdD) program at one Midwestern university on which this dissertation focuses. This community includes a group of individuals working together to become scholarly practitioners and will be the focus of this case study. The case includes the EdD students in the "real-life, contemporary bounded system" (Creswell, 2013, p. 97) of this university EdD program.

The purpose of this first chapter, this autoethnography, is to demonstrate how the new EdD program at this Midwestern university has transformed my learning. When I first enrolled in this program, I anticipated that I would learn much about education and pedagogy. I knew the degree would require hard work and critical thinking. I knew that completing the degree would require significant personal commitment and time. However, I did not realize that my way of thinking, my lens of education and humanity were about to change. I did not realize that I would leave this program a different thinker than when I began. This dissertation research study provides perspectives and experiences from students in the EdD program; however, it is possible that it has also been influenced by my own experiences, as I could not separate myself completely from my involvement within this program. Therefore, I began with an introspection to

exemplify one personal example of the transformative learning that has occurred in this EdD program.

Theoretical Framework: Transformative Learning

Transformative learning is "the process of learning through critical self-reflection, which results in the reformulation of a meaning perspective to allow a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrative understanding of one's experience. Learning includes acting on these insights" (Mezirow, 1990, p. xvi). Within one's experiences and frame of reference, Mezirow (1997) described what he called habits of mind and points of view. The habits of mind are the broad generalization of one's feelings or notions about specific events or ideas in life, generally constructed through one's environment and experience. The point of view then is the way we apply the habits of mind. One's perspective directly influences how one solves problems in life and how unexpected or confusing situations are handled. Transformative leaning is the process students navigate when their habits of mind and points of view are challenged; they critically reflect on beliefs, they develop an understanding of the changes in their mindsets and the mindsets of those around them, and they act upon their learning.

Personal transformations that shift our frames of reference happen when we commit to an introspection of ourselves, what we think, and what we do (Mezirow, 1997). Table 1 identifies the ten learning phases described by Mezirow (2000).

Table 1.

The Ten Phases of Mezirow's Transformative Learning Theory

Mezirow's (2000) transformative theory emphasizes rational thought and reflection in a 10-step recursive process
1. experiencing a disorienting dilemma
2. experiencing fear, anger, guilt, or shame
3. critically assessing assumptions about the world
4. realizing others have gone through what they are feeling
5. revising one's old belief system and exploring new ones
6. planning a course of action
7. gaining the knowledge and skills for implementing new plans
8. trying on the new role
9. becoming competent and confident with the new change
10. reintegrating into one's life based on a new perspective

Note. Adapted from "Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory," by J. Mezirow, 2000, *Learning as transformation* (pp. 3-33). Copyright 2000 by Jossey-Bass.

The first four of these phases of learning are the basis of the theoretical framework demonstrating the transformative learning I have personally experienced as a student in this EdD program. While Mezirow's study was limited to one very specific population of women involved in adult learning classes, studies with other populations continue to augment the literature providing support that these phases can be applicable with other populations (Clark & Wilson, 1991; Nohl, 2015; Taylor, 1997; Taylor, 2007; Taylor & Snyder, 2012). Transformative learning has been specifically examined in doctoral education by Rudestam and Newton (2001) and applied to doctoral education by Carter (2014). This dissertation will be an addition to this body of professional literature.

Autoethnography: My Transformative Journey

An ethnography "focuses on an entire culture-sharing group" (Creswell, 2013, p. 90), a group like the one we have developed in the Midwestern university EdD program. An autoethnography also follows a culture-sharing group, but "the focus is the self in various contexts" (Grbich, 2013, p. 119), a focus on myself within the context of EdD programming. This self-reflection will provide an understanding of my personal knowledge of and participation in the program I have chosen to investigate.

Phase 1: A Disorienting Dilemma

When I started the EdD program, I had no expectation of or preparation for disorientation, but as I reflect now, I see that disequilibrium began in the first semester of classes. Students in this program stretch across three intensive study areas, but are united by the required common core courses. Within these core courses a cohort mentality has developed, and as I appreciate now, this shared mental state was partially because of disorientation. We began our first semester with two core courses: *Foundations of Inquiry* and *Inquiry I*. As we progressed through these two courses, we developed dependencies on each other. We needed each other to work through the struggles as we were asked to think about ideas that some of us had never previously considered. One of these struggles involved the application of lenses of theory to our studies. As educators, we had all studied at least a brief overview of the history of American education, but few of us had explored the shifts in theory over the years and how they influenced the beliefs about education in their times. We were challenged to constantly ask *why* about our beliefs. If we asserted an opinion about the educational system or policy, we would be

questioned with a form of “Really?” or “Does it?” which might then be followed by another question about Aristotle, Descartes, or Dewey. We were challenged to constantly ask *why* about our habits of mind and points of view. Using a Socratic style, our professors would question us over and over until we were confident with our answers. I remember minute after minute of frustration then followed by an *aha* moment when what I really wanted to say finally surfaced. We were expected to be able to explain everything clearly and rationally. This was an extension of the questioning technique as well, but it was also a matter of semantics. We would post ideas and thoughts on chalkboards to create a rough overview of our discussion and work through an intricate process to organize the thoughts and then justify the ideas. By the end of the discussion, the chalkboards were ablaze with lines connecting the thoughts and scraps of additional writing to provide support. Throughout these challenges, many of us found ourselves beyond our comfort levels, and at times, this was very disconcerting. I know I had never been challenged to think as deeply as I was expected to in the beginning of my doctoral experience. I leaned on the other students for support and encouragement when I wondered if I could really handle the program, and I gave support to them when they suffered from self-doubt. I took comfort in knowing that I was not alone and gladly provided comfort for others when they needed it.

Phases 2 and 3: Self-Examination and Critical Assessment

Moving forward in the program, we continued to use self-reflection and began to incorporate critical self-assessment. During the second year of the program, one of the core courses was *Critical Analysis of Social and Cultural Contexts in Education*. This

class was designed to expose doctoral students to diverse aspects of teaching and learning. I expected the information about diverse populations, learning styles, and abilities. I did not expect to learn about an alternate construction of American history, one based on white privilege and intentional cultural bias. I am not sure if I felt disgust or anger first. I remember feeling dumfounded at the realization that my learning could have been purposely and inaccurately constructed or manipulated to continue the power structure in our country. I then found myself frustrated that I had never been told nor taught for twenty-four years about this knowledge. I felt cheated, and I was concerned that I had cheated my students. I was immersed in critical reflection (Mezirow, 1990) about how I could ensure that this information, this inclusive idealism, could positively influence my future as an educator. Through this learning, my point of view was altered.

Phase 4: Recognition of Shared Experience

Critical Analysis of Social and Cultural Contexts in Education was a course that created pivotal change in my point of view. I soon realized the transformation was not limited to my own perspective. I began to see others struggling with some of the same issues. I saw others feeling overwhelmed at the different ideas that were swimming around in their brains. Through class discussions and projects, I discovered that I was not alone. All of us in the class were engaged in the digestion of new information, new understandings. We each had to work through the various ideas as they pertained to our own unique experiences.

With international students in the class, it was amazing to discover their perceptions of our American education system. An international student from the Middle

East shared how the American education system is much more lenient than the system in her country. Students in her country are required to be and act more serious in their classrooms, and their teachers are very well respected. Another student shared his astonishment at the continuing issues with race and social status in our system. In his country there are differences among the different villages and areas, but when the students are in school, they are all treated the same. Hearing details about their education systems compared to ours was interesting. The other American students in the class had stories that were similar to mine, but also others that were vastly different. One profound difference discussed was the way rural schools differ from urban schools, especially in terms of diversity. I have often struggled with the homogenous classrooms of rural schools and how to provide the cultural richness that all kids need. In contrast, in a nearby city, teachers, and administrators work with diverse populations daily.

Another catalyst for understanding these shared experiences occurred in another core course, *Leadership in Formal and Informal Learning Environments*. I began the class expecting all of us to have had leadership experience; however, our experiences were vastly different and our strengths within the realm of leadership were varied. The process of learning in this class sought to draw from our diverse experiences to examine various areas of leadership. Four of the students in the class were college teachers, and two had previous experience teaching at the high school level. One had leadership experience as a student advisor at two different colleges as well as work with at-risk populations at the two colleges. One student had administrative experience as head of her college department of nursing. One had leadership experience as the president of a

school board and a state-level non-profit organization. The variety of experiences provided rich conversations for exploration and sharing. We learned the strengths and skills of our own leadership styles as well as those of our peers. Together we explored our leadership roles and developed an understanding of the tremendous growth we had achieved through our experiences in this EdD program. We reflected on accomplishments and frustrations of previous leadership decisions and appreciated the support of others in the class. As I looked back on this course, I saw evidence of the process of transformation that was occurring with all involved. We were creating and defining ways to improve our own work as educational leaders (Harris, Lowery-Moore, & Farrow, 2008).

Remaining Phases

The remaining six phases extended into and beyond the current study and will be reported at the end of the current study. For now, I have experienced numerous disorienting dilemmas; self-reflected on my life, my teaching, and my learning; critically analyzed knowledge, skills, research, and the application of all three; and shared my experiences with my colleagues and some of their experiences as well. It has been a journey of critical reflection that has elicited the beginnings of a change in my perspective, a tremendous experience of transformative learning.

The EdD Program at one Midwestern University

This EdD Program

This EdD program is housed within a university with a history of excellence in teacher preparation. This university is located in a beautiful Midwestern city that boasts

shady streets, numerous venues for leisure activities, and a variety of options for exploring the fine arts. The campus provides carefully landscaped quadrangles, vast fields of grass, state-of-the-art facilities, and 21st Century technology. University life includes quality health care, various clubs and organizations, a solid athletic program, and exceptional performances in music and theatre. The city is primarily a community of white, middle-class families, but the adjacent city has a much broader cultural base. The urban schools and community organizations provide opportunities for graduate students and preservice teachers to learn by interacting with students with different backgrounds including those of low socioeconomic status, African American and Hispanic heritage, and recent immigrants from Bosnia and the Marshall Islands.

The EdD program at this university forms a unique community. Most programs around campus have professors dedicated to their specific programs. This program does not have its own faculty. Instead it draws from expertise across the campus. Faculty share their own professional knowledge and research threads with students, and students join faculty to learn how to conduct research with fidelity. Students and faculty engage in lively discussions and ponder difficult questions while working together to form the world of educational wonder that enhances the continual learning necessary for those involved with this type of advanced degree program. For me, the dynamic environment has enhanced my love of learning. This is, of course, my perspective now after a transformational change in programming.

Intensive Study Areas (ISAs)

EdD programming at this university involves three Intensive Study Areas (ISAs). Table 2 describes these three areas: Allied Health, Recreation, and Community Services; Curriculum and Instruction; and Educational Leadership.

Table 2.

Intensive Study Areas (ISAs)

Allied Health, Recreation, and Community Services ISA
This area of intensive study is designed to provide students with advanced planning, management, supervision and evaluation of programs in the community and its institutions. The combined areas of allied health, recreation and community services are diverse professional areas knitted together by a unified commitment to enhancing, enriching and sustaining individual well-being and quality of life. Each of these areas contributes unique and different professional perspectives, yet, at the same time, focus on the individual and collective well-being of people, communities and society as a whole. Graduates are prepared for careers as applied scholars, evaluators, athletic administration, administrators of community nonprofit organizations, youth serving agencies, public parks and recreation agencies, foundations, and government agencies. The program of study will be based upon student's needs, interests, and upon approval by an academic advisor and program of study committee.
Curriculum and Instruction ISA
This area of intensive study is designed to prepare scholar practitioners to plan, implement, evaluate, and supervise educational programs for children, from infancy through adolescence, as well as adult learners, inclusive of a wide variety of diversity. Faculty in this intensive study area come from many departments and disciplines, including but not limited to prekindergarten through tertiary curriculum and pedagogy; foundations of education in psychology, philosophy, social sciences; disability studies, gifted and talented, and multicultural education; literacy education; instructional technology, school library studies; and P-12 content areas such as mathematics, physical education, science, social studies, and language arts.
Educational Leadership ISA
This area of intensive study in education administration, prepares personnel for leadership positions in PK-12 schools, post-secondary institutions, and other educational services or settings. Typical positions held by educators with the terminal degree focused on educational leadership include principals, superintendents, school district central office administrators, professors of educational leadership, special education directors at the Area Education Agency level or Department of Education administrators and consultants.

Note. Adapted from University of Northern Iowa (UNI), *Post-Admission Student Handbook*, 2015, p. 9.

Core Courses

Of the 60 credit hours required for this EdD program, 27 of those hours are considered Core Curricula. Table 3 identifies these core courses, which are required for all EdD students regardless of which ISA they are enrolled. The remaining credit hours combine ISA requirements, electives, and dissertation credits.

The People

Throughout the transformative learning experience, my colleagues and I worked together as well as individually. We took most of our core classes together, and we took other classes with students in different areas or different stages of the program. The areas and stages are more ambiguous outside the required core. The doctoral students in each (ISA) can take courses in other ISAs to fulfill their electives, so there is some overlap. While this is not considered a cohort program, relationships do develop similar to those formed within cohort programs. The structure is very beneficial for the students. Students can meet people in the other ISAs and learn how doctoral programming is being emphasized in each specific area. As a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction ISA, I found it interesting to interact and learn from those in the Allied Health, Recreation, and Community Services ISA and the Educational Leadership ISA. We all benefited from learning about research being conducted in the various areas of each different ISA instead of being secluded in our own. This provided a collaborative environment for all of us to share our knowledge and ideas.

Table 3.

EdD Core Courses

Substantive Component:	**18 credit hours (3 credits per course)**	**18**
INTDEPED 7303 (190:303)	Foundations of Inquiry	
INTDEPED 7318	Evidence-Based Practices, Assessment, Accountability, and Program Evaluation	
INTDEPED 7320	Leadership in Formal and Informal Learning Environments (OR EDLEAD 7311 or EDLEAD 6245 if taken for an Advanced Studies Certificate in Educational Leadership/Special Education Director)	
INTDEPED 7322	Organizational and Community Transformation (OR EDLEAD 7319 or EDLEAD 6247 if taken for an Advanced Studies Certificate in Educational Leadership/Special Education Director)	
INTDEPED 7324	Critical Analysis of Social and Cultural Contexts in Education	
INTDEPED 7389 (190:389)	Doctoral Seminar	
Research Methods	**6 credit hours (3 credits per course)**	**6**
INTDEPED 7314	Inquiry I	
INTDEPED 7316	Inquiry II	
Advanced Methods	**3 credit hours (Course choice)**	**3**
	Choose one or more of the following 3-credit-hour courses:	
MEASRES 6270 (250:270)	Educational Program Evaluation	
MEASRES 7301 (250:301)	Advanced Quantitative Research in Education	
MEASRES 7310 (250:310)	Advanced Qualitative Methods in Educational Research	
Total hours	**Professional Common Core**	**27**

Note. Adapted from UNI, *Post-Admission Student Handbook*, 2015, p.13.

Enrollment varies among the students in all three ISAs. Some students are enrolled in the coursework full-time and some are enrolled part-time. Some students have a more traditional experience taking three or more classes each semester and spending more time on campus. Many full-time students, like me, are also working as graduate assistants gaining more university experience through research or teaching and obtaining insights through collegial discussions of problems that emerge. Some students have remained at their full-time jobs elsewhere and are taking one or two classes each semester as part-time students. These students are encouraged to focus on the core classes in sequence, which creates a cohort feel for them even though they are not on campus full-time. As they are in some of the core classes with the full-time students, they are still making connections.

The History

The educational doctorate (EdD) is not new. In fact, it is almost 100 years old. As the terminal degree in education, the professional education doctorate focuses on practitioners who are invested in advancing the proficiency of their own unique circumstances, improving their knowledge of relevant research, and developing abilities to use what they have learned to generate new knowledge and implement changes for the improvement of their profession (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2009). The confusing aspect of the identity of the EdD is not new either. Beginning with and since its inauguration at Harvard in 1920 (Perry, 2012), this degree program has always been questioned. Recently, however, in 2007, a group of 25 universities began a collaborative project to better identify the education doctorate and develop programming

that would produce exceptional professionals qualified to make a difference in American education (Perry, 2012). This group, under the umbrella of the Carnegie Foundation, formed the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), a national consortium of universities committed to strengthening the rigor and credibility of educational doctorate programming (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2015). Since the inception of CPED in 2007, many universities have undertaken the task of evaluating and restructuring their EdD programs, which has led this group of 25 universities in 2007 to grow to 83 institutions today (CPED, 2016b). The current members of CPED are leading the way to develop and promote rigorous and effective programming that targets educational professionals. The goal, which is not much different from Harvard's goal in 1920, is to help educators become professional practitioners who are able to understand, utilize, and conduct research within their practice (Perry, 2012).

In 2014, after three years of planning, the educational doctorate program at the Midwestern university was redesigned and aligned with the work developed by CPED. A committee of university leaders invested in doctoral programming led this redesign. The committee began with an examination of the then current EdD program, its place with the university's college of education, and the roles of the faculty members. They assessed the inputs of the program, defined the necessary activities, and identified the outputs to monitor the change process. The final step was creating the impact by implementing the new CPED-influenced program and continuing the work of ongoing evaluation with the committee.

The newly determined purposes of this university's EdD program are "to provide practicing educators, in formal and informal settings, the opportunity to continue their study and earn the terminal professional degree in their field" and require students "to study in basic areas that undergird and define educational practice and develop skills of problem definition, data collection and analysis, and interpretation" (University of Northern Iowa, 2015, p. 5). The target audience for this EdD program is the practitioner, and central to the redesign of this program is the focus on contextual research and inquiry conducted to make a practical impact. This focus aims to develop scholarly professionals who can critically read, analyze, and apply the research of others as well as conduct, analyze, and disseminate original research of their own. Using these developed inquiry skills, students are expected to create influential change in a practical setting. It is yet to be determined if students are confident they have this knowledge and these skills and if they are confident, if they feel they will be able to use them to elicit influential change.

Enrollment Options

In addition to the curricular aspects of EdD programming, students are also influenced by the structure of the programming and the options for them as they continue in their current roles as full-time professionals or return to graduate school as full-time students. Students are considered full-time doctoral students if they are taking nine or more credit hours during a term. Students are considered part-time doctoral students if they are taking fewer than nine graduate credit hours during a term. Both options are available at this university, and there are students in both situations. Two of the core classes are online, and the rest are on campus in a face-to-face format. Students can

pursue the degree full-time or part-time depending on their circumstances, but they are required to be in class on campus for the core courses not offered online. As students in the program reflect on their full-time or part-time experiences, information can be gathered to determine the preferences of the students and thereby influence future decisions on programming structure.

Statement of the Problem

The limited research on programs realigned with the CPED initiative show that CPED-influenced programs are effective. Studies have shown that CPED-influenced programs are providing options for students to demonstrate mastery and application of their learning (Tucker & Uline, 2015), environments for them to develop collaborative inquiry skills (Amrein-Beardsley et al., 2012), and increased ability in collecting and using research in practice (Kumar & Dawson, 2013). This EdD program is aligned with CPED, but until this study, it had not been analyzed to determine if this realignment has provided students with the knowledge and skills to understand, utilize, and conduct research. Additionally, with the ever-changing world of education, there were questions about the structure of EdD programs and their effects on students. The actual perceptions of these EdD students had not been examined.

Purpose of this Study

The purposes of this study were to explore this new, CPED-influenced EdD program to determine if students believe that the EdD program is meeting its outcomes, to discover if and how the program outcomes are influencing students, and to explore how a full-time program experience compares to a part-time program experience.

This study is relevant (a) to this university's specific educational doctorate environment, (b) to all institutions that have educational doctorate programs as well as those considering implementation of such a program, (c) to CPED as it will add to the empirical research on newly-revised EdD Programs based on CPED principles, (d) to educators who are considering a terminal degree that focuses on developing their research skills and preparing them to be scholarly practitioners, and (e) to the literature on transformative learning.

Research Questions

Given the historical difficulties of understanding the educational doctorate as well as the successful results of other CPED-influenced programs, which includes how practitioners find time to earn a terminal degree while focusing on their own problems of practice, the research questions for this dissertation were as follows:

1. Do EdD students, in their own personal experiences of the program, perceive that the outcomes of the new EdD Program at this university are being met?
2. Have the new EdD Program outcomes at this university influenced the students? If yes, how?
3. Do the program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university differ? If yes, how?

Conclusion

In this initial chapter, I have shared the influences of this EdD program on my experience. The information described the essence of transformative learning (Mezirow, 1990), a key component in effective EdD programming according to Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (2009). Further elaboration was made on the historical perspective of EdD programming in general and how more research is needed to help clarify this historically ambiguous degree. A brief description of the bounded system to be used for this investigation was included.

The next chapter will focus on principles for effective EdD programming and the history of EdD programming prior to the collaborative beginning of CPED. The chapter will continue with an overview of CPED, associated literature, and the literature stemming from CPED-influenced program research. The final sections of the literature review will cover the history of the EdD at this university, how this newly-revised program aligns with the CPED Guiding Principles, the demographics of EdD students in general, and a contextual overview of the education doctorate students at this university.

Chapter 3 covers the methodology and design of the study, Chapter 4 covers the collected data of the study, and Chapter 5 provides the analysis and interpretation of the results.

Key Terms

CPED (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate) -- a national consortium of universities committed to strengthening the rigor and credibility of educational doctorate programming (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2015).

EdD, Doctorate of Education or Education Doctorate – As the terminal degree in education, the professional education doctorate focuses on practitioners who are invested in advancing the proficiency of their own unique circumstances, improving their knowledge of relevant research, and developing abilities to use what they have learned to generate new knowledge and implement changes for the improvement of their profession (Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate, 2009).

EdD Programming -- professional terminal degree curricula that develops educators into scholarly practitioners (Zambo, Buss, & Zambo, 2015).

Scholarly Practitioner -- "an educational leader able to draw on research, theory, and critical thinking to solve important, contemporary problems of practice" (Reuda, Sundt, & Picus, 2013, p. 252). For the purposes of this study, a practitioner will be defined as a professional with experience from or currently occupying an education position in a professional setting. The key component is that the practitioner has experience as a professional practitioner.

Full-time Status – Students were labeled as having full-time status if they took nine or more credit hours during their doctoral experience.

Part-time Status – Students were labeled as having part-time status if they took fewer than nine graduate credit hours during their doctoral experience.

Transformative learning – For this study, transformative learning was operationally defined as learning that compels self-reflection and introspection, results in a changed perception, and incites action based on the transformation (Mezirow, 1997).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

The purposes of this study were to determine if the students in the education doctorate (EdD) program at this university thought it was meeting its outcomes, if and how those outcomes have influenced the students, and if there were a difference between the program experiences of part-time students and full-time students, and if there were, what those the differences were. As this study involved educational doctorate programming in general, understanding the history of the educational doctorate was important. A major turning point in the history of the educational doctorate was the inception of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED); the literature review addressed this institution and event. To understand the changes that were happening in CPED-influenced programs, a review of the studies conducted within these newly revised programs was vital. As this study focused on one recently-revised program, the doctoral program at this university, an exploration was included to provide an overview of how this program's redesigned outcomes aligned with CPED. Finally, to clarify the program structures influencing full-time and part-time students, demographics of the students were included.

Effective Higher Education Programming

While a variety of opinions exist on what is a quality program in higher education, Suskie (2015) has identified five key elements: relevance, community, focus and inspiration, evidence, and betterment. Suskie's first element is relevance, which is

essential for students in any class, but also critical to the stakeholders in a program. Students in higher education are paying for their education, contributors and investors are investing in programming, and all expect a return on their investments. The community is also important for programming. Higher education programs involve many people including, but not limited to, the faculty, staff, and students and should effectively create a strong culture of community. Suskie's second and third elements are focus and aspiration. Both are fundamental to effective programming because they provide a beginning, middle, and end to the program. Without these directions, students could find it difficult to navigate through a program. The fourth element, evidence, is consistent with one of the largest current trends in educational instruction, that of data-driven instruction. Teachers are encouraged to use measurements and assessments to determine students' learning, and program leaders use measurements and assessments to determine the effectiveness of the program. Leaders in higher education should be diligent in comparing measurements with the standards to ensure that program goals are being successfully met. The final dimension is the culture of betterment, a very important focus on being engaged in continuous improvement. The successful implementation of the five elements can create a quality program that collects and uses evidence to determine potential change (Suskie, 2015).

The Educational Doctorate

The first doctorate of philosophy (PhD) in education program began in 1893 at Teachers College at Columbia University. This program was initiated following the inception of professional preparation for the fields of medicine and law, preparation that

required both classroom instruction as well as practical application of knowledge (Perry, 2012). The initial intention for this PhD in education was continuing the education of teachers, combining classroom instruction in pedagogy with practical experiences in actual classrooms; however, the design of the program was disconnected because it focused primarily on those educators who wanted to move into administrative roles (Cremin, 1978). This disconnect between intention and design created a problematic start for the PhD degree in education.

Around the same time, changes were happening in the education department at Harvard College that led to the creation of the Education Doctorate (Powell, 1980). The EdD separated education from the arts and sciences, making it the degree designed specifically for experienced educators with a strong liberal arts foundation who wanted to advance to higher positions in their schools or school systems (Perry, 2012). This advancement to higher positions was not exclusively focused on administration as it did include leadership as school practitioners.

In her review of the historical debate between the EdD and the PhD, Perry (2012) identified a variety of positions expressed over the years along with studies that have been conducted to determine how to clarify the differences between the two degrees. Two studies found that the requirements for the EdD were slightly different from the requirements for the same institution's PhD (Freeman, 1931). Ludlow (1964) revealed no significant differences in abilities or achievements of candidates from either degree program. Brown (1966) discovered, ten years after Ludlow's study, the demographics of the EdD students had changed, but the differences in programming had only changed in

terms of length. EdD programs had been shortened during the ten-year span. In contrast, Eells (1963) found no distinguishing characteristics between the two degrees. Colleges and universities continued with both degrees and the same type of programming (Perry, 2012). Spurr (1970) determined that the EdD was simply a separate degree for schools of education.

Interest in EdD programming continued into the 1980s. Anderson (1983) showed minimal differences between EdD and PhD programming, but did discover a substantial difference between the culminating projects or dissertations. Dill and Morrison (1985) showed that PhD programs required more research classes, but the methods courses were the same for both degrees. Clifford and Guthrie (1988) suggested that the EdD was the only degree necessary for educators. However, Brown (1991) disagreed with Clifford and Guthrie as his study revealed that the two degrees were similar, but different in the focus on research. He concluded that both degrees have value.

The debate continued into the 1990s. Osguthorpe and Wong (1993) surveyed 664 U.S. institutions reviewed the institutional catalogues of each. Of the 664 surveys that were sent, 407 were completed and returned. Results showed few differences between the two degree programs, but EdD programs were offered more often at comprehensive colleges and universities, and the PhD more often at research-intensive institutions. Also, many research institutions offered a choice between the two degree programs. Deering (1998) studied the catalogues of 50 randomly-selected universities from the Holmes Group and found that EdD and PhD programs were very similar, including similar dissertations conducted by students in both programs. Additionally, he discovered that

there was not a significant preference for hiring persons earning either degree at colleges of education

At the beginning of the 21st Century, Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, and Garabedian (2006) expressed frustration with the lack of clarity between the two degrees About the same time, three other major events contributed to the debate (Perry, 2013). Two called for the elimination of the EdD, and one supported the continuation of the EdD. The combination of these events became the impetus for the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). CPED was a collaborative initiative founded by 25 institutions to clarify the role and improve the programming of the education doctorate by facilitating the learning of practitioners working in various fields of education (Perry, 2012).

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED)

The formation of CPED created a renewed interest in education doctorate programming. With the help of CPED, many colleges and universities have undertaken the task of evaluating and restructuring EdD programs. In 2016, 83 institutions were members of CPED (CPED, 2016b), and these institutions were leading the way to develop and promote rigorous and effective programming that targets educational professionals. The goal was to facilitate education professionals to become professional practitioners who can understand, utilize, and conduct research within their own practices.

Even though the education doctorate has been around for more than a century, the organization of CPED and efforts of CPED member institutions represents a unique

collaborative effort to effect change in the defining and framing of EdD programming (Perry, 2013). The focus on action has propelled member institutions forward in supporting and improving EdD programs around the country. This process of change began with conversations among participants from member institutions. These conversations focused on what differentiates an educational researcher from an educational practitioner. People interacted with each other about their programs, sharing what was working and what was not working. Committee members and researchers then went back to their institutions, implemented changes, and continued the process again. This cycle of collaboration and improvement is still functioning among CPED members.

CPED Three Design Frameworks

One of the hallmarks of CPED has been the development of three specific design frameworks that can be used at any college or university desiring to improve or begin programming of an education doctorate (CPED, 2016a).

CPED's definition of the EdD.

The first of the three design frameworks is CPED's Definition of the EdD: "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" (CPED, 2016a, para. 3). Within this definition are three major traits that are key to a successful EdD graduate: (a) to develop habits to influence practice; (b) to construct research to address the problems; and (c) to develop confidence to solve these complex problems within their classrooms, schools, and systems (Perry, 2013).

CPED guiding principles. The second design framework focuses on the six CPED Guiding Principles of program development. Table 4 identifies these guiding principles, which were developed to help member institutions during reviews and revisions of EdD programming. The goal was to prepare educational leaders for the complex problems, intense changes, and diverse needs found in all levels in education (Perry, 2013).

Table 4.

CPED Guiding Principles for Program Design

CPED Guiding Principles
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.

Note. Adapted from *Guiding Principles for Program Design*, 2016d, para. 7. Copyright 2016 by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/AboutUs.

The first principle calls for the inclusion and focus on equity, ethics, and social justice. To be an effective educational leader in today's complex world, this social justice focus is an essential component of an educational program. The second principle identifies leaders who understand how to develop and implement knowledge and skills to improve education for everyone. The importance of this principle can be seen in its universality of leadership. The leaders in education should be able to clearly disseminate information and knowledge to all stakeholders involved. This population of stakeholders includes those outside of the school environment.

The third principle is also universal, but instead of just focusing on the leadership, the focus is also on the collaboration and communication skills necessary to work with diverse populations through creating and building partnerships. Principle four emphasizes the importance of working with individuals in diverse settings to identify and understand problems in specific fields and then utilize a variety of perspectives to multiply options for solutions. The foci in this principle are the experiences in educational settings, the analyses of problems occurring in real settings, and the ability to see a variety of options in searching for effective solutions. The experiences must be real. The fifth principle promotes the connections made among each student's educational and research knowledge, educational experience, theoretical frameworks, and fundamentals of inquiry. Students should have a solid understanding of all areas. The sixth and final principle is the culmination of successful programming. Students should be able to apply what they have learned in the educational setting. Students should effectively apply solutions to real problems of practice.

CPED design concepts. The third design framework provides a list with clear definitions of CPED Design Concepts for EdD programming (see Table 5). The CPED Design Concepts were created to clearly identify the different concept areas, to provide contextual adaptability in programming, and to distinguish the unique elements of the education doctorate (Perry, 2013).

Utilizing these three frameworks, CPED encourages member institutions to determine the outcomes for their graduating education doctoral students and to work backwards to determine how to prepare and assess students for achieving those outcomes (Perry, 2013).

Post-CPED Research

Since Perry's review in 2007 and the creation of CPED, empirical research studies about the education doctorate have been conducted.

Using an exit survey and content analysis of dissertations, Amrein-Beardsley et al. (2012) collected data from twenty educational doctorate students at one university. The students were in the first cohort of a new, CPED-aligned EdD program. From the responses, researchers discovered three prominent areas where students were influenced in this program. The first area recognized the importance of the curriculum and the value of the instruction. The students reported value in courses co-taught by up to five faculty members even though they also felt improvements could be made. The instructional

Table 5.

CPED Design Concepts

CPED Design Concepts for EdD Programming
▪ **Scholarly Practitioners** blend practical wisdom with professional skills and knowledge to name, frame, and solve problems of practice. They use practical research and applied theories as tools for change because they understand the importance of equity and social justice. They disseminate their work in multiple ways, and they have an obligation to resolve problems of practice by collaborating with key stakeholders, including the university, the educational institution, the community, and individuals.
▪ **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, 2006, p.52). Signature pedagogy includes three dimensions, as articulated by Lee Shulman (2006): 1. Teaching is deliberate, pervasive and persistent. It challenges assumptions, engages in action, and requires ongoing assessment and accountability. 2. Teaching and learning are grounded in theory, research, and in problems of practice. It leads to habits of mind, hand, and heart that can and will be applied to authentic professional settings. 3. Teaching helps students develop a critical and professional stance with a moral and ethical imperative for equity and social justice.
▪ **Inquiry as Practice** is the process of posing significant questions that focus on complex problems of practice. By using various research, theories, and professional wisdom, scholarly practitioners design innovative solutions to address the problems of practice. At the center of Inquiry as Practice is the ability to use data to understand the effects of innovation. As such, Inquiry as Practice requires the ability to gather, organize, judge, aggregate, and analyze situations, literature, and data with a critical lens.
▪ **Laboratories of Practice** are settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other. They address complex problems of practice where ideas—formed by the intersection of theory, inquiry, and practice—can be implemented, measured, and analyzed for the impact made. Laboratories of Practice facilitate transformative and generative learning that is measured by the development of scholarly expertise and implementation of practice.
▪ A **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.
▪ The **Dissertation in Practice** is a scholarly endeavor that impacts a complex problem of practice.

Note. Adapted from *Design-Concepts upon which to build programs*, 2016c, para. 8. Copyright 2016 by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/AboutUs.

methods of the instructors received a mixed review. Students recognized the value of autonomy while also noting the difficulties. The second area discovered in the study was the benefit of the collaborative community. Students found that the support of their peers and the faculty was an important part of their success in finishing the program. The third area identified in this study was the experience of change the graduates felt in their own personal identities. Students reported that they had become more competent, more confident leaders and scholars (Amrein-Beardsley et al., 2012).

A study by Kumar and Dawson (2013) was conducted with nineteen educational doctorate students at one university during the second year of their 3-year program experience. Data was triangulated with information gathered from each student's curriculum vitae and professional website. Researchers discovered two results from the data: students could apply research knowledge in their own personal professional practices and students experienced confidence in their own professional growth in their respective disciplines (Kumar & Dawson, 2013).

Zambo and Zambo (2013) used poetry to analyze a representative sample of six dissertations from eighteen students in the third cohort of one newly revised EdD program in Leadership and Innovation. All students were employed full-time in an educational field and pursued their doctoral programming as part-time students. Their goal was to use the actual words of the practitioners to understand their work in action research. The researchers used the language from dissertation proposals to create I poems, a qualitative way to analyze data. Researchers began by reading the dissertation proposals separately to discern the problems and actions and then came together to make

sure understandings were complete and accurate. Using a linear framework, the researchers then placed, making sure to keep them in sequence, all statements beginning with "I" from the proposal texts and underlined the important words, especially verbs. The "I" lines were combined sequentially to create poems for each dissertation proposal. These poems provided evidence explaining the problems these eighteen doctoral students had with their research projects and the actions they used to address the problems. From this study, the researchers inferred two conclusions: (a) action research is an effective way for practitioners to develop the skills needed to address problems of practice and habits needed to be influential leaders and is directly in line with CPED's signature pedagogy design concept; and (b) using the actual voices of the educators who conduct action research can help readers better understand the reality of their environments.

Buss, Zambo, Zambo, and Williams (2014) developed a study to explore the self-identified perspectives of being learners, leaders, and action researchers comparing entering EdD students to graduating EdD students. Questionnaires were completed by 32 students in one educational doctorate program. From the 32 students completing the questionnaires, 18 random students were chosen for interviews. Nine students were entering students, and nine students were recent graduates. Quantitative data revealed that entering students and graduates considered themselves at about the same level in terms of being a leader and a learner; however, there was a significant difference between the first-year students and graduates for their self-reflections of being a researcher. Graduates identified themselves at a much higher level as a researcher than the entering

students identified themselves. The quantitative data was confirmed with the qualitative data (Buss et al., 2014).

Tucker and Uline (2015) analyzed data from a national survey of doctoral educational leadership programs (n = 103). Doctoral students in this studied represented both PhD and EdD programs. Researchers analyzed the surveys that had been used to collect data on traditional and emerging assessment strategies used in both types of programs. Entry requirements for both EdD programs and PhD programs still primarily used the GRE, with 66.7% of the EdD programs requiring the GRE, and 85.7% of the PhD programs requiring the GRE. The EdD programs allowed for other tests with some programs requiring no test, while the PhD programs either required the GRE or required no test at all. No other options were available for PhD candidates in these programs. Comprehensive exam requirements were also surveyed in this study, and results showed that 86% of the EdD programs required comprehensive exams but allowed for a variety of other ways to show proficiency, while 95% of the PhD programs required comprehensive exams. Results show that there are additional assessment options available to EdD students in this study compared to the PhD students in this study. Both programs have a variety of traditional assessments throughout the programs to determine student success. The greatest difference that emerged between the two degree programs was in the structure of the capstone project. For the EdD programs, 75% required traditional research dissertations, whereas for the PhD programs, 100% required traditional research dissertations (Tucker & Uline, 2015). This information supports that

CPED-influenced EdD programs may provide options for students to demonstrate mastery and application of their learning.

A survey of program coordinators from 103 doctoral educational leadership programs, both EdD and PhD, was conducted in 46 states and Puerto Rico. Surveys were sent to 258 programs, and 103 completed surveys were returned. Results showed that EdD programs were more commonly redesigned in general, and those with CPED affiliations were more likely to undergo redesign. However, the redesign was primarily noted to decrease the amount of time for students in the program, and little to no changes were found in coursework. The researchers found that cohorts were used more often in EdD programming than in PhD programming, especially in redesigned EdD programs. Researchers concluded that EdD students could "benefit from the increased opportunities for camaraderie, peer support, and networking (Buttram & Doolittle, 2015). These results are concerning in that the improvements in the redesigning of programs should be more effective than reduction in time.

When this university joined CPED, the intent was to develop a newly revised, CPED-influenced EdD program from the previous EdD program. Through a collaborative process, the components of this new EdD program emerged.

This EdD Program

The educational doctorate has been a degree option at this university since 1977. In 1977, a consultant was hired to make sure the process was thorough (UNI, 1982). At that time, there were six Intensive Study Areas (ISAs): Curriculum and Instruction, Counseling, Educational Administration, Reading, School Psychology, and Special

Education (UNI, 1982, pp. 299-i-299-ii). In 2014, the doctoral program was repurposed and aligned with the Guiding Principles of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), a national consortium of universities committed to strengthening the rigor and credibility of educational doctorate programming (Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate, 2015). An Intensive Studies Areas Committee (ISA Committee), a committee of academic leaders invested in this university's doctoral programming, led this repurposing. This committee continues to oversee, reflect, and revise the EdD program.

EdD Program Outcomes as aligned with CPED Guiding Principles

Table 3 identifies the EdD program outcomes at this university and their alignment with the CPED guiding principles (See Table 6). Areas and content overlap regarding ethics, analyzing and solving problems of practice, leadership skills, application of knowledge, building communities of collaboration, practical and research knowledge, and professional growth.

EdD Student Demographics

Students enter doctoral programs in education for a variety of reasons. Some are endeavoring to advance to higher levels in their educational careers, some are exploring other options within the field of education, and some are transferring their employment to the college level (Aiken & Gerstl-Pepin, 2013). Many students who enter doctoral programs enter because they simply love being students (O'Connor & Cordova, 2010).

The primary focus, however, for choosing the EdD over or above another terminal degree in education is the focus on the scholarly practitioner. Scholarly practitioners are

Table 6.

Program Outcomes as aligned with CPED Guiding Principles

EdD Outcomes Students will…	CPED's Guiding Principles for the EdD The professional doctorate in education…
1. …apply leadership skills to empower individuals and groups with diverse goals to fulfill common goals, envision new possibilities, and transform ideas into action following the principles of ethical leadership.	1. …is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
2. …demonstrate a commitment to professional development and growth incorporating adaptation and creative responses to changes in a global society.	2. …prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
3. …make practical decisions using a wide variety of perspectives including sociological, philosophical, psychological, and historical premises of schooling in formal and informal settings when faced with a situation in professional practice.	3. …provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships. 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.
4. …integrate and apply theories of organizations and organizational processes, and conflict mediation skills as applied to organizational change.	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. …evaluate research on effective practice and apply that research in assessment of individuals, organizations, and programs in a way that stimulates professional growth.	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.
6. …implement and integrate knowledge, theory, practice, and research in order to make pedagogical decisions.	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.
7. …conduct methodologically-sound original scholarly research.	6. … emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice.

Note. Adapted from *Guiding Principles for Program Design*, 2016d, para. 7. Copyright 2016 by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/AboutUs and *Post-Admission Student Handbook*, 2015, p.7.

interested in developing the skills to impact changes in their own educational environments (Aiken & Gerstl-Pepin, 2013). The goal is to learn how to use research and scholarship to solve problems and then to share that knowledge so other practitioners benefit as well (Aiken & Gerstl-Pepin, 2013; Salter, 2013).

Some EdD programs offer the option of taking coursework as a full-time student. In one study, researchers concluded that EdD students could benefit from a full-time on-campus cohort atmosphere because students are more engaged and graduate (Buttram & Doolittle, 2015). Another reported that even though leaving a full-time job to return to school full-time can be difficult, the results can be effective as the student transforms from a practitioner to a researcher (Austin et al., 2009).

Many students opt to enroll in doctoral programs part-time instead of full-time. Some part-time programs are tailored specifically for full-time practitioners who want to continue in their practices (Aiken & Gerstl-Pepin, 2013; Amrein-Beardsley et al., 2012; Brennan, 1998; Buss et al., 2014; Caboni & Proper, 2009; Kumar & Dawson, 2013; Zambo et al., 2015). One study found that full-time practitioners appreciated the flexibility of a part-time online environment (Kumar & Dawson, 2013). Butcher and Sieminski (2006) found in their study that part-time EdD practitioner students participating in an online program were successful in becoming active researchers. Because of the flexibility of their online program, the faculty was able to support the students and more students were retained through program completion. Contrary to the positive effects of part-time program options, one study posited a disengagement effect

because the part-time student is not immersed in the program environment (Neumann & Rodwell, 2009).

Contextual Overview of Doctoral Students at this University

Students in this EdD program are comparable to the generalized population of EdD programs in general. Students come from a variety of backgrounds. In the ISA Educational Leadership area, most are current educators or principals who are working toward finishing their principal license or getting their licensure to be a superintendent. Most have full-time jobs and are taking courses part-time. The ISA Educational Leadership courses are online, so it is very flexible for the students. These professionals are also allowed to reflect upon time spent in their jobs for internship credits and only need to be on campus for the EdD core courses that are not offered online. Some doctoral students in Ed Leadership vary to include students working as full-time instructors, counselors at other post-secondary institutions, special education coordinators, and other specialty positions in educational leadership. These students are pursuing doctoral degrees to advance to the next level of their professional careers in educational leadership.

The doctoral students in the Curriculum and Instruction area are diverse. Many students are part-time students because of full-time positions at other institutions and some are full-time students many of whom are getting additional experience by working as graduate assistants on campus. The Curriculum and Instruction courses are not offered online, so doctoral students in this area are required to come to campus for coursework more often than students in the Ed Leadership area. Some doctoral students in

Curriculum and Instruction are pursuing doctoral degrees to advance to the next level of their professional careers, some want to teach at the college or university level, and some want to enhance their skills to become better educators in the positions they already hold.

Students in the Allied Health, Recreational and Community Services area are diverse as well. Most doctoral students in this area are full-time students who are working as graduate assistants. They have taken time away from their professions to pursue a terminal degree to advance to the next level. There are, however, also some doctoral students in this area who are part-time students because they are still working full-time outside the EdD program. These students are working in various areas of health and community services or teaching at other educational institutions. Some of these positions require terminal degrees, and others encourage terminal degrees.

Summary

From the historical perspective, educators have had a difficult time creating and securing the identity of the education doctorate. The collaborative work of institutional members of the Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate (CPED) has begun to solidify this identity. CPED has provided a framework for EdD programming and clarified definitions associated with EdD programming. This framework and these definitions have provided the base for research to be conducted. Continued research on EdD programming is needed to determine effectiveness in preparing scholarly practitioners. Using the framework and definitions provided by CPED, this researcher conducted a study to explore the effectiveness of one newly-revised EdD program and the perceptions of the students within it.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Purpose

The purposes of this study were to explore the new, CPED-influenced EdD program at this university to determine if students were confident that the EdD program meets its outcomes, to discover if and how the program outcomes influence students, and to explore how the full-time program experience compares to the part-time program experience.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are:

1. Do EdD students, in their own personal experiences of the program, perceive that the outcomes of the new EdD Program at this university are being met?
2. Have the new EdD Program outcomes at this university influenced the students? If yes, how?
3. Do the program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university differ? If yes, how?

Participants

Participants for the initial study were enrolled educational doctorate students at one Midwestern university during the fall of 2016. All students in the EdD Program, regardless of level or enrollment status, were asked to participate in the student perception survey of EdD programming outcomes. This population included (a) students

in the old program, students who began coursework prior to 2014; (b) hybrid students who began in the old program and were then transitioned into the new program; and (c) the new program students who began in the fall of 2014 or after. Student names were collected with the survey submissions so the researcher would know which participants to contact for the interviews. The names were then changed to code numbers for the data reporting and analysis. Names were known only to the researcher and advisor.

For the second data collection, a purposive sample population was created using (a) students from the old program who had transferred into the new program, and new program students, (b) who had completed the two following required core classes (Foundations of Inquiry and Inquiry I) for a total of at least 6 semester hours out of the 27 required in the common core of the EdD program; and (c) were currently continuing in the program either full-time or part-time. Students who met the three criteria were then divided into two groups, full-time students and part-time students. From the two groups, four students in each group were randomly chosen for interviews from a random number generator. This procedure did not produce a representative sample in terms of gender, intensive study area, or domestic versus international student data. The four random full-time students and four part-time students were invited to participate in the interviews for the second and third research questions. Only one part-time student chose to decline participation citing a busy schedule for the reason. The researcher selected another random part-time student to invite, and this student accepted.

Study Design

Components of Mixed Methods

This dissertation study used a mixed methods approach. According to Grbich (2013), mixed methods provide a unique set of tools for researchers to get the best data. Mixed methods research involves combining two forms of research, quantitative and qualitative. With both forms of data collection, this researcher believed she would discover, through the quantitative data, what was effective and ineffective about this program but also, through the qualitative data, how and why some aspects of the program were effective and others were not. Table 7 identifies the research questions as aligned with the research approaches.

Case Study

For both phases of this study, the researcher focused on one bounded system, the students in one Midwestern university's EdD program. Case studies provide insight into the lived experiences of the students in the bounded system (Creswell, 2013). Students were asked to identify and describe their perceived levels of successful attainment of the outcomes in the EdD program. Each doctoral student's experiences, recalled during the moments of the survey and the interview, concerning the outcomes of the program, were recorded. These lived experiences were gathered from a variety of students involved in the EdD program.

Table 7.

Research Questions Aligned with Research Approaches

Questions	Research Approaches
Do EdD students, in their own personal experiences of the program, perceive that the outcomes of the new EdD Program at this university are being met?	Quantitative Survey
Have the new EdD Program outcomes at this university influenced the students? If yes, how?	Qualitative Interviews
Do the program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university differ? If yes, how?	Qualitative Interviews

Phase I: The Quantitative Survey

The first phase of this study explored the perceptions of all enrolled students in the EdD program during the fall of 2016. A quantitative survey provided a broad lens of understanding the experiences of all students enrolled in the program. Recruitment for the quantitative survey was conducted via email from the researcher to all enrolled EdD students at this university, the potential student participants. Students were asked to participate in the study and assured that the information collected would be identifiable to only the researcher and advisor with a low risk of breach of confidentiality. Students

were informed that consent was completely voluntary and no repercussions would occur if students chose not to participate. Students were also informed that the potential benefit for participating was obtaining a clearer understanding of the outcomes of the EdD program. The intention was to gather information on student perceptions of the program to provide data that might be helpful in future revisions of the program.

Appendix A illustrates The Self Report of Proficiency, which began with questions regarding the demographics of the students enrolled in the doctoral program in the fall of 2016 and perceptions of mastery of program outcomes. Students responded to items using an interval scale through the online survey software Qualtrics®. Students reported confidence in their mastery of the identified program benchmarks on a scale of 1 to 5. Data received from old program students were collected for inclusion in the university's academic program review and for the first research question of this study, but these data were not used for research questions two and three. Data received from hybrid students and new program students were collected for inclusion in the university's academic program review and for the first part of this study, but data were also used to determine the students who met the criteria for the interviews to be used for research questions two and three. The answers from the quantitative survey had no influence on the questions asked in the interviews.

Phase II: The Qualitative Interviews

The second and third goals of this study were to discover if and how the new, CPED-influenced program outcomes influenced the students and if and how the full-time program experience differed from the part-time experience in this program. These goals

were addressed through qualitative interviews. This format provided a greater depth of understanding the experiences of these students.

Recruitment for the qualitative interviews was conducted via email from the researcher to the random sample population of four full-time students and four part-time students ($n = 8$). Students were asked to participate in the study and assured that the information collected would be identifiable to only the researcher and advisor with a low risk of breach of confidentiality. Students were informed that consent was completely voluntary and no repercussions would occur if they chose not to participate. Students were also informed that the potential benefit to them for participating was obtaining a clearer understanding of the outcomes of the EdD program. The intention was to gather information on the influence of the program outcomes and enrollment status on students in the program.

Structured one-on-one interviews were used for the qualitative data collection (Merriam, 2009). The decision was made to conduct one-on-one interviews instead of focus groups because the researcher did not want answers of one participant to influence the answer(s) of another participant, and the one-on-one interview created a more reliable environment. The researcher scheduled interviews with willing participants at times and in locations chosen by the interviewees. During a pilot study of this project, the researcher determined that the location for conducting the interviews was an important aspect. The participants needed to feel comfortable in the environment, which made the participants willing to speak more freely (Creswell, 2013).

Table 8 identifies the interview questions that were structured for the interviews answering research question number two. Flexibility was allowed for additional questions related to information given by the participant. Participants were asked to

Table 8.

Interview Questions Supporting Research Question #2

Have the new EdD Program Outcomes at this university influenced the students? If yes, how?	
EdD Program Outcomes	Interview Questions
1. Students will apply leadership skills to empower individuals and groups with diverse goals to fulfill common goals, envision new possibilities, and transform ideas into action following the principles of ethical leadership. 2. Students will demonstrate a commitment to professional development and growth incorporating adaptation and creative responses to changes in a global society. 3. Faced with a situation in professional practice, students will make practical decisions using a wide variety of perspectives including sociological, philosophical, psychological, and historical premises of schooling in formal and informal settings. 4. Students will integrate and apply theories of organizations and organizational processes, and conflict mediation skills as applied to organizational change. 5. Students will evaluate research on effective practice and apply that research in assessment of individuals, organizations, and programs in a way that stimulates professional growth. 6. Students will implement and integrate knowledge, theory, practice, and research in order to make pedagogical decisions. 7. Students will conduct methodologically-sound original scholarly research. 8. Of the outcomes mentioned above, is there one that has had the greatest effect on you and/or your future during this EdD program? Explain. 9. What has influenced you the most in determining the focus for your research and/or dissertation?	A. What aspects of this outcome do you feel you have achieved or learned, and which aspect(s) of the EdD program helped you learn or achieve this? B. Do you feel there are any aspects lacking in regards to this outcome, or is there a way the EdD program could be restructured to enhance this area? C. Will the influence of this specific program outcome affect your future? If yes, how?

expand on their answers and provided opportunities to answer follow-up questions from the researcher if necessary. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed, but recordings and transcriptions were secure in files on the researcher's laptop computer. Recordings were destroyed after completion of the transcripts, and names were removed from transcripts and replaced with code numbers.

Table 9 identifies the interview questions that were structured for the interviews answering research question number three. The same procedures were followed as described for Table 8.

Table 9.

Interview Questions Supporting Research Question #3

Do the program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university differ? If yes, how?
1. Are you enrolled in UNI's EdD program full-time or part-time? A. What criteria influenced this decision to be full-time or part-time? B. What do you see as advantages or benefits to being full-time or part-time? C. What do you see as problems, drawbacks, or detriments to being full-time or part-time? D. Has your status changed during the program (going from full-time to part-time or part-time to full-time)? If yes, what was the impetus for this change?
2. Give an example of and explain how you feel your full-time or part-time status has affected your learning.
3. Do you have a graduate assistantship if you are a full-time student, or do you have a job in education if you are a part-time student? A. If yes, please explain the duties you perform related to it. B. How has this working experience influenced your learning? Please give an example and explain.
4. Do you have a scholarship? A. If yes, explain. B. How has having this scholarship influenced your learning?
5. If you were able to go back and decide to be a part-time student instead of a full-time student or a full-time student instead of a part-time student, would you do it? Why or why not?

Data Analysis

Phase I: Quantitative Analysis

The survey mined the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the program outcomes. Reliability was determined through a Cronbach's reliability analysis with reliability set at an alpha of .70. The analysis of the survey data utilized descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and range. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated to determine students' self-reported proficiencies of the seven program outcomes: Leadership Skills, Professional Development and Growth, Practical Decision Making, Organizational Change, Research in Practice, Pedagogical Decision Making, and Original Research. From these calculations, the researcher ascertained the program outcome with the highest self-report of proficiency and the lowest self-report of proficiency. Mean scores and standard deviations were also calculated on each separate question or item covering the benchmarks or subgroups to determine a range of benchmark results for each program outcome. Using the means of the program outcomes, additional calculations were conducted to compare old program students to new program students and full-time students to part-time students. These calculations included *t*-tests to determine *p*-values of statistical significance or $p = 0.05$.

Phase II: Qualitative Analysis

Thematic analysis is one of the most frequently used ways to streamline qualitative research data (Creswell, 2013; Grbich, 2013; Merriam, 2009). Thematic analysis was determined to be the best option for analysis of the information being collected because the information included personal feelings and opinions. This made

the data suitable for creating themes from the similar ideas as well as stand-alone categories for the outlying ideas.

Open Coding. According to Grbich (2013), thematic analysis includes six stages. First, the researchers read and re-read the database, which in this study included the results of open-ended student perception responses and the transcripts of the interviews. Reading, re-reading, and taking notes with each finished interview was crucial because of the emergent design of qualitative data, and constant analysis and note taking was used throughout data collection to capture emergent ideas. During the interviews, the researcher kept a journal and analytic memos. The journal was kept and reviewed to capture emerging ideas, and the analytic memos were kept to record changes in procedures of collection and analysis. Interviews were transcribed by the researcher, so the researcher could relive the interview experience during this process. On the transcripts, the researcher identified emerging ideas to identify open codes, such as program structure, practical application of learning, collaboration, application practice or professors, mentor influence, research work, etc. Appendices B and C provide detailed coding from this study.

Categories. As ideas emerged and subsequent interviews provided confirming ideas or new ideas, the researcher began making connections and identifying differences among the open codes. Color coding of the open codes helped the researcher begin tracking the different ideas emerging from the interviews as well as identifying commonalities and differences among the codes and participant responses. The researcher then created a spreadsheet to organize the open codes into categories.

In addition to the emerging ideas from the interviews, the researcher compiled the results from the open-ended questions of the quantitative survey and used similar coding. Using similar methods of coding allowed the researcher to compare the results from the open-ended quantitative survey questions to the ideas that emerged from the interviews. This allowed the researcher to organize the data set and label everything according to codes. The researcher then added the qualitative data from the open responses to the spreadsheet of open codes and merged the data with the categories from the interviews. The use of data from both sources, the interviews and the open-ended survey responses, provided triangulation to further validate the findings (Creswell, 2013).

Thematic Integration. At this point the researcher began regrouping or separating the categories and bracketed them even further into subgroupings called themes. The researcher began making connections from the data to the research questions, theoretical framework, methodology, and reviewed literature (Merriam, 2009). The analysis of securing the connections among the themes regarding the research questions two and three, the theoretical framework of transformative learning, the mixed methodology, and the literature on graduate programs and educational doctorate programs was the final stage. The researcher was then able to identify the results of the study through relevant insights, supporting information, and contradictory data.

Trustworthiness and Credibility. Because the researcher conducted only one interview with participants, it was important to use probing follow-up questions to dig deeper into understanding the perspective of the participant and add to the validity of the study. Throughout the interviews, the researcher asked questions to confirm the

assertions of the participant. These questions included rephrasing the participant's words for clarification: "If I'm hearing you correctly, you were thankful for the flexibility of aligning assignments within your own context." Other questions included asking for additional information: "You mentioned the importance of your advisor as a mentor. In what ways did your advisor act as a mentor?" Some asked for information generated from previous answers: "You mentioned you appreciated your advisor and how supportive he is. Would you identify him as a mentor?" Using follow-up questions and extensive probing provided richer, more elaborate data for the study.

To support the researcher's credibility, analytic memos were kept throughout the process of this study. The notes were informally written in a spiral notebook and included thoughts during interviews, during transcription, and during processing and analysis. These analytic memos were also included to keep track of the process of the research and the changes throughout the study. Appendix D provides examples of the researcher's analytic memos.

Another method of validation included allowing participants to review highlights from their transcripts and confirm accuracy. The researcher emailed each interview participant with highlights from his or her transcripts and asked for validation. Six of the eight participants responded immediately. Seven responded that all was correct. One asked for a few minor changes, to which the researcher immediately complied. Triangulation was created with the use of two data sources, the interviews, and the open-ended survey responses. The open-ended responses from the survey provided comparative data for themes that emerged from the interviews.

Personal Reflexivity. This researcher began this study with a personal interest in the results. Understanding that this personal interest could create a bias in the research and results, the researcher tried to separate herself, remain objective, and mitigate the bias. As a member of the ISA Committee, the university's governing committee of EdD programming, the researcher had a thorough understanding of the program outcomes and benchmarks and how they were aligned with actual courses within the doctoral program. This knowledge helped the researcher develop probing questions during the interviews when participants had no knowledge of a program outcome because they had not taken the course aligned with the outcome.

As a third-year doctoral student in the program being studied, the researcher knew most participants in the study. There were several individuals who completed the survey who were not personally known to the researcher, but seven of the eight participants interviewed were known from various courses. In some circumstances, this could have been a detriment to the comfort level of participants in the interview process, but for this study, this added to the comfort level of the participants. All interviews were relaxed and comfortable with casual conversation interwoven throughout.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Phase I: The Quantitative Survey Results

Research Question Addressed by Phase I

The first question in the current study addressed if EdD students, in their own personal experiences of the program, perceived that the outcomes of the new EdD Program at this university were being met. Quantitative analysis showed that students perceptions did indicate the new program is meeting the intended outcomes. Details supporting this analysis are presented in this section.

Participants

A total of 36 current EdD students participated in the quantitative online survey. This was a 44% response rate of the 81 EdD students in the program who were all invited to participate. The total number of students included all doctoral students enrolled during the fall of 2016. Some of the students were no longer on campus, which could have influenced their participation or lack thereof. Of the 36 students, 50% were old program students, and 50% were hybrid or new program students. Age of the participants ranged from 26-65 years (M = 40.39, SD = 9.64). Twenty-six of the students were female; 10 were male. Students self-identified race/ethnicity as the following: 18 Caucasian, 10 White, 3 Asian, 2 African-American, 1 African, 1 Arab, and 1 Turkish-American. Twenty-nine of the students were domestic students, and seven were international students. Thirteen students were enrolled in the Allied Health, Recreation, and

Community Service ISA, fifteen in the Curriculum and Instruction ISA, and eight in the Educational Leadership ISA.

Twenty students were enrolled part-time, taking fewer than 9 credit hours per semester, and 16 students were enrolled full-time, maintaining 9 or more credit hours per semester. Of the 20 students enrolled part-time, all reported having a full-time job in addition to part-time student status. Additionally, three of the 16 full-time students also reported having a full-time job in addition to their full-time student status. Of the 23 students with full-time jobs, seven were employed by this Midwestern University (in a position other than graduate student). Others were employed as PK-12 teachers (n = 1), PK-12 administrators (n = 2), college staff (n = 7), college faculty (n = 4), and other (n = 2).

Validity

The validity of any instrument refers to the assessment's effectiveness of measuring what is intended to measure (Vogt, 2007). For the purposes of this assessment, the researcher focused on criterion-related validity, which measures how the instrument relates to the criteria against which is being measured. Criterion-referenced validity was achieved by creating a survey that consisted of questions directly linked to the benchmarks of the seven program outcomes connected to the six CPED Guiding Principles as shown in Table 4 (see page 26).

Content validity addresses the importance of the test questions measuring what they are intended to measure as determined by a panel or group of experts in the field. The panel confirms the content of the questions and advises on revisions of the questions

to ensure their relevance (Vogt, 2007). The panel of experts for this study was the Intensive Study Areas Committee (ISA Committee), which oversees all EdD programming at this university. Members of this group have foundational knowledge of the program, its components, and its students. These program experts were consulted and helped revise the questions to make sure the questions accurately reflected the outcomes of the program, and therefore validate the survey questions.

Reliability

Questions for this survey were created from the benchmarks of the seven program outcomes of the Educational Doctorate. The seven program outcomes were identified as: Leadership Skills, Professional Development, Organizational Change, Research in Practice, Pedagogical Decision Making, and Original Research. Each of the seven outcomes had three to ten benchmarks. The set of questions for this survey was designed to include all aspects of each benchmark. To determine if the questions supporting each program outcome were measuring the program outcomes, a Cronbach's alpha calculation was used (Vogt, 2007). Table 10 exhibits the strength of the reliability for each outcome ($\alpha > .86$). In general, a Cronbach's alpha of .70 is considered adequate; the Cronbach data for this study indicates good reliability for the survey data. For five of the seven outcomes, alpha scores were > .94.

Self-Report of Proficiency

Students reported proficiency at the average 3.07 to above average 4.08 for all seven outcomes as shown in Table 10, indicating their perception that the outcomes of the program were being met. Students reported the highest level of proficiency in the

outcome addressing Research in Practice (*M* = 4.08, *SD* = 1.18). This program outcome of Research in Practice included utilizing reflective practice to stimulate organizational and programmatic learning and growth, demonstrating knowledge of current research on effective teaching along with learning to impact the profession, and identifying, describing, and implementing effective models of professional practice. The lowest perceived proficiency level was the outcome of Organizational Change (*M* = 3.07, *SD* = 0.75). This program outcome of Organizational Change included demonstrating knowledge of change theory, change theory processes, change theory research, conflict management theory, conflict management theory processes, conflict management theory research, and the employment of conflict mediation theory, skills, and research in situations of practice.

Table 10.

Self-Report of Proficiency and Reliability of Program Outcomes

Subscale/Item	*n*	*M* (*SD*)	Cronbach's Alpha
Research in Practice	34	4.08 (1.18)	.96
Original Research	36	4.01 (0.77)	.97
Professional Development	36	3.64 (0.97)	.86
Pedagogical Decisions	31	3.49 (1.10)	.99
Practical Decision Making	34	3.43 (0.84)	.87
Leadership Skills	35	3.32 (0.84)	.94
Organizational Change	32	3.07 (0.75)	.95

Note. 5-point Likert scale used for all items.

Comparison of Old and New Program Participants

The participants were separated into two groups: the old program students (n = 18) and the new program students (n = 16) combined with the hybrid students (n = 2), and t-tests were calculated to determine differences between the two groups on the seven program outcomes. As shown in Table 11, there was no significant difference between the scores for old program students and new program students on any of the seven outcomes.

Table 11.

Comparison of Proficiency Scores Between Old and New Program Students

	Old Program		New Program		*t*-test	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Leadership Skills	3.39	0.88	3.25	0.83	$t(34) = .50$	$p = .63$
Professional Development	3.59	0.63	3.69	1.23	$t(34) = -.29$	$p = .78$
Practical Decision Making	3.25	1.22	3.26	0.96	$t(34) = -.04$	$p = .97$
Organizational Change	3.21	0.62	2.94	0.84	$t(33) = 1.06$	$p = .30$
Research in Practice	4.22	1.03	3.98	1.33	$t(33) = .60$	$p = .55$
Pedagogical Decision Making	3.47	0.82	3.31	1.32	$t(33) = .44$	$p = .67$
Original Research	3.96	0.86	4.06	0.69	$t(34) = -.38$	$p = .70$

Comparison of Full-Time and Part-Time Participants

Students were then separated into two groups comparing full-time (n = 16) to part-time students (n = 20). As shown in Table 12, there was no significant difference in the scores for the seven program outcomes between full-time students and part-time students.

Table 12.

Comparison of Proficiency Scores Between Full- and Part-time Students

	Full-time		Part-time		*t*-test	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*		
Leadership Skills	3.54	0.68	3.16	0.96	$t(33) = 1.32$	$p = .20$
Professional Development	3.63	0.97	3.68	1.00	$t(33) = -.18$	$p = .86$
Practical Decision Making	3.05	1.31	3.43	0.88	$t(33) = .17$	$p = .31$
Organizational Change	3.21	0.79	2.19	0.67	$t(32) = .37$	$p = .25$
Research in Practice	3.56	0.65	3.36	0.79	$t(33) = .81$	$p = .42$
Pedagogical Decision Making	3.64	0.31	3.18	1.18	$t(33) = -.41$	$p = .21$
Original Research	4.04	0.78	3.92	0.77	$t(33) = .65$	$p = .64$

Summary of Quantitative Findings

The perceptions of educational doctoral students at this university show that the new CPED-influenced program outcomes are being met with both old program students

and new program students, both full- and part-time students. Students reported proficiency ratings ranging from 3.07 to 4.08 for the seven program outcomes. No significant differences were found between old and new program students or full-time and part-time students.

Phase II: The Qualitative Interview Results

Research Questions Addressed by Phase II

For the purposes of Phase II, research will be limited to the new program and hybrid students combined. To answer the second and third research questions, qualitative interviews were conducted with eight randomly-selected doctoral students (four full-time students and four part-time students). The first nine questions of the interview were focused on the seven program outcomes as aligned with CPED. Questions identified and assessed each student's perception of each of the seven program outcomes respectively. The students heard the outcome read while visually reading the outcome, and then were asked a series of three questions: (a) did the student feel he/she had learned or achieved the outcome in the EdD program, and if yes, where in the program did this occur; (b) did the student think the structure of the EdD program could be changed to enhance the learning for the specific program outcome, and if yes, how; and (c) how did the student think the successful attainment of the program outcome would affect his or her future. Next, students were asked to identify the program outcome or outcomes he or she found most influential to his or her learning and future and to identify the most influential component for their research and dissertation topics. Student responses to these questions addressed research question number two:

2. Have the new EdD Program outcomes at this university influenced the students? If yes, how?

The final questions were focused on the students' enrollment status, part-time or full time, and how this status influenced their learning throughout the EdD program. Student responses to these questions addressed research question number three:

3. Do the program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university differ? If yes, how?

Participants

Eight current doctoral students were selected to participate in the second data collection. A purposive sample population was created using hybrid students, students from the old program who had transferred into the new program, and new program students, those who began the program in the fall of 2014 or after, and who met the following criteria: (a) completion of the quantitative survey in this study; (b) completion of the first two required core classes (Foundations of Inquiry and Inquiry I) for a total of at least 6 semester hours out of the 27 required in the common core of the EdD program; and (c) enrolled and continuing in the program either full-time or part-time. Students who met the three criteria were then divided into two groups, full-time students and part-time students. From the two groups, four students in each group were randomly chosen for interviews from a random number generator. This procedure did not produce a representative sample in terms of gender, intensive study area, or domestic versus international student data. The four full-time students and four part-time students were invited to participate in the interviews in order to assess the second and third research

questions. Only one part-time student chose to decline participation. The student cited a busy schedule for the reason. The researcher selected another random part-time student to invite, and this student accepted.

Research Question 2: Influence of Program Outcomes

The purpose of this research question was to determine if the program outcomes of this EdD program are influencing the students, and if so, how. An analysis of the results indicated that the interviewed student participants in this student were influenced by the program outcomes of this EdD program in a variety of ways.

Thematic analysis was used for this study. This involved beginning with open coding, narrowing to categorical coding, and collapsing to the major themes (Creswell, 2013). After completing transcriptions, I created a spreadsheet file to begin open coding and a sheet within the document for each question to separate the information. Words and phrases by question from the transcripts were placed in a column along the left side of the spreadsheet and sorted so similar ones were grouped, which determined categories. For example, words like *think* and *thought* and phrases containing them were grouped to form the category Change of Thinking or *able to* and *my contexts* and phrases to form the category Relevance. Appendix B provides examples of codes to categories for research question two.

After narrowing the codes to categories, I went through the codes and categories again to make sure the codes were correctly placed in the categories, and the categories were accurate descriptions of the codes. A few codes were changed based on subtle differences. For example, I had originally grouped the professors mentioned with the list

of classes, but after thinking about this grouping, I chose to move them to the Professors/Mentors/ Advisors because they were referenced as having influence, not simply as course instructors. After carefully constructing the categories, I moved to narrowing the focus even more. I then examined each of the categories and began considering which ones fit together, which ones were connected. As shown in Table 13, themes emerged that represented the influence of the program outcomes: (a) transformative thinking or the change in the ways students think, (b) invested faculty/mentoring, (c) collaboration with and diversity among peers, (d) flexibility of assignments and program structure (ability for students to complete assignments within their own interest area and practitioner context), (e) the importance of the focus on quality research in practice, and (f) the application of learning.

Once the themes had been determined, I placed them in prioritized order to clearly identify the order of importance based on what I saw and heard during the interviews. The highest priority themes were the ones about which the participants were most passionate. Participants' language was louder, and they used gesticulations as they spoke. Priority was also given to those themes about which students went into deeper explanations and made deeper connections. I prioritized the order of the themes starting with the most apparent.

Transformative Thinking. The strongest theme to emerge from the interviews was how this program changed the way the students think, or what I have labeled transformative thinking. One student, with much excitement in her voice and a large

Table 13.

Sample of Categories to Themes

Categories			Themes	Priority
Coursework/ Classes	Learned in Coursework/ Classes	Course focus on research	Focus on Research	Transformative Thinking
Application in Practice	Application	Application	Application	Invested Faculty/ Mentoring
Professors	Mentor/Advisor/ Professors	Professors/ Advisors/ Mentors	Invested Faculty/ Mentoring	Collaboration with Peers
Leadership Focus				Flexibility of Assignments & Program Options
Collaboration with Peers/Colleagues	Collaboration with Peers/Colleagues	Collaboration with Peers	Collaboration with Peers	Focus on Research
International Students	International Students Need Help	Global Society		Application
Change of Thinking	Depth of Understanding	New Understanding	Transformative Thinking	
Flexibility/ Relevance	Commitment/ Engagement	Personal Focus	Flexibility of Assignments & Program Options	

smile on her face, declared, “I’m not just roast beef and corn” because of her newfound lens of critical thinking that has led to a transformative change for her. She felt “more worldly” than she had before. Another student often used the word transformative: “I’m experiencing transformative thinking, wanting to try different things in my classroom.” Another talked about how one professor “challenged how we think, not just what we think” and how she feels that her changed thinking has also changed how she approaches her work.

One mentioned that she's "growing professionally and maturing too," both of which have "enhanced my self-realization and my commitment to professionalism." Another student expressed how the classroom discussions have "taught me to be a better thinker, be more flexible, look at different perspectives of education from different lenses." One student identified a new "mindset" because "the way I look at things has changed because of what I've learned." Another claimed that "I'm taking my learning in a new direction." Words and phrases that supported the idea of deeper critical thinking included "challenged my thinking," "invigorating discussions," "depth of understanding," "illuminating," "look at different perspectives of education from different lenses," "approach my teaching at a deeper level," "critical and engaging reading," and "stretched my thinking."

These various indications of a transformative change of thinking into critical thinking emerged with passion and fervor as students explained their own experience. Body language changed and became more animated. Participants used gesticulations, volume increased, and they were very invested in sharing this information as if this theme were fundamentally important to them to make sure I understood what they were saying. Transformative thinking was the theme that emerged as the most important because of their examples as well as their physical changes while sharing.

The transformative thinking the students experienced was a change in their way of thinking. What they were learning in their classes was providing them with a new lens, which affected thoughts and feelings, perspective on life and learning. For most, the

change in thinking has been a foundational shift in the way they will live, work, learn, and teach.

Invested Faculty/Mentoring. The second theme to emerge from the qualitative interviews was the importance of invested faculty, some even acting as mentors. While the first theme was consistently described as positive about the changes in thinking, this theme had more variance in the opinions about the faculty members working with students in this program. Many students voiced how supportive the professors and advisors were, how "they were very helpful. We were made to 'experience' doing qualitative research, and this was invaluable!" Several students identified one specific faculty member who made a significant difference in their learning of the research process. One such student said that this professor's course "was extremely helpful. She made me feel comfortable with research. I'm so glad I took that course!" Another described the "amazing amount of time [this professor] spent with all of the students walking us through the research and writing process."

A couple of the students expressed concern about other students having to take specific classes with different professors because they appreciated their professors so much: "I wonder how the other class compares to the one we took because ours was extremely valuable and definitely taught at the doc level." Several students focused on how faculty in this program have taken on mentoring roles and become more than just their teacher. "My advisor has been very encouraging and helpful. I am very comfortable with him." Another described her advisor as her mentor. "We developed a strong partnership, strengthened my interests, allowed me to grow in my own direction,

[provided me] a venue to practice research, dig deeper, and even publish." One third year student credited her advisor and mentor as having "influenced my decision to come to [this] program." Yet another identified a "connection between my mentor and me to discover what's valid and important to me." One said that "mentors helped me gain knowledge on evaluating practice." Many described the effective "guidance of professors," "support from professors," encourage[ment] to read more and explore more by professors," and 'the helpful access of meet[ing] with the professors and how "they were very helpful" and "always encouraged, in all classes, [us] to implement or apply what we're learning to our own individual circumstances and contexts."

Other students expressed concern with some of the faculty. According to one student, "Professors need to invest in the diversity of students, backgrounds of students, and interests of students in developing the learning environment." One student said that "the teachers are very important in developing [an inclusive and open] environment [but] not all teachers follow this aspect of the program." A similar statement came from another student: "Not all teachers follow the intent of the program." Another claimed that "More professors should encourage students to publish their work." One student who shared that "doctoral students should be utilized more" and therefore recognized more, stated that "most professors in my area don't even know who I am." One student summarized her thoughts, which were not consistent with all student participants, with "some faculty are supportive; others aren't." She was referring to how willing professors are or are not to providing additional time and assistance for students outside of class.

Another student passionately and repeatedly expressed concerns with the faculty choices being made. He felt that decisions about the "professors being assigned to teach in the doc program" might not be the best choices because the professors have not been 'chosen for the right reason," though he was unsure how or why certain professors were chosen:

> Selecting the right person to teach the classes is very important. They have to know how to work with doc students. They have to support students in the student's interest areas, not the professor's. UNI needs to invest in this program and support this program. All students need a mentor/professor to guide them through the process. The student is the product of this program -- focus on the students and what they need to be successful. It is frustrating to have professors who don't know how to teach doc students. They take attendance, give quizzes and tests instead of projects, [have] no investment in the students or the program -- no engagement in doc students. It's like coffee. All undergrads drink the same coffee; doc students choose their own type of coffee -- latte, cappuccino, whatever. Doc programming needs to be tailored to the students and their interests. We don't all want or need the same coffee.

Student participants were clearly impacted by the faculty of the EdD program. Most students reflected positively about experiences with the faculty, some calling them mentors. The common thread was that the faculty and the advisors working with the students were extremely important to these students. They all felt that having this type of guiding leader was what kept students in the program, helped them make decisions about their programming and research, and for some, helped them successfully continue through completion.

Collaboration with Peers. Numerous students identified the importance of collaboration with their peers in the program, both students within their own Intensive

Study Areas as well as those in the others. Three students mentioned that the "courses are connected and overlap," which provides a unifying tone for all students. One student identified a "camaraderie with others in the program." Another appreciated that "everybody was eager to participate and learn." One student focused on the open discussions with classmates in specific classes that helped her "better understand the content." Two students mentioned the "support of colleagues when [the] coursework or assignments became overwhelming." They acknowledged that they reached out to each other to ask for help as well as offer help when needed. Even without official cohorts, according to four of the interviewed students, the comfort level among the students grew strong and positively influenced their environment. One explained that "this is a great environment with great discussions." In two separate interviews, students chuckled at a memory of a frustration shared with a colleague. One rolled her eyes as she mentioned what she felt was her own misdirection about an assignment after clarifying the assignment directions with a colleague. One smiled as she reflected on how appreciative she was of the other EdD students.

One element of the collaboration with peers was the influence of the international students in the program. They added a measure of diversity to the courses, and this diversity of the doctoral population was a key element within the students' collaborative environment. Several students appreciated the diversity among cultures with the international students in the program. One claimed to be "impressed and challenged by the wide variety of backgrounds of people in the program." Another spoke about great discussions among the "diverse populations in class" and how the professors are "open to

different views." Comments supporting the collaboration among diverse students included statements, such as: "understanding of diversity in this world and how it plays a role," the "interaction with international students [being] very important," these interactions "help us understand how things work in places outside the US," and numerous variations on "collaboration with colleagues in the program."

Aside from the positive benefits of the international students in the program, three students commented on a lack of curricular focus on the global society (in one of the outcomes). One said that "there is not a global perspective unless a student's research interest is global. Then it's an opportunity for that student, but not there for all [students]." They identified this as an area lacking in the program, but acknowledged that a global perspective was included through interactions with international students, an unintentional consequence. One student commented on "international students [being] unable to participate much of the time [in one class] because class discussions were focused solely on [the] American education system."

Another contradictory comment was expressed in terms of collaboration of peers. This comment was regarding the Core Course requirements for students in all ISAs. She felt that she "would like to work more completely and more deeply with others in my own ISA." She appreciated the breadth of information and knowledge she was getting, but really wanted to "go deeper with like-minded colleagues," those in her own area of expertise.

Relationships develop among the students in this program. Even though this is not considered a cohort-structured program, the students are developing the connections

that are normally found more often in a cohort system. These relationships are important to the students, and they appreciate the opportunities for collaboration. They were especially positive about the inclusion of the international students, which adds an element of diversity to the conversations.

Flexibility of Assignments and Program Options. Another theme with both positive and negative responses that resonated among the interviews was flexibility, primarily of assignments, but also of programming options. The appreciation of flexibility of assignments was primarily tied to personal contexts or interests. One student was thankful "to have choice in some classes and flexibility for most assignments." Another said, "Most of the professors allow us to create products and apply skills in our own contexts, and this has been very important to me because it's meaningful." One appreciated the professor's willingness to be "flexible so I could explore my own interests." One was thankful for the opportunity to "use one assignment to create a model in her own context" and she "is working on getting it published with the instructor." Another student expressed the flexibility as a type of freedom: "This freedom of choice to focus on [my] own context has primarily engaged me in self-reflection and scholarly reading and enhanced self-realization. It has strengthened my commitment to professionalism." One student emphasized how it was "important that teachers were flexible so she could explore her own interests" and another "appreciate[d] the flexibility for her own interests."

The appreciation of flexibility in programming focused on those who have been able to supplement their coursework with courses that focus on their own contexts and

interest. One student felt "lucky to have independent studies" but was "not sure all students [were] getting this." One student was "grateful that this program is accepting higher ed students now, or I would be somewhere else." She was also thankful that she was "able to take classes in other areas, mostly master's level courses, that were relevant to me" because as a doctoral student in Education Leadership who is not interested in being a superintendent or principal, her elective choices within her ISA are very limited. A different student identified an appreciation for "the opportunity to have choice in some classes [as electives].

Other students expressed concern with the lack of flexibility in some areas of programming. One student identified that sometimes scheduling comes down to choices because some of the required courses are not offered each term, and sometimes choices are difficult because students do not know when specific courses will be offered again. She found herself "taking leadership when [it was] offered because the opportunity was there." Another student expressed concern because she "took a class out of order" and felt that the program was "not necessarily supportive of part-time students" as some "classes are not accessible and prerequisites are confining." One student identified a "wish" for "less focus on education" and "more on health, therapy, recreation," additional courses specific to her ISA. She also "would like to see if the program is encouraging students to get engaged in the communities, making practical decisions on what they're learning." Another student recommended that the university "really look at those who are coming to this program" and that they "support practitioners, regardless of their [area of] practice," that "we all need opportunities to apply what we're learning." A different

student stated that the "programming needs to be flexible for students who don't fit the status quo."

With the diverse population of students in this program, flexibility in programming options is important. Without them, there were several student participants who would not have been able to be in the program. The other important aspect is flexibility of doing assignments and projects that are relevant in their own contexts and situations. The students in this program are practitioners and utilizing what they are learning to improve their practices.

Focus on Research. Many students expressed confidence in their ability to evaluate, conduct, and implement changes based on research. One student stated, "I have the foundation to move forward with research because I was provided research experience." Another credited the first two core courses: "Inquiry I and II were critical. It's important that students understand the importance of proposals." One student said, "Students in all ISAs need the [*Allied Health] Seminar* to continuously read, reflect, discuss, analyze, understand, and experience research." Another shared that she would "continue to read and study research to make changes in my practice." One, with much excitement in her voice, declared: "This is what I came here for! I have not had experience in research, and I want to learn more. Now I know how to read and evaluate research, so I can use evidence-based research to guide my instruction."

Some students focused on specific courses that utilized research articles instead of textbooks: "We read articles instead of using a book, and that was beneficial. It got us reading research, got us familiar with literature, discussing the research, applying

research." Throughout the interviews, phrases emerged: "gained more confidence with research," "created a foundation for me," "made me a better researcher," "we looked at and evaluated research," and "evaluated research a lot." One student credits this program for her commitment to research: "I feel this program has developed my commitment to continuing to do research to add to the literature and continue to grow."

Some educational doctorate students expressed a lack of confidence in their ability to conduct research. "I am not confident at all in how to conduct a study, and I am halfway through the program." Another stated that she had "learned a lot, but still want[s] to know more about methodologies, both quant and qual." One student asked for "more reading of educational research" stating that this "would have given me more confidence in my writing." One student explained that she had "no idea where and how [she] learned [original research]. Doc seminar helped, but we need more, especially in the second year. *Inquiry I* and *Inquiry II* brought us to the same page for the program, but next?" A different student said that students "need help walking through the research practice," they need "support for the transition between *Inquiry I*, *Inquiry II*, and *Advanced Methods*."

The focus on research is an important aspect of this program, but the importance also includes each practitioner's focus on research in his or her own context. Learning to read, understand, implement, and conduct research are necessary skills for practitioners to take back to their own professional environments. The concerns shown here by some participants identifies the lack of foundational research skills held by practitioners, which in turn, requires additional support for this development. Doctoral students are

experienced and skilled working in their fields, but many have little to no experience with research. This focus on research is important to encourage and support the practitioners enrolled in the program.

Application of Learning. The final theme that emerged focused on the application of the learning. Student participants expressed the importance of the application of their learning into practice. One of the students talked about the importance for her to apply her learning, saying "I want to make sure my students know things I'm just now learning." Another participant said her graduate assistantship was very important to her because she could "utilize skills in my assistantship [teaching]." One student smiled as she reflected on a memory: "I can think of specific situations where we learned something in class and I was able to put it into a situation with my students." One student stated, "I even applied a few items from that course." Another spoke highly of her experience in two classes: "We were made to 'experience' doing qualitative research, employing observation skills, interviewing techniques, transcribing, generating themes. This was invaluable!" A different student felt he had opportunities for applying what he was learning, but he also wondered "if the program is encouraging students to get engaged in the communities and make decisions on what they're learning." He had more confidence in his own experiences with application than with others in the program.

While the application of student learning was discovered during the portion of the interview focused on the program outcomes, the focus on application was more prevalent during the conversations surrounding the influence of full-time versus part-time status. One full-time student identified the importance of her graduate assistantship and how her

work was “interwoven with coursework” and how that “has been really beneficial for choices of research, choices of teaching, things that I’m learning.” Another full-time student shared how experiences in one of her classes “opened her eyes to different pockets of diversity on our campus,” which had a positive influence on her work with students on campus. One part-time student spoke about her job in education: “I’m learning how to incorporate research into my job.” Another part-time student appreciated the ability to apply her learning:

> I’m taking what I’m learning in the classroom and applying it directly to the work that I’m doing without having to wait three or four years after I finish [the program]. I’m living and breathing what I do for work, and I take that into the classroom with me.

The application of learning was not the most prominent theme that emerged from these interviews, but was a significant part of the experience for some of these students. These opportunities are important for the students. This is the reason most of them are here. They want to be able to make a difference in their own areas of practice.

Research Question 3: Comparison of Full- and Part-Time Students.

The analysis of this research data began as a thematic integration; however, the thematic approach did not capture the essence of the data as well as a simple descriptive presentation. Appendix C provides the initial list of the codes to categories for research question three prior to this change.

The purpose of this research question was to determine what, if any, are the differences between full-time and part-time students in this EdD program. Results from those interviewed showed that there are differences between being a full-time student and a part-time student. Both populations revealed advantages and disadvantages of their

enrollment status. The only similarity was the fact that seven out of the eight students interviewed were content with their enrollment status and would not have changed their status even if they had been able to. This suggests that the opportunity to be full-time or part-time is preference, which supports the flexibility discovered in the thematic results.

Full-time Advantages. The advantage to being full-time that was mentioned the most was the benefit of "the learning being intensive" and feeling "totally immersed" in the program. Students identified the ability to "synthesize courses by taking a full load [of classes]," "getting a rich experience," and being "fully emerged" and "engaged every day." Another advantage for full-time students is collaboration with peers, which supports one of the themes in the thematic results. Student participants mentioned "talking across courses," "having conversations with other doc students," and "collaborating with colleagues." The third most commonly mentioned advantage was finishing faster. One student mentioned "wanting to get done faster within three to three and a half years." Another commented on how she wanted to "get coursework finished quickly, timely," and another on how one "can finish faster than if distracted by being part-time." The last advantage mentioned by full-time students was the "access to resources" on campus. Students appreciate the library and helpful staff of the library; the experts in computers, statistics, and writing; the ability to meet with professors more frequently; and even the "extra events on campus, especially those with free food." The full-time students were all satisfied with their full-time experience.

Full-time Disadvantages. Only a few disadvantages for full-time students were mentioned. Dealing with financial limitations was a problem for some because they did not have much of an income source and were reliant on their partners for financial support and insurance. One student found the full-time coursework to be time consuming and is worried about how she will handle coursework and graduate assistantship once she starts her dissertation. Another student, an international student, said the worst part for her is being away from her husband. She also mentioned that getting access to scholarships and graduate assistantships is a very difficult process, so much so, that the stress has affected her studies.

Part-time Advantages. Part-time students have many advantages as well. Some students enjoy the option to continue working at a full-time job outside the program while taking one or two classes per term. One mentioned being part-time as her only option because she has "to work full-time" because this "allows me to pay my bills and have a relationship with my family," and another stated the need to "work and earn income while taking classes." One student explained that part-time is better because of the time aspect. Part-time is "not as intense as full-time so I can still enjoy personal time, family, children, relaxing time." One student felt that part-time school with a full-time job was the "best of both worlds" because "I'm taking what I'm learning in the classroom and applying it directly to the work that I'm doing without having to wait." Like the full-time students, all but one of the part-time students were satisfied with their part-time status. The one student who would have preferred full-time to part-time said that she would like

to go deeper into some of the material, which she felt she could do more easily as a full-time student.

Part-time Disadvantages. Several disadvantages to being part-time were revealed. Students mentioned that part-time status was more expensive because they did not qualify for a graduate assistantship or scholarship. Two others focused on time. One stated that she "might be able to dedicate more time to class and research without a separate full-time job." A couple of the students mentioned that they are not able to focus as much or as long on readings and assignments because they do not have enough time. Another student said being part-time made it "difficult to balance work and studies and family."

Two students identified two disadvantages as frustrations. One focused on the faculty and the other on the programming. One frustration was with some faculty members in the program. According to the student, "The biggest challenge is that the faculty treat us like we're all full-time students," and some expect students to focus on "research as if we are a Research One institution" instead of understanding the students' roles as practitioners. She recommended more balance between "implement[ing] and maintain[ing] rigor and the practitioner focus." The other frustration was about program scheduling. The student stated that students "never know when classes are going to be scheduled, so I have to make sure I make the time to find out."

Summary of Qualitative Findings

Research Question 2: Influence of Program Outcomes. The findings of these qualitative data covering the influences of EdD Program Outcomes at this university demonstrate that the program outcomes are influencing students in a variety of ways. Themes that emerged were critical, invested faculty/mentors, collaboration with peers, flexibility, and research.

Research Question 3: Comparison of Full- and Part-Time Students. Results comparing full-time students and part-time students show few specific similarities between the two; however, the major revelation was that both populations, full-time and part-time students, except one student, were content with their schedule. If students were full-time, they thought being full-time was the best option. Three of the four students who were part-time thought being part-time was also the best option. Thus, flexibility is very important to meet the needs of these students.

Personal Reflexivity

My full-time participation in this EdD program has influenced my view and my opinions as much as participation has my peers. During the interviews, I had to focus on active listening and what they were saying without allowing my own perspective to influence my reactions. I wanted to encourage them with their answers, but also contain my initial reactions to their responses. Neutral reactions were challenging at times because of my own experiences within the program; however, because of my relationship with my peers, I could connect with my participants and maintain my role as the researcher. According to Mirriam (2009), “the interviewer-respondent interaction is a

complex phenomenon. Both parties bring biases, predispositions, attitudes, and physical characteristics that affect the interaction and the data elicited" (p. 109). Realizing this and working to be "nonjudgmental, sensitive, and respectful of the respondent" (p. 109) were ways that I dispelled my own program biases.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Educational doctorate (EdD) programming has been questioned throughout its history and even called by some a "PhD-lite" (Shulman, 2006, p. 27). The problem, however, has not simply been in the name or letters. The problem lies within the true purpose of EdD programming: expanding and enhancing the skills and abilities of practitioners so they can read, understand, evaluate, implement, and conduct research to create change in their own contexts (Cremin, 1978; Perry, 2012). Practitioners in EdD programs want to continue working as practitioners. EdD students are not preparing for a life dependent on research, but on the integration of research into their own world. This difference sets apart the EdD program in this study and potentially most, if not all, EdD programs. This vision of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) has been the inspiration for this dissertation.

Many institutions of higher learning with EdD programs, including the one Midwestern university in this study, have joined CPED with plans to enhance the programming they provide for their students. With the help of CPED, its guiding principles, and its conceptual framework, universities and colleges are developing an understanding of what EdD programming should encompass. Because CPED has created a time of change and reform for EdD programming, studies are needed to determine if CPED-aligned programs are effectively meeting the needs of their students. The current study will add to this literature. Additionally, this study is providing information to the Midwestern university where conducted so those who are involved with implementing

the EdD program are able to move forward making research-based program decisions for their practitioner students.

The purposes of this case study were to determine (a) if students in one Midwestern university EdD program perceive that the EdD program outcomes were being met; (b) if the students were being influenced by the EdD program outcomes and if they were, how; and (c) if there were differences between full-time and part-time students in this program. The alignment of the program's outcomes with CPED guiding principles provided the framework through which this mixed-methods study was designed.

The methodology of the study for research question number one included a quantitative survey conducted through Qualtrics. The survey was distributed to all EdD students at the Midwestern university in the fall of 2016. Reliability was determined through a Cronbach's reliability analysis. The analysis of the survey data utilized descriptive statistics including mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and range. Additional calculations included *t*-tests to determine *p*-values of statistical significance. For any outcomes or benchmarks with significant differences, effect size was determined using Cohen's *d*.

Eight students were randomly selected to participate in structured interviews for research questions two and three. Interviews were recorded and transcribed. Themes were used for the analysis. Codes were determined from the transcriptions, the codes were compared and combined into categories, and the categories were narrowed to themes.

Findings

Research Question 1

The results of the quantitative survey showed that the students do perceive that the EdD program outcomes are being met. Students self-reported a range of proficiency at the average to slightly above average levels for the seven program outcomes.

Two of the seven program outcome rankings were in the above average range: Research in Practice and Original Research. Kumar and Dawson (2013) noted an increase in confidence or perceived proficiency in applying research in practice. The high rating for proficiency in research is significant because most students and faculty would identify the two research outcomes as the two most challenging areas of learning and teaching. These high ratings indicate that students are finding success the way research is taught in the program, which could mean that research is an area in which transformative learning is occurring. Conducting research studies is not a comfortable area for most practitioners, so this understanding would indicate that the students are undergoing a transformative experience. The doctoral classes entitled Inquiry I and Inquiry II are providing a base for research understanding. Whether this understanding favors quantitative or qualitative research is unclear as both approaches are incorporated into the two classes. This finding would support continuing to incorporate intense research study, analysis, and practice from the beginning of and throughout the program.

Rated slightly lower than the research-focused outcomes was the program outcome of professional development. The mean score for professional development was the third highest of the program outcomes. This finding could indicate that students are

learning new concepts in the program, and therefore feeling successful with professional development or student growth from program experiences. Kumar and Dawson (2013) also reported confidence in professional growth, which was confirmed in the current study. Rated slightly lower than professional development were the program outcomes of practical decision making and pedagogical decision making. A slightly higher rating for pedagogical decision making could reflect the influence of the practitioner experience with pedagogy. These data also confirm the results that emerged by Kumar and Dawson (2013), which reported students gaining confidence in their application of knowledge in their own professional practice.

Two of the program outcomes are directly addressed by specific core courses in the EdD program. One class is called Leadership in Formal and Informal Learning Environments; however, leadership is a skill that is modeled and encouraged in every class. Students who are accepted and enroll in a terminal degree program would be considered leaders by most people. Most would not have the ambition to complete a terminal degree without leadership qualities. The average rating in this area shows that not all students feel proficient in leadership, which could indicate that more focus needs to be placed on leadership in more classes. Buss et al. (2014) found a similar result: incoming students and graduates both considered themselves at about the same level of proficiency in being a leader. Perhaps leadership is too value-laden for self-report ratings. Are students able to honestly self-report on their leadership abilities? In contrast, Amrein-Beardsley et al. (2012) found that students reported an increase in

competence and confidence in leadership after completing a CPED-aligned EdD program.

Organizational Change is another program outcome that is the specific focus of one class. Students reported at least mid-range proficiency with this program outcome, but was rated lowest of the seven program outcomes. Concepts connected to this principle are taught in the course Organizational and Community Transformation, which is a course often taken in a doctoral student's second year. Because some of the students responding to the survey were in their first year of programming, several had not yet taken this course. Additionally, this topic is not one that is traditionally found in education-related schooling. At this university, this focus comes from the influence of the Allied Health, Community, and Recreation Services Intensive Study Area. This topic is part of the EdD core and includes important information on change theory and conflict management. These topics concerning organizational change are important because as practitioners work in their environments and undergo change, which happens often, EdD students will be able to understand the process and how they can influence its progression in innovative and effective ways.

Research Question 2

EdD Program outcomes at this university have influenced the students. The most significant theme that emerged from the qualitative data was transformative thinking as described by Mezirow (2000). Student participants revealed a clear and distinct change in the way they think, how they think, and what they think. Students attributed the beginning of the change to one of the first courses required in the EdD program,

Foundations of Inquiry, and the professor for this course. Students commented on the depth of the learning, the growth in their thoughts, and the discomfort of the challenges. Their descriptions revealed the dynamics of transformational learning. During this class, students were in states of unease, questioned their own learning and beliefs, and looked to each other for support. They were engaged in a type of self-discovery of being without knowledge as they gained more knowledge, of developing stronger metacognitive abilities about their learning. Interestingly, most were surprised by the transformational change they underwent with their thinking. This overhaul of thinking mode was not one of their expectations when enrolling in this EdD program.

The second theme that emerged focused on the importance of invested faculty members and advisors along with their roles as mentors for students in the program. Similarly, Amrein-Beardsley et al. (2012) reported students valued the curriculum and the faculty, even though students acknowledged the rigor of the curriculum. Students in this study also found value in their instructors and the curriculum. Student participants talked about how having an advisor or professor believe and encourage them kept them in the program. They mentioned ways professors reached out to and assisted them through difficult processes that they do not know if they would have ever understood without the personal guidance. These results highlighted the importance of invested faculty for the program. All faculty members need to be informed about the program, understand the requirements, and have the experience needed to challenge and support doctoral students, who are much different from undergraduate students and master's level students. Additionally, faculty members who are advising or teaching in the program, especially

the core courses, need to be invested and committed to the students and the program. The students need knowledge and expertise, but they also need encouragement, guidance, and support. With the high level of rigor in the program and the dynamic and transformative changes the students are undergoing, invested, knowledgeable faculty members are a critical component.

Collaboration with peers was the third emergent theme. Evidence confirming the transformative learning occurring with the doctoral students supports Amrein-Beardsley et al. (2012). According to that study, students found the collaborative community to be beneficial to work in the EdD program. Similarly, in the current study, students in the program expressed high engagement in discussions with peers, thoughtful and deep interactions, and exceptional support given and received. They described a sense of respect, a camaraderie, and a close-knit community among their colleagues in the program. For some, this feeling was described as a reliance on each other, being emotional and academic supports for each other, and experiencing together the stress of the program and professor expectations. These results show the importance of peer-support and indicate a need for collaboration and interaction among the students. This caring environment strengthens student learning and understanding of content as well as providing support for the application of the learning.

One significant component of this collaboration was the inclusion of international students. This program is unique in accepting international students, and the student responses indicate that this aspect is an extremely beneficial part of the program. Interactions with international students provide a global perspective the students do not

seem to find elsewhere in the program or at their workplaces. Continuing to admit international students to add to the richness and diversity of the collaboration of the students is important.

Buttram and Doolittle (2015) found that the use of cohorts was important for collaboration. They discovered that many redesigned EdD programs were using cohorts to increase student interaction and engagement. While the EdD program in the current study does not use the cohort model, student participants did express "a cohort feel" to the program because of the cohesion of the students and the fact that many students took the doctoral core classes together.

Flexibility was an important fourth theme, and a significant one when considering future programming plans. The students clearly supported flexibility of programming, full-time and part-time students, and domestic and international students.

Flexibility within courses was also evident. Students experienced relevant application of learning and knowledge when they were able to incorporate their own interests and contexts within assignments. As this is an educational doctorate, a practitioner's terminal degree, flexibility is a vital element. Practitioners need to apply what they are learning to their own problems of practice. Students need to learn how to use research to make decisions and be agents of change. This fundamental understanding of educational doctorate programming should be understood by the faculty members in the program.

A focus on research is another foundational element of this EdD program. This theme supports the slightly above-average reports of proficiency found in the quantitative

survey results. Students are reading, understanding, and evaluating research. They are being immersed in the importance of research and its application in their practice, and this should continue. Students should be engaged in research from the beginning of the program because research is not a common focus for pk-12 educators or many faculty members at the community college or private four-year college levels. Students should become critical readers of research studies to learn how to implement research-based knowledge and skills, and to conduct their own original research for implementation in their own practices. Similarly, Amrein-Beardsley et al. (2012) revealed that students reported an increase in competence and confidence in scholarship, and Buss et al. (2014) found that EdD graduates identified themselves at a much higher level regarding understanding of research than incoming students.

The final theme that emerged from the qualitative interviews was application. Students were excited about being able to take what they were learning in the classroom and apply this to their own teaching or within their own practices. Although this theme was not the most noted one that emerged, application is imperative for EdD programming. While the focus on research is vital, the use of the research within one's own practice is paramount. Students should be encouraged to utilize what they are learning. They should gain solid understandings so they can implement new practices or facilitate changes in their own contexts, which is the final goal of an educational doctorate degree program. The students should take and use what they have learned to make their own worlds better and more effective for their constituents. Similarly, Kumar

and Dawson (2013) found students were confident applying research to practice and in their own professional growth as well.

Research Question 3

The program experiences of full-time EdD students and part-time EdD students at this university do differ in several ways. Both full- and part-time students identified advantages and disadvantages to their personal enrollment choices, and seven of the eight interviewed expressed their current status as their preference. Only one student acknowledged that she would prefer to be full-time instead of part-time, but she simply cannot afford to enroll full-time.

Full-time students reported numerous advantages to their enrollment status. Part-time students also noted several advantages, but interestingly, none overlapped with the advantages of the full-time students. Disadvantages between full-time students and part-time students, however, did overlap. Both full- and part-time students identified concerns with finances and time, which are common concerns for most students.

The results support one of the themes found in the other qualitative data: flexibility. Every student has his or her own situation within which to fit the doctoral program. Because the program is flexible and allows for students to take classes on a part-time basis or full-time basis, the current program is an option for more students. Students who have families with children can work around their schedules, international students are able to enroll, those who need to work still can, and those who have the option of going back to school full-time can. In addition to the benefits to the students, this flexibility also benefits the university and program. The students are the reason for

the program, the constituents of the program. Without the students, the program would not continue.

Significance and Implications

Students enrolled in this EdD program can be confident that the program outcomes are being met through the required core courses in this program. They can graduate with the skills to read, understand, analyze, evaluate, and conduct research in their own contexts of professional practice. Students could experience a dynamic change in thinking. Students can be confident they will be supported as a student in the program regardless of their enrollment status, full-time or part-time. Students should also know that finding a faculty member, advisor, or mentor is a critical part of this program. Students should reach out to faculty and make connections with them or find someone who has similar topic interests or methodological interests. Students need to recognize and embrace the intensity and rigor of a program that demands their commitment if they are to be successful.

Students succeed in this EdD program, and this success is influenced by several variables. One of those variables is the actual programming itself. Flexibility in programming has been shown to be a tremendous asset of this program as students benefit from the full-time and part-time options. Another aspect of programming that should continue to be a priority is that of hiring professional, qualified staff members. The influence of the faculty on the students and learning was very clear. Students need professors who know how to teach at the doctoral level, who are committed and invested,

and who have strong research skills. If professors are missing any of these qualifications, then the learning of students suffers.

The faculty should recognize their impact on the success of the students in this program, as well as those in charge of hiring effective faculty and assigning courses to make use of faculty expertise. Faculty should understand the EdD program, purpose, outcomes, and core courses. Faculty should invest the time to deeply appreciate the role of the scholarly practitioner, so they are able to help doctoral students, advise them, teach them, and mentor them to take and apply what they are learning in their unique practice or context. Faculty should also reach out to students to guide research decisions based on the students' problems of practice. They should help students learn how to locate, read, understand, and analyze research in these areas so students are able to conduct their own research. A doctoral faculty member is a tremendous commitment to the students and to the program and also an investment in the future of education.

These findings confirm that the new CPED-aligned program outcomes at this university are being met and effectively influencing both full-time and part-time students. This program is guiding practitioners toward creating change in their own unique programs of practice. These findings also suggest the need for future study.

Additional research is needed on the foundational structures of EdD programs in general. How do programs around the country and world compare? What are the course requirements? What are the comprehensive requirements? What are the capstone requirements? Answers to these questions would provide additional support for the structure that began with the CPED framework.

Further study on the inclusion of international populations in EdD programming would be beneficial to all programs. Because there are not many EdD programs in the USA for international students, this information could be very valuable for institutions here and around the world. How can we all work together to develop scholarly practitioners? How can we invest in educators to represent the global society in which we live? How can we provide a more global experience for future generations? This type of research could create collaboration that goes well beyond the walls of the classroom.

Recommendations

This program is working, but the momentum and growth must continue. The cycle of change should not occur without pausing to measure the success or failure of what has been. The program was redesigned in 2014, but is the rationale behind the changes clear to all involved? Has research been conducted to determine if the changes were effective? The data included here is quite positive about the revised, CPED-influenced program. This program is working, but this information is just a fraction of what could be discovered if there is interest in seeing what is working effectively and what is not.

Having a mentor to guide students is very important and needs to be a part of the program structure. Effort should be given to a procedure that would facilitate connections between students and potential mentors and/or advisors. This could be connected to student advising or created through connections students have with faculty and staff in their coursework. Regardless how it is designed, it is important to provide

students a mentor or mentors that will support them in their own interest areas. It is also important for students and mentors to be connected through research methodology and theoretical frameworks.

Investment in the program by the university, the Graduate College, and all connected departments must improve. As a member of the Graduate Council, this writer saw first-hand how disconnected the doctoral program is from the Graduate College. This disconnect is not intentional, but exists. This program should be celebrated across campus. The university should capitalize on published research conducted by these students. The university's name is on these studies. The studies and their results reflect on the university and its commitment to scholarly practitioners, yet many students have no idea that UNI even has a doctoral program. The university should market this program, highlight these students, and utilize their skills and research. As a leading college in education, there should be more recognition for the terminal degree in education on campus.

The faculty of the EdD program need to be excellent. This Midwestern university should hire professional faculty dedicated to the doctoral program and its courses and support professional development in teaching doctoral students and designing appropriate coursework. Faculty should be educated in how to teach in a practitioner-based EdD program, teach at the doctoral level, be flexible with assignments and allow students to tailor their experience for their own interests and in their own contexts, and how to guide students in learning to conduct and publish a research study. Currently, several faculty members work with students to help them understand the principles, attitudes, and skills

for conducting a research study. However, few faculty members invest the time needed to help students understand the entire research process from planning to publication. In my experience, I had one professor who did spend hours working with other students and with me. I learned how to start with a question, set up the study, conduct the study and collect the data, create a spreadsheet to analyze the data, how to interpret the data, and how to write as a scholar. I know I still have a lot to learn, but I also know that I would not have come as far as I have without this guiding mentorship, and I am not alone in my appreciation of this faculty member.

This Midwest university's EdD program is transforming educators, changing the way we think. Transformative thinking is fundamental to the growth of students, and the process starts with one class, Foundations of Inquiry. This course was mentioned by every student interviewed and several times in the open-ended questions of the quantitative survey. Foundations of Inquiry should be kept as a requirement at the beginning of a student's program. This course is foundational to providing the impetus for change in the way students think. The course forces students to think, question, think, rationalize, question, and think again; this repetition of reflection combined with rigorous material on theoretical and conceptual frameworks provides students with new lenses through which they can traverse their doctoral journey.

Research is important. Students should read, discuss, read, discuss, and read and discuss. Most practitioners enter this program without much background in research. Students are not coming to the program to become researchers like those who enroll at Research One institutions. Students joined the program because they are practitioners

and want the terminal degree in education. Students want to learn to understand, analyze, implement, and conduct research in their own context, their own personal practice. In the beginning, they have ideas. Students know their problems of practice. Students need help investigating the research that has already been completed in these areas, and they need help narrowing their focus to a specific level that can become a focus for their research. To do this, Inquiry I and II should remain at the beginning of the program so students begin developing a research focus early. The foundation built in these two classes should then be continuously built upon in follow-up courses.

The Curriculum and Instruction ISA and the Educational Leadership ISA should consider continuous seminar courses, such as the one offered in the Allied Health, Recreation, and Community Services ISA. This seminar course is scheduled every semester for all students in the ISA, and assists students in feeling connected to other students. Students learn from each other. First and second year students watch third year students practice dissertation proposals and defenses. Students hear about and read examples of literature reviews. Students are involved in the feedback and learning through listening to the professor guiding and critiquing the work of others. They develop a thorough understanding of the program, what needs to be done, when, and how. Students provide feedback to each other and learn through the process. Guest speakers are invited throughout the semester to provide additional perspectives for the students. The students in the Allied Health, Recreation, and Community Services ISA develop a true community of scholars, a mutual respect, and an interactive and supportive culture. This type of class would benefit students in all or within each ISA.

Those in charge of program design should continue to allow and encourage the enrollment of international students. We live in a global society, and the inclusion of international students provides diversity experiences that students could not acquire from a text, such as learning about the educational systems in the Middle East and Africa. Such opportunities allow students to consider education through yet another lens. American students are intrigued to hear ideas that work for international students in their countries and to consider if the same ideas might work here in America. The collaborative discussions become richer and deeper because of the breadth of knowledge among the students. Conversations are not limited to discussing two types of Iowa schools, urban and rural, but able to broadly consider unfamiliar settings and arrangements. These experiences move students beyond state and national borders to new, exciting locations.

My Transformative Journey Concludes

I have completed a three-year journey through this program, and I can honestly say that I am a changed person. This degree program experience truly has been transformative (Mezirow, 2000). I entered as a confident educator after twenty-four years in the classroom. I thought I knew a lot about education. The first semester I was challenged, academically and emotionally (Phase 1: a disorienting dilemma). I felt confused and lost, angry and frustrated (Phase 2: experiencing fear, anger, guilt, or shame), sad, and alone as I explored the worlds of thought that were so unfamiliar to me (Phase 3: critically assessing assumptions about the world). I considered quitting, but

pride, tenacity, and probably a whole lot of stubborn tendencies would not let me do that. I experienced Mezirow's first three stages during my first semester in this program.

The next phase began as the first three continued in the second semester of my doctoral journey. The connections I made with classmates were solidifying. We were becoming friends. We shared ideas and learned together, listened and supported each other. Our non-cohort was becoming a pseudo-cohort or "non-cohort cohort" as we liked to call ourselves. I finally realized that I was not alone. Others were experiencing fear, anger, and frustration too (Phase 4: realizing that others have gone through what they are feeling). The realization of this joint experience was empowering.

In that second semester, I was still wrestling with theoretical and conceptual frameworks discovered during the first semester. *Sophie's World* was still permeating my thoughts. I was struggling with statistics, coding in R, and convinced that one professor thought I was inadequate and unable to learn. Then, we began to spend more time on qualitative research. We were tasked with completing a field experience, transcribing, and coding. This opened another perspective for me: I did not have to conduct studies that would rely on in-depth statistics and analysis of multi-linear regression. I could still do both quantitative and qualitative, but I did not have to become a statistician. I could do statistical studies and follow them with in-depth qualitative studies (Phase 5: revising one's old belief system and exploring new ones).

Throughout that first year, my experiences in my classes were only a part of my learning. I was also learning in my graduate assistantship as the assistant to the Associate Dean of the College of Education. This role had a tremendous impact on my professional

growth and learning because I was supported by a strong mentor and I was involved in areas of higher education that are not visible to most doctoral students. I lived behind the scenes as well as in front. This incredible experience solidified my desire to work in higher education after graduating. During this assistantship, I began working with the ISA Committee and on the EdD program handbooks and website. Simultaneously, I was working on proposals in Inquiry II, and I began spending more time researching EdD programming than either of the two previous topics I had come to the program convinced I would study. My interest evolved into a proposal and potential study, and the beginning of my dissertation focus began (Phase 6: planning a course of action).

My first summer in the program I took the doctoral seminar course and began the literature review for my dissertation. The initial path was rocky, and I started over several times. I knew I had been taught the skills to do the literature review, but applying what I had learned and completing the task were difficult. I felt lost much of the time. I am not sure why I did not ask for additional help, but looking back, I wish I had. I know I would be a stronger researcher now if I had. This was the time, however, that I began learning how to write a dissertation (Phase 7: gaining the knowledge and skills for implementing new plans). We read and discussed numerous dissertations handpicked by our professor to have some type of connection with our own areas of interest. We worked on proposals and reviewed literature. We created spreadsheets for taking notes as we researched, and we began writing a little at a time.

The fall of my second year, I found myself in a different situation with my graduate assistantship. The former Dean of the College of Education had resigned and

left for another institution, and my supervisor, the Associate Dean, had resigned her position and returned to the classroom as a professor. After some discussion about my role as a graduate assistant, the department head allowed me to continue my work with my original supervisor for one semester to finalize the projects we had begun. This opportunity was a tremendous gift as I could continue to work with her and the ISA Committee on the EdD programming. In my mind, I was beginning to think about my research study that would be the basis for my dissertation. I explored more research on the educational doctorate and began collecting articles. I talked with my former supervisor, I talked with my advisor, and I talked with the new head of the ISA Committee, the new Associate Dean of the College of Education. I wanted to be an authority on the subject.

In the spring semester of my second year, my graduate assistantship was changed, and I was given a teaching assignment. This prospect turned out to be awesome. I had done some co-teaching in the fall in preparation for the spring term, but the co-teaching experience was not the same as having my own class. I had redesigned the course during one of my fall courses, so I was implementing my new design (Phase 8: trying on the new role). I did not realize at the time, but my dissertation of EdD programming combined with my experience as a teacher educator that semester changed my focus again. The merging of the two worlds guided my focus toward teacher education. I was learning and becoming a teacher of teachers, and that was where I wanted to be (Phase 9: becoming competent and confident with the new change). I left that spring for summer break. I

planned to write my literature review and be finished by August, and I was assigned to teach again in the fall.

I spent my summer reading and researching as I worked on my literature review. I did not make my August 1 deadline, but I was finished with the first draft by August 8. I worked on the literature review and began making plans for my research study and methodology. One week before school started, the class I was to teach was cancelled, and I was reassigned to co-teach two courses with one of the new faculty members. This turn of events was a change, but nothing major. I had my dissertation committee, and my chair and I were working together to create a plan. The committee approved the plan after numerous revisions, I presented my proposal, and I began the research with the other EdD students in the program. My study had become a reality.

The second semester of my third year in the program, I organized my results and continued writing. I started with the quantitative survey data. I had great help from my chair and another committee member, for which I was extremely grateful. Just as I had in Inquiry I and II, I struggled with the numbers and calculations, but with the help of one essential committee member, I persevered. After I was finished with the quantitative results, I focused on the qualitative results. I then realized that while the statistics were the struggle in quantitative research, sheer volume is the struggle in qualitative analysis. I had to transcribe my interviews and then complete the analysis. I felt at times like I was wading through quicksand. I never lost passion about my topic or failed to find the information interesting, but I was often overwhelmed with the abundance of information.

With much encouragement, scheduled work times, and a considerable desire to finish, I am at the end.

I now look to the future and see myself as a professor guiding and encouraging future teachers as they are traveling through their own transformative journeys (Phase 10: reintegrating into one's life based on a new perspective).

REFERENCES

Aiken, J. A., & Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2013). Envisioning the EdD and PhD as a partnership for change. *Planning and Changing, 44*(3/4), 162-180.

Amrein-Beardsley, A., Zambo, D., Moore, D. W., Buss, R. R., Perry, N. J., Painter, S. R., … Puckett, K. S. (2012). Graduates respond to an innovative educational doctorate program. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 71*(1), 98-122.

Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34*(3), 55-58.

Austin, J., T. Cameron, M. Glass, K. Kosko, F. Marsh, R. Abdelmagid, & Burge, P. L. (2009). First semester experiences of professionals transitioning to full-time doctoral study. *The College Student Affairs Journal, 27,* 195 –214.

Brennan, M. (1998). Struggles over the definition and practice of the educational doctorate in Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 25*(1), 71-89.

Brown, L. D. (1966). *Doctoral graduates in education. An inquiry into their motives, aspirations, and perceptions of the program*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Brown, L. D. (1991). *A perspective on the Ph.D.-Ed.D. discussion in schools of education*. Boston, MA: American Educational Research Association. Eric Document Information System No. ED320882. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED320882.pdf>

Buss, R. R., Zambo, R., Zambo, D., & Williams, T. R. (2014). Developing researching professionals in an EdD program. *Higher Education, Skills, and Work-based Learning, 4*(2), 137-160.

Butcher, J., & Sieminski, S. (2006). The challenge of a distance learning professional doctorate in education. *Open Learning, 21*(1), 59-69.

Buttram, J., & Doolittle, V. (2015). Redesign of EdD and PhD educational leadership programs. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 24*(3), 282-308.

Caboni, T. C., & Proper, E. (2009). Re-envisioning the professional doctorate for educational leadership and higher education leadership: Vanderbilt University's Peabody College Ed.D. Program. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*, 61-68.

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2009). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education.* College Park, MD: Author.

Carnegie Project for the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2015). *The Carnegie project on the education doctorate: A knowledge forum on the EdD.* Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2016a). *Working principles for the EdD program design*. Retrieved from http://cpedinitiative.org/working-principles

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2016b). *Consortium members*. Retrieved from http://cpedinitiative.org/consortium-members

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2016c). *Design concepts upon which to build programs*. Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/AboutUs.

Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). (2016d). *Guiding principles for program design*. Retrieved from http://www.cpedinitiative.org/page/AboutUs.

Carter, S. D. (2014). Doctoral programs outcomes assessment: An approach to assessing program inputs, learning objectives, and postgraduation outcomes. *Journal of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, 4*(2), 160-179.

Clark, M. C., & Wilson, A. L. (1991). Context and rationality in Mezirow's theory of transformational learning. *Adult Education Quarterly, 41*, 75-91.

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for a professional education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cremin, L. (1978). *The education of the educating professions*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Eric Document Information System No. ED148829. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED148829.pdf>

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five choices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum, 62*, 243-248.

Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). Ed.D. and Ph.D. research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. *Review of Higher Education, 8*(2), 169-182.

Eells, W. C. (1963). *Degrees in higher education*. Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Research in Education.

Freeman, F. N. (1931). *Practices of American universities in granting higher degrees in education: A series of official statements* (Vol. 19). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Grbich, C. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Harris, S., Lowery-Moore, H., & Farrow, V. (2008). Extending transfer of learning theory to transformative learning theory: A model for promoting teacher leadership. *Theory into Practice, 47*(4), 318-326. doi:10.1080/00405840802329318

Kumar, S., & Dawson, K. (2013). Exploring the impact of a professional practice education doctorate in educational environments. *Studies in Continuing Education, 35*(2), 165-178. doi:10.1080/0158037X.2012.736380

Ludlow, H. G. (1964). *The doctorate in education*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.* New Jersey, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 74*(1), 5-12.

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation* (pp. 3-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Neumann, R., & Rodwell, J. (2009). The 'invisible' part-time research students: A case study of satisfaction and completion. *Studies in Higher Education, 34*, 55– 68.

Nohl, A. M. (2015). Typical phases of transformative learning: A practice-based model. *Adult Education Quarterly, 65*(1), 35-49.

O'Connor, B. N., & Cordova, R. (2010). Learning: The experiences of adults who work full-time while attending graduate school part-time. *Journal of Education for Business, 85*, 359-368.

Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The Ph.D. versus the Ed.D.: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education, 18*(1), 47-63.

Perry, J. (2012). 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 policy and practice of the education doctorate* (pp. 51-72). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Perry, J. A. (2013). Carnegie project on the education doctorate: The education doctorate -- a degree for our time. *Planning and Changing, 44*(3/4), 113-126.

Powell, A. G. (1980). *The uncertain profession*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reuda, R., Sundt, M., & Picus, L. O. (2013). Developing scholarly practitioners: Lessons from a decade-long experiment. *Planning and Changing, 44*, (3/4), 252-265.

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Salter, D. W. (2013). One university's approach to defining and supporting professional doctorates. *Studies in Higher Education, 38*(8), 1175-1184.

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.

Spurr, S. H. (1970). *Academic degree structures: Innovative approaches*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Suskie, L. A. (2015). *Five dimensions of quality: A common sense guide to accreditation and accountability*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, E. W. (1997). Building upon the theoretical debate: A critical review of the empirical studies of Mezirow's transformative learning theory. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*, 34-59.

Taylor, E. W. (2007). An update of transformative learning theory: A critical review of the empirical research (1999-2005). *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 26*, 173-191.

Taylor, E. W., & Snyder, M. J. (2012). A critical review of research on transformative learning theory, 2006-2010. In E. W. Taylor & P. Cranton (Eds.), *The handbook of transformative learning* (pp. 37-55). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Tucker, P., & Uline, C. (2015). The role of candidate assessment within educational leadership doctoral programs. *International Journal for Educational Reform, 24*(3), 248-265.

University of Northern Iowa. (1982). *College of Education [Proposal]. A proposal for a doctoral of education degree program from the college of education*. EdD Archives, Cedar Falls, IA.

University of Northern Iowa. (2015). *Post-Admission Student Handbook for the Doctor of Education Degree*. Retrieved from http://www.uni.edu/coe/graduate/EdDProgram

Vogt, W. P. (2007). *Quantitative research methods for professionals*. New York, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Zambo, D., Buss, R. R., & Zambo, R. (2015). Uncovering the identities of students and graduates in a CPED-influenced EdD program. *Studies in Higher Education, 40*(2), 233-252. doi: 10.1080/03075079.2013.823932

Zambo, R., & Zambo, D. (2013). Using I poems to hear the voices and understand the actions of EdD students conducting action research. *The Qualitative Report*. Academic OneFile. Web. Retrieved from https://login.proxy.lib.uni.edu/login?url=http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA353211915&v=2.1&u=uni_rodit&it=r&p=AONE&sw=w&asid=b8052c51f4d0a2bd6d7d0ed3ce58bdc9

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTION #2: SELF-REPORT OF PROFICIENCY

Do EdD students, in their own personal experiences of the program, perceive that the outcomes of the new EdD Program at this university are being met?

Demographics

What is your name?

What is your age?

What is your gender? Choose one: Male, Female, Other

Identify your race/ethnicity. (Open response)

Are you an international student? Yes or no?

Why did you choose the University of Northern Iowa for your doctoral degree? [Open response]

Are you a student in the old EdD program that started prior to fall of 2014, a hybrid student who started before 2014 but has been transitioned into the new program, or new program student who started in the fall of 2014 or after? Choose one: Old Program Student, Hybrid Student, New Program Student?

In which Intensive Study Area are you enrolled? Choose one: Allied Health, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership?

Which of the following describes your doctoral student status? Choose one: Full-time (you most often take 9 or more credit hours per term) or part-time (you most often take fewer than 9 hours per term)?

In addition to your doctoral studies, do you have a full-time job (not including graduate assistants)? Yes or no?

If you have a full-time job in addition to your doctoral studies, how would you best identify this position? Choose one: PK-12 teacher, PK-12 administrator, PK-12 specialist/coordinator/coach, college faculty, college staff, other (open response)

(continued)

Demographics (continued)

If you have a full-time job in addition to your doctoral studies, please provide your job title, employer, and briefly describe what you do. (Open response)

Are you currently employed full-time by the University of Northern Iowa (not including graduate assistants)? Yes or no?

How many credit hours have you completed in the EdD program? (Open response)

Have you successfully completed (not currently enrolled) Foundations of Inquiry, Inquiry I and II, and Seminar (the first four core requirements for this program)? Yes or no?

Have you completed your comprehensive requirement?

If you have completed your comprehensive requirement, which requirement(s) did you choose? Exam, Research Articles, or Grant?

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes

Instructions: Please answer these questions focused on the knowledge and skills you have learned and developed in your general EdD program experience, including coursework, related meetings, graduate assistantships, pratica, and research as well as informal and formal interactions with faculty and other EdD students. N/A means that you are unaware of the specific content in your coursework or experiences so far or you have not covered the specific content in the courses you have taken so far.

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to demonstrate skill in collaborative team building?

1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to demonstrate shared decision making?

1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to demonstrate conflict resolution?

1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to articulate a process for the future of an organization?

1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to implement a vision for the future of an organization?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to effectively transform ideas into action using applicable data?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to develop a personal philosophy that reflects an understanding of the social and ethical responsibility that underlies leadership in the profession?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you applied leadership skills to empower individuals and groups with diverse goals to fulfill common goals, envision new possibilities, and transform ideas into action following the principles of ethical leadership during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
[Open response]

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to utilize reflective practice techniques to stimulate your own professional growth?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to identify the components of social change and their relationship to professional education?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to understand the leader's role as a steward of democratic ideals?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you demonstrated a commitment to professional development and growth incorporating adaptation and creative responses to changes in a global society during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
[Open response]

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of sociological premises of schooling as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of philosophical premises of schooling as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of psychological premises of schooling as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of historical roots of schooling as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you made practical decisions using a wide variety of perspectives including sociological, philosophical, psychological, and historical premises of schooling in formal and informal settings during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
{Open response}

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of change theory as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of conflict management theory as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of change theory processes as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of conflict management theory processes as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of change theory research as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to demonstrate knowledge of conflict management theory research as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Rate your ability to employ conflict mediation theory, skills, and research in situations of practice as derived from your general EdD program experience.
1 (low) 2 3 (Average) 4 5 (High) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you integrated and applied theories of organizations and organizational processes and conflict mediation skills as applied to organizational change during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
{Open response}

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to utilize reflective practice techniques to stimulate your own organizational learning and growth?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to utilize reflective practice techniques to stimulate your own programmatic learning and growth?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to demonstrate knowledge of current research on effective teaching and learning to impact the profession?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to identify effective models of professional practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to describe effective models of professional practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to implement effective models of professional practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you evaluated research on effective practice and applied that research in assessment of individuals, organizations, or programs in a way that stimulated your professional growth during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
[Open response]

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to use knowledge of best practices to develop curriculum and programs?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to use knowledge of best practices to implement curriculum and programs?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to use knowledge of best practices to evaluate curriculum and programs?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to explain the interface of content and teaching and learning?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to demonstrate the interface of content and teaching and learning?

1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to understand program structure and their implications for practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to understand program resources and their implications for practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to understand program delivery models and their implications for practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to formulate research into pedagogical decisions and demonstration programs?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

To what degree do you believe the program has prepared you to integrate research into pedagogical decisions and demonstration programs?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Some) 4 5 (Large degree) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you implemented and integrated knowledge, theory, practice, and research in order to make pedagogical decisions during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
{Open response}

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at identifying an educational or community problem requiring study?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at situating the problem within existing literature?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at addressing relevant theoretical frameworks?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at validating the problem's potential to improve professional practice?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at collecting information and appropriate research methods to resolve an educational question or situation?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

(continued)

Perceptions Regarding Program Outcomes (continued)

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at synthesizing information and appropriate research methods to resolve an educational question or situation?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at analyzing information and appropriate research methods to resolve an educational question or situation?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at utilizing information and appropriate research methods to resolve an educational question or situation?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at demonstrating that conclusions drawn from scholarly research are warranted by the evidence collected?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

As a result of your EdD program experience, how competent or skilled are you at making appropriate recommendations for professional practice along with future research?
1 (Not at all) 2 3 (Moderately) 4 5 (Highly) N/A

Please describe your best example of an event, activity, or course assignment when you conducted methodologically-sound original scholarly research during your EdD program experience. Please include the setting or course.
[Open response]

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH QUESTION #2: CODES TO CATEGORIES

Program Outcome 1: Leadership Skills	
learned throughout program utilized skills in variety of classes courses are connected they overlap every class has a focus on this in some way or another learned mainly in class through the courses primarily the program is demanding and pushes us, the students, empowers us, within the classes to demonstrate leadership skills in classes	Classes in Program
utilized skills in assistantship (teaching) use more leadership skills in my own teaching want to make sure my students know things I'm just learning not just learning, also application in practice through the research work in assistantship job here at UNI being a part of the program is a lot -- I'm taking my own learning in a new direction	Teaching/Application in Practice
Professors and my colleagues [Professors] very open to different views and encouraging leadership; they modeled ethical leadership	Professors
collaboration with peers student collaboration diverse colleagues impressed and challenged by the wide variety of backgrounds of people in the program diverse populations in class; great discussions	Collaboration with Peers/Colleagues
developed a strong foundation; challenged how we think (not just what we think) changed my thinking realize how important it is to be a leader; didn't realize this before even though a teacher for 19 years	Change of Thinking

(continued)

Program Outcome 1: Leadership Skills (continued)	
focus on leadership and ways to be a good leader leadership is part of what I do every day; work with very diverse population daily We use it here every day in youth leisure	Leadership Focus
Foundations Inquiry I and II Accountability Foundations Advanced Instructional Design Youth Academic Café, publishing, meetings, entire Allied Health program	Course influence

Program Outcome 2: Professional Development	
global society – program has more of a US perspective; we don't really have global view (brought to my attention by a classmate) brought in because we have international students, but it's not an emphasis in actual program global society – important to have an understanding of diversity in this world and how it plays a role interaction with international students very important – helps us understand how things work in places outside the US international student population there is a focus on the global society, which is great	International Students
being in program is prof development commitment to professional development committed to continuing – won't just stop after I finish my doctorate I gravitate toward professional development and enjoy a lot I am constantly trying to find prof dev for my teachers We experience professional growth through engagement in our community and college of education	Commitment/ Engagement
work on proposal and defense; practice required courses elective opportunities	Coursework/Classes

(continued)

Program Outcome 2: Professional Development (continued)	
I have a new understanding of how damaging the focus on standardized is; now understand why amazing experience online, invigorating discussions, lots of deep discussions, great readings, reflecting, analyzing, Amazing how I now look at programming because of the depth of understanding I'm developing in this program; want to take the time to plan effectively and thoroughly comprehensive understanding Understanding the importance of key pieces, all of the design pieces of the process; adapting to the change and seeing value in planning	Depth of Understanding
used one assignment to create a model of self-study for professional development in her own context and is working on getting it published with instructor I am growing professionally and maturing too; I am learning a lot about myself and how much I still need to know; development of metacognitive skills flexibility in focus of assignments on personal research interests and context; this freedom of choice to focus on own context has primarily engaged me in self-reflection and scholarly reading and enhanced self-realization & strengthened my commitment to professionalism this has confirmed that I would like to teach in teacher ed at the college level	Personal Focus
guidance of professors	Professors
collaboration with colleagues collaboration with colleagues in program	Collaboration with Peers/Colleagues
my job Contexts book study in Contexts - dove in deep Youth Academy Café the philosophy of one specific professor Adv Instructional Design transformation ISA class -- research and evaluation seminar in Allied Health -- 1 credit every semester -- scholarly work, evaluation, ongoing process, real-life stuff, putting my own work forward, getting critiques, makes me realize how important this is I have not learned much; no focus on higher education positions in ed leadership, only focused on superintendents and principals	Influence

(continued)

Program Outcome 3: Practical Decision Making (continued)	
every class has applied emphasis for this goal every class, all classes in program assignments, discussions, discussion boards I feel very confident with the foundations we've been given throughout this EdD program. The content within the classes has really helped. our courses have been good, but very broad I feel that I have a base, foundational knowledge focused on specific theorists and specific readings helped with depth I am comfortable with theoretical foundations I learned a lot about the historical, philosophical, and psychological aspects of education -- very important I learned aspects of research deep knowledge of philosophy and scholarship still in the process, very challenging	Coursework
made my thinking more flexible using different lenses of thought the way I look at things has changed because of what I have learned about the historical and philosophical aspects of education	Change of Thinking
I feel comfortable with all of that. I can think of specific situations where we learned something in class and was able to put it into a situation with my students. not sure - would like to see if the program is encouraging students to get engaged in the communities, making practical decisions based on what they're learning helped me with other courses; made them easier	Application
able to take classes in other areas, most master's level; relevant to me able to learn about issues in our society that impact educational settings some students do, and some students don't realized that this is very important for me to have this background to be a good teacher did a lot of reading in my interest area, which helped me develop a deeper understanding of theories and research more learning about history -- very valuable to me because it's in my interest area, critical and engaging reading, appreciate it counts for elective for EdD - appreciate the opportunity to have choice in some classes and flexibility for most assignments	Flexibility/Relevance

(continued)

Program Outcome 3: Practical Decision Making (continued)	
Foundations of Inquiry Inquiry I and II Foundations of Inquiry Inquiry I and II Elective - Great Scholars in Education Foundations of Inquiry Foundations of Inquiry Contexts Foundations of Inquiry - illuminating, everybody was eager to participate and learn, but at the same time many felt it was quite challenging Independent study A [professor's] course was very helpful -- It gave me a basic understanding of the research process, but I don't feel I could do it on my own psychology human relations Adv program eval - able to apply to my program in my job!	Course Influence

Program Outcome 4: Organizational Change	
how organizations work, change, how to work with them conflict mediation - a bit in Kansas toolkit I understand conflict mediation skills I gained knowledge in organizations, non-profit organizations I'm comfortable with change; this program gives me more knowledge about the differences out there	Learned in Coursework/Classes
I even applied a few of the items from that course learned about organizational change and different models; learned how to apply learning about evaluating projects, which will be very important for me engaged with psychology of change, communities, organizations, social capital, technology, gender, generation to generation	Application

(continued)

Program Outcome 4: Organizational Change (continued)	
I lived change in my country but had no idea what was really going on. Now I realize that we weren't oriented for the change. It was top down, and we were just told what to do. I actually offered to orient the faculty each semester at the beginning of the semester. It worked. I had no idea that I was helping them process the change! learning to put reasons and verbiage to things I did before without realizing how important they were or why I was doing them learning how to have a bigger voice and when to use it and when not to use it; I hope with time and experience, that will grow	New Understanding
Transformation my job, not really in the program hasn't had transformation yet Accountability Transformation not in the EdD program hasn't taken transformation yet transformation instructional design, I think, but I don't really remember transformation transformation curriculum theory hasn't taken transformation transformation We learned about this in the transformation course; I even applied a few of the items from that course no concept of the organizational change or processes none -- hoping this is something I will get to; haven't seen it yet	Influence

Program Outcome 5: Research in Practice	
evaluated research a lot looked at research through projects - looked at and evaluated research being able to evaluate research definitely emphasized and I've learned it was given numerous articles to read, study, and evaluate, but the enormity of the assignments became overwhelming	Course focus on research

(continued)

Program Outcome 5: Research in Practice (continued)	
I am developing researching skills for my studies in leisure, both theoretical and practical I gained great knowledge in leisure as a profession, a strong foundational knowledge, what I should know learned a lot about research and evaluation -aspects of education, but not narrowly focused relevant even to higher education -- not just k-12 read and analyzed a lot of research articles reading and analyzing more now - much easier now I'm comfortable with this and feel that the practice in Inq I & II has strengthened my skills Inquiry I & II -- many students struggled, but I had a great experience. I made the initiative to meet with the professors, and they were very helpful.	Course focus on research (continued)
used research for professional growth, my teaching, my own research; not sure how it all fits with coursework being able to apply it The framework was there in Inquiry I & II, but I would have preferred to have a little more experience applying the methods within my interest area. not confident with this outcome right now not sure about the application of the research and how to implement We were made to 'experience' doing qualitative research, i.e., employing observation skills, interviewing techniques, transcribing, generating themes. This was invaluable! Beginning understanding; need to read more; need more time to be confident	Application

(continued)

Program Outcome 5: Research in Practice (continued)	
too much negative feedback Struggling a bit here. Want to work with people who understand methodologies (especially, quantitative as it is one of my weaknesses). I am scared with numbers. I am lucky that I have an advisor who will help me with numbers and the quantitative work. Very supported by [professor]- "line by line, idea by idea, paragraph by paragraph, beginning to end of dissertation" [professor] is tough, and you may cry at first, but then you realize he's honest and cares about students, he knows what he's doing and works with students through the process – in student's interest areas mentors helped me gain knowledge on evaluating practice	Professors/Advisors/ Mentors
personal choices I made on projects Appreciate flexibility of professors in applying knowledge and skills in own context important that teachers were flexible so she could explore own interests took before finishing Inq I and II – gap?	Personal Choice/ Options/Flexibility
Inquiry I & II Contexts Inquiry I & II – emphasized that we have to understand research, evaluate it, critique it, and apply it Allied Health Seminar – continuous focus on research Inquiry I & II Measures – Adv program evaluation Inquiry I and II Transformation Inquiry I & II Accountability Curriculum courses Inquiry I Inquiry I and II not effective for me not sure how we use research to evaluate individuals, organizations, or programs	coursework influence

(continued)

Program Outcome 6: Pedagogical Decision Making (continued)	
met in all classes, but most importantly in my graduate assistantship -- would not have met without mentorship all classes collective -- hard to differentiate and isolate one course or one assignment; it's integrated coursework, readings, activities collectively -- the courses the assignments, especially the papers, have been very meaningful for me. very confident with this outcome; vital focus on this in every class studying the research has given me ideas about what to research and I'm getting the idea of how to conduct the research All classes "Isn't that the whole program? It feels like it."	Coursework/Class Focus on Research
"I have taken away information from the k-12 setting that helps me have a better understanding of who our students are and how they get here educationally and their backgrounds, which does help me make different pedagogical decisions." applied as graduate student This is what I came here for! I have not had experience in research, and I want to learn more. Now I know how to read and evaluate research, so I can use evidence-based research to guide my instruction. applying everything I'm learning in my job every day	Application
I feel very confident with this goal -- always encouraged, in all classes, to implement or apply what we're learning to our own individual circumstances and contexts I've had to see and challenge myself on my own to get information on higher education	Flexibility/Personal Choice
curriculum courses Foundations Inquiry I and II curriculum Critical Theory I and II Foundations of Inquiry Doc Seminar HIPELS Seminar	coursework influence

(continued)

Program Outcome 6: Pedagogical Decision Making (continued)	
Foundations of Inquiry -- took out of sequence -- should be first course for doc program, even before Inquiry I if not able to take both - it's foundational Inquiry I & II -- learned a lot about how to teach kids to read in k-12 setting (because that was the research focus of the professor -- all examples came from his research in k-2 reading)	coursework influence (continued)

Program Outcome 7: Original Research	
in the process have the puzzle pieces; need to put them in order just at the very beginning of this area Learned a lot, but still want to know more about methodologies, both quant and qual. learning more about quantitative research now Yes, for myself personally. I have met these goals. not sure--backwards, upside down-no idea where or how we learned lots of information from actual professionals; learned about some different methodologies I learned this; I was learning the skills to conduct research We lived it and practiced it Getting the body of knowledge to conduct my own research	Coursework on Research
Mentor -- My advisor has been very encouraging and helpful. I am very comfortable with him. He's very flexible. Mentor -- my advisor/chair was very influential for me -- I was ahead of the game in Inquiry. _____is a great support for our research as well. We work with him on his projects, and he helps us with ours. _____ with Dr._____ - amazing amount of time with all of the students walking us through the research and writing process Inquiry I & II -- helped us learn to set up a study -- worked well for me because of my advisor and our research seminar -- not everyone had such a positive experience I wrote Chapter 2 in Inquiry I and Chapter 3 in Inquiry II -- with the professor's help -- it was very clear One specific professor One specific professor I don't feel very confident, but I at least understand the basics of research because of _____ (one specific professor)	Mentor/Advisor/ Professors

(continued)

Program Outcome 7: Original Research (continued)	
great colleagues and great connections working here	Collaboration with Peers
International students really need help conducting research here	International Students Need Help
doc seminar helped, but we need more especially in the second year Inq I & II brought us to same pages for program, but next? Allied Health Seminar -- critical in the development in my understanding of research Inquiry I -- selecting topic, lit review Inquiry II -- setting up a study Inquiry I and II SPSS course in Allied Health Allied Health Seminar - 1 credit	course influence

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH QUESTION #3: CODES TO CATEGORIES

Full-time Advantages	
wanting to get done faster -- within 3 to 3 1/2 years get coursework finished quickly - timely can finish faster than if you're distracted by being part-time	finish more quickly
during the terms I took more courses, I was more invested and immersed in the program able to synthesize courses by taking full load -- carry over what I'm learning -- getting a rich experience -- courses build upon each other fully emerged in experience -- all interrelated integrate independent studies richer experience because of synthesis of courses was difficult; learning has been intensive (totally immersed)	immersion/synthesis of learning
better experience because I'm focused on my studies keeps you committed to the program makes you concentrate and focus kept me focused	focused and committed
always on campus access to resources and support of staff (i.e. library)	perks being on campus
international student - have to be full time only option as international student	international student - only option
can criss-cross between classes and have conversations with other doc students in courses talk across courses	collaboration with other doc students
will be prepared to do work for my dissertation	will be prepared to do work for my dissertation
being able to take a break from the classroom	being able to take a break from the classroom
being able to go full time financially	being able to go full time financially

Full-time Disadvantages	
lack of income financial constraints without research assistantships and scholarships reliance on partner's insurance	financial constraints
too much to manage when starting dissertation (with graduate assistantship and nine course hours)	too much work
being away from my husband	personal suffering

(continued)

Part-time Advantages (continued)	
already had a full time position that I wanted to keep have a full time job work full time -- have to keep a full time job have to work full-time, not an option to stop wanted to work full time teaching while taking classes	full-time job
able to work and earn income while taking classes allows me to still pay my bills work full time at UNI; portion of tuition paid	financial benefits
exponentially -- learning how to incorporate research into my job "I'm taking what I'm learning in the classroom and applying it directly to the work that I'm doing" without having to wait... not sure it has; "I'm living and breathing what I do for work, and I take that into the classroom with me" Contexts course -- opened my eyes to different pockets of diversity on our campus; hope I was able to provide information through my experiences	apply learning in practice
students of concern; students who display concerning behavior; mental health, autism, etc. able to have relationship with my family time aspect -- not as intense as full time; can still enjoy personal time, family, children, relaxing time able to spend time with family have four children	personal/family Influence

Part-time Disadvantages	
cost - more expensive paying out of pocket without graduate assistantship and/or scholarship	financial concerns

(continued)

Part-time Disadvantages (continued)	
sometimes not able to focus as much as I'd like because I feel drawn in lots of different ways sometimes my reading and research are interrupted, and I don't feel I'm getting into my studies as deeply as I'd like sometimes I have to finish assignments to get the done, and I wish I had more time difficult to balance work and studies and family sometimes feel like can't read as in depth as I might as full time When I took fewer classes, I wasn't as involved. It definitely took a back burner during those semesters maybe able to dedicate more time to class and research without separate full time job biggest challenge -- do the faculty expect all of us to be full-time students or at least treat us like we're full-time students?	multiple commitments affect studies
Some of our professors don't seem to understand practitioners and how to teach practitioners instead of focusing on research as if we are a Research 1 university	lack of support from professors
never know when classes are going to be scheduled, so I have to make sure I make the time to do the homework	course schedule issues
some expecting us to do busy work and calling it rigorous -- it's not -- there needs to be some check and balance to implement and maintain the rigor and the practitioner focus	questionable coursework

APPENDIX D

ANALYTIC MEMO SAMPLES

After the third interview, I realized that only had one student to interview who was in the Educational Leadership ISA, and she was not a typical student in that ISA (as in principal or superintendent). I started doubting the process and wondering if I should have created a more purposeful sample instead of the random sample conditioned only for part-time versus full-time. I decided that I just needed to be clear in the explanation that the random sample was not representative of all ISAs.

I was struggling with organization. My color-coding of the written transcripts was becoming overwhelming, so I needed to figure out a way to organize the different comments as they related to the different categories. I decided to try another spreadsheet and sort the codes by the categories. This worked, so I used the same technique as I collapsed the categories into themes.

I had a meeting with one of my committee members, and we talked about the difficulties I was having with identifying the results of the third research question. The results did not fit into a thematic analysis as I had first planned. She helped me understand that the results for question three were really a descriptive presentation, not a thematic analysis, and that made more sense.