

# Chapter 8

## Preparing the Scholarly Practitioner: The Importance of Socialization in CPED- Influenced EdD Programs



Jill Alexa Perry and Emma Abruzzo

In professional graduate programs, socialization is an essential process that helps develop a student's identity as a member of their chosen profession. As Weidman et al. (2001) indicate, this process gives students the knowledge, skills and values they will need to enter in and commit to their profession. What this process looks like, however, varies by profession and by type of doctoral program. Deborah Colwill (2012) describes three categories of doctoral education. The first is the Professional Doctorate, which provides training through "lengthy internships and clinical experiences" (Gardner, 2009, p. 30) and generally doesn't require a dissertation or thesis. Professional fields within the realm of medicine and law typically employ this type of doctorate. The second type of doctoral education is the Research Doctorate, which culminates in an original piece of research that contributes to advancing the field of study (Colwill, 2012). This type of doctorate typically prepares those who wish to conduct research or work as university-level faculty members. The final type of doctorate is the Professional Research Doctorate, which Colwill (2012) describes as focusing on both research and practice. A dissertation or thesis is required in such programs, however, the research is focused on "investigating a particular professional topic or existing problem" (p. 13). Each one of these graduate degrees will require a distinct socialization process to prepare the student to enter into the corresponding position (attorney, professor, educator).

This chapter expands upon the socialization process for one type of Professional Research Doctorate, the Education Doctorate (EdD). In particular, this chapter focuses on the CPED-influenced EdD. This degree is an EdD that has been redesigned under the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate's (CPED) Framework which aims to improve professional preparation in education for the advanced prep-

---

J. A. Perry (✉) · E. Abruzzo  
Department of Administrative and Policy Studies, University of Pittsburgh,  
Pittsburgh, PA, USA  
e-mail: [jperry@pitt.edu](mailto:jperry@pitt.edu)

aration of school practitioners, clinical faculty, academic leaders and professional staff for the nation's schools and colleges and the organizations that support them (Perry & Imig, 2008). EdD programs generally attract students who are already practicing professionals, therefore the aim of the program is slightly different than in other professional programs such as medicine, law, clergy, etc. Instead of indoctrinating students into a new profession, in education students trained to enhance their existing skills to impact their practice.

This chapter discusses how CPED has changed the EdD and what that has meant for socializing students in these programs. First, we provide some background information on the EdD and CPED. Then we discuss the goal of the CPED-influenced program and who these programs aspire to graduate. Next, we discuss the core elements of the Weidman, Twale and Stein Model (2001) that may provide a guide for improving the socialization process in EdD programs. Finally, we provide data from two CPED research efforts that demonstrate how the Weidman, et al. (2001) core elements are changing in CPED-influenced EdD programs and thus improving the way students in these programs are being socialized into new roles.

## Background

Upon its birth, the EdD degree had a distinct purpose: to prepare school leaders. Henry Holmes (a professor at Harvard in 1921) created the degree as a solution to the need for strong upper-level elementary and secondary school leaders at a time when the Boston area schools were growing and principals were only administrative positions (Powell, 1980). In this early creation, however, the EdD was defined by “subtraction” (Shulman, Golde, Beuschel, & Garbedian, 2006), meaning Holmes modeled the degree just as the PhD, but reduced the number of requirements and credits (Powell, 1980). Additionally, after ten years of operation, scholars uncovered that the Harvard EdD accepted less rigorous student dissertation work than what was expected of PhD student (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Deering, 1998; Freeman, 1931). This original EdD design of less credits and weaker research proliferated to graduate schools of education around the US and, over time, left the EdD with the unfortunate nickname of “PhD-lite” (Shulman et al., 2006). As a result, many practitioners sought the more prestigious PhD instead (Perry, Zambo, & Wunder, 2015) or if their only option was the EdD, they viewed it as a credential rather than the rigorous preparation needed to help them impact their practice. Take for example, the following statement retrieved from [Edweek.org](http://Edweek.org) May 15, 2012:

*I need better skills for my job. We are all struggling (but afraid to say so because we don't want to lose our jobs) because the training people like me have received is either too simplistic or too theoretical. If I could get a similar level education to a medical doctor I would be pleased. What I want is a degree that tells people (and especially my board) that I know a thing or two about how to make research on teaching applicable in our school district. – Anonymous post*

Doctoral preparation in the field of education has suffered this kind of confusion for nearly a century (Perry, 2010, 2012; Shulman et al., 2006) as those seeking to enter the professoriate and those seeking to lead in practice have been historically trained in nearly the same fashion.

When the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate began in 2007, its intent was to respond to the EdD's diversion from its original objective and again distinguish it as the professional education degree. CPED leaders looked to the Council of Graduate Schools' Task Force on the Professional Doctorates for guidance. The Task Force recommended:

Graduate colleges should not use one-size-fits all standards that simply ask why a professional doctorate is not just like a PhD. [But rather] a Professional degree should represent preparation for the potential transformation of that field of professional practice just as the PhD represents preparation for the potential transformation of the basic knowledge of a discipline. (Council of Graduate Schools, 2007, p. 6).

This recommendation supported what practitioners had been seeking. Twenty-five graduate schools of education committed themselves to working together to undertake a critical examination of the education doctorate with a particular focus on improving the preparation of those leading in professional practice. Their tasks were twofold: to distinguish the EdD from the PhD and to “rethink how preparation would both differ from traditional EdD or PhD programs and be distinctly designed for practitioners” (Hoffman & Perry, 2016, p. 14). To do this, members ask what skills, knowledge and dispositions practitioners in the field needed to be transformational leaders. Faculty members recognized that professionals entering doctoral programs bring varying goals and needs that reflect their distinct professional contexts—rural, urban, suburban, and international PK-20 educational and organizational settings. Faculty also understood that each university campus is distinctive with its own regulations that may, or may not, limit programmatic and policy changes. As a result of such variety and diversity across educational contexts, a one-sized-fits-all model for the EdD was rejected and the CPED Framework was developed to honor local contexts and allow member to maintain flexibility in their program designs. Ten years after CPED began, the consortium now has over 100 schools of education as members with faculty and administrators who utilize the CPED Framework to redesign their EdD programs.

### *Rethinking the EdD*

This section offers a brief overview of the CPED Framework. This framework guides members in the development of programs that enhance already existing professional skills with inquiry and leadership skills to improve practice. As such, professional practitioners who study in CPED-influenced programs are socialized to become Scholarly Practitioners through their coursework, cohort experiences, field experiences, milestones and faculty mentoring. This type of preparation is different

than the traditional ways that were based on PhD preparation. Instead, the CPED model resulted from a group of faculty considering who students that come from practice are, what their needs are, and how the academy might contribute to their growth as leaders.

### *Types of Students*

Professional preparation at the doctoral level in education is different than in other professions. In the case of the EdD, it is not “a ‘license to practice’ undertaken by those entering an educational career, rather it is study undertaken by experienced practitioners” (Tupling & Outhwaite, 2017, p. 154), which is the “inverse of other fields” (Shulman et al., 2006, p. 26). These professional practitioners are typically older and generally have between 10 and 20 years of professional experience. Many are highly qualified, successful practitioners who bring an immense amount of professional expertise to their program of study (Perry, 2013; Willis, Valenti, & Inman, 2010).

These students arrive with a solid professional identity and often enter these programs eager to gain stronger skills and abilities that will help them address the pressing issues they face in their daily practice. Additionally, because they are working professionals, actively on a career path, they do not leave their practice to study but rather “remain in their specialist practice as they study the EdD” (Tupling & Outhwaite, 2017, p. 154). Therefore, they desire part-time study and generally apply their learning to practice as they progress through their program.

### *Practitioner Needs*

In many cases, educational practitioners face the dilemma of needing to obtain a doctorate to advance in their careers. Frequently, however, their only options are traditional doctoral programs that don’t necessarily give them applicable skills for practice. They sacrifice time away from work and family and spend hard-earned money (part-time students don’t qualify for financial aid) to obtain a degree that does not support their professional development beyond credentialing. They write dissertations that are heavily theoretically-based and struggle to apply the experience and knowledge to their practice settings.

In other professions, training deals with applying skills to practice. For instance, medical students work in hospitals alongside certified doctors to learn diagnosing skills and bedside manners. Surgeons learn to sew as part of their program curriculum. Lawyers practice arguing and debating, over and over. Clergy learn to console. Engineers practice design. Traditionally, doctoral students of education received no such training. Rarely did programs teach them to apply theoretical knowledge to practice settings and their dissertations generally satisfied academic requirements

but did little to change their practice. The end result of such preparation was a credential that supported career advancement but offered little in the way of useful skills to help practitioners improve the practice of education (Perry, 2012).

### ***Applying Inquiry to Practice***

Since the birth of the EdD, many scholarly studies (Anderson, 1983; Brown, 1966; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Deering, 1998; Denmark, 1985; Eells, 1963; Freeman, 1931; Hochbein & Perry, 2013; Levine, 2005; Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993; Shulman et al., 2006) have pointed out that the role of research and inquiry has been weakened in EdD programs. According to these studies, the research course credits in many EdD programs were frequently reduced and dissertations focused on problems of practice were frequently perceived as less rigorous. The reason, these studies suggest, is that faculty who taught in EdD programs did not consider research and inquiry skills as important skills for practitioners.

Learning across CPED consortium faculty and student practitioners, however, has indicated the opposite. Strong inquiry skills are central to providing practitioners with the tools to better understand and improve the problems they face in practice (Perry, 2016). Therefore, CPED advocates that professional preparation take into account the role and importance of inquiry, particularly as it is applied to practice, and strengthen it in professional doctoral preparation.

Re-envisioning the Education Doctorate with these considerations in mind makes for an interesting task as faculty grapple with ways to offer skilled professionals what they need. The result has been a partnership where faculty bring their expertise in research and inquiry to problems that practitioners face daily for collaborative learning and problem solving. Below is an outline of the CPED Framework that supports members in redesigning such programs.

### ***The Framework***

The CPED Framework includes (a) a new definition of the EdD, (b) a set of guiding principles for program redesign, and (c) a set of design-concepts upon which programs can be built.

### ***Definition***

In 2009, the CPED membership redefined the education doctorate to be: “The professional doctorate in education that prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the

stewardship of the profession” (CPED, 2009). According to Golde (2006), “stewardship establishes the purpose of doctoral education” (p. 9). She describes stewardship as the ability “to inculcate those we educate with the highest levels of competency and integrity” (p. 9). She further suggests that a steward of the discipline is “a caretaker who trains a critical eye to look forward and must be willing to take risks to move the discipline forward” (p. 13) through the generation, conservation and transformation of knowledge (Golde, 2006). Like the Steward of the Discipline, this caretaker role is also required of the Steward of the Practice. However, for the Steward of the Practice, the knowledge that is generated and conserved is comprised of both theoretical and professional knowledge and the transformation of practice is the result of generating and conserving such knowledge.

### Generation

Research skill is central to doctoral study. A steward is “expected to conduct investigation according to accepted standards of rigor and quality” (Golde, 2006, p. 10). While this statement rings true for those who are stewards of the discipline or of the practice, scholarly practitioners have the added responsibility of generating knowledge that is grounded in field work and that is readily useable in practice. Given their daily confrontations with problems of practice, practitioners have the ability to conduct research in the field “at a depth that traditional forms of research might well not be capable, precisely because they are practitioners” (Jarvis, 1999, p. 24).

Then how do we prepare practitioners to engage in scholarly research that will generate useful, practical knowledge? How does their preparation differ from traditional research methods training and provide skills needed to be able to generate impactful, quality research that generates change? The CPED consortium developed the concept of *inquiry as practice* to address these questions. Inquiry as Practice is “the process of posing significant questions that focus on complex problems of practice and utilizing data to understand the effects of innovation. As such, inquiry of practice requires the ability to gather, organize, judge, aggregate, and analyze situations, literature, and data with a critical lens” (CPED, 2011). Hochbein and Perry (2013) have noted these skills go beyond what traditional research preparation provides and requires that practitioners be taught to decipher, debate and design studies as tools for confronting daily problems in education. This type of research training typically involves methods and scholarship “suited to the context of practice” (Willis et al., 2010, p. 25) and that is “mediated by intellectual understanding and reflection” (Green & Powell, 2005, p.88).

### Conservation

Conservation for Stewards of the Discipline involves “mastering the breadth and depth in the discipline” (Golde, 2006, p. 11) including historical and contextual landscapes. Berliner (2006) suggests conservation “requires understanding of how

that field started and what it has become, so that the future of the field is both faithful to its origins and appropriate for its times” (p. 269). For Stewards of the Practice, conservation merges professional knowledge and skills with the tools of inquiry. What is unique about CPED-influenced programs is the means by which conservation is taught—through precise and focused instruction. The CPED consortium has adopted the notion of *signature pedagogy* as the central means for teaching theoretical and practical knowledge and skills. A Signature Pedagogy is the pervasive set of practices used to prepare scholarly practitioners for all aspects of their professional work: “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” (Shulman, 2005, p. 52) and includes three dimensions:

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.

Doctoral students of CPED-influenced EdD programs understand the importance of having full knowledge of the field including its history, current events and policy implications. As such, they are taught to incorporate these aspects into their investigations of problems of practice. They are also taught that this knowledge needs to be shared beyond their leadership, communicating effectively and clearly to stakeholders (Archbald, 2008).

## Transformation

Golde (2006) defined transformation as the way in which a steward applies “knowledge, skills, finding and insights” (p. 12). Her definition builds upon the understanding of what a professional doctorate should be established by the Council of Graduate Schools Task Force on the Professional Doctorate (2007); that is, preparation for the “potential transformation for that field of professional practice” (p. 7). The CPED consortium contends that the transformation of the field lies in the impact of the graduates applying their newly acquired skills and knowledge. Impact on practice comes not only from their leadership abilities newly infused with innovative, scholarly thinking, but also from the work they generate through their *dissertation in practice*—a scholarly endeavor that impacts a complex problem of practice.

This product should do four things (CPED, 2011). First, it should exhibit the doctoral candidate’s ability “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” as Shulman (2005) defines as the goals for professional preparation. Second, the dissertation in practice should demonstrate how the candidate’s research has addressed and impacted a complex problem of practice, or “a persistent, contextualized, and specific issue embedded in the work of a professional practitioner, the addressing of

which has the potential to result in improved understanding, experience, and outcomes” (CPED, 2011). Third, this scholarly work should serve as the launching pad for practitioners to be change agents in their practice just as the traditional dissertation serves as the launching pad for publication for newly minted PhDs. Finally, the impact of the scholarly practitioner’s work should benefit a larger community of stakeholders (i.e., the candidate’s organization, community constituents, clients, professional peers) (Archbald, 2008).

## Principles

Members apply this definition to their local context and design their professional practice doctorate utilizing the principles and design-concepts. The CPED guiding principles state that the Education Doctorate:

1. Is framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice to bring about solutions to complex problems of practice.
2. Prepares leaders who can construct and apply knowledge to make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities.
3. Provides opportunities for candidates to develop and demonstrate collaboration and communication skills to work with diverse communities and to build partnerships.
4. Provides field-based opportunities to analyze problems of practice and use multiple frames to develop meaningful solutions.
5. Is grounded in and develops a professional knowledge base that integrates both practical and research knowledge, that links theory with systemic and systematic inquiry.
6. Emphasizes the generation, transformation, and use of professional knowledge and practice (CPED, 2009).

## Design-Concepts

The design-concepts are programmatic building blocks that were originally identified by Dr. Lee Shulman, President Emeritus of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, as he studied professional preparation in engineering, law, medicine, nursing, and clergy. Through the early work of the consortium members, additional design-concepts that could further shape the key practices in professional education preparation were added. Together, these include *signature pedagogy*, *laboratories of practice*, *inquiry as practice*, *problem of practice*, *dissertation in practice* and the *scholarly practitioner* (CPED, 2011). Definitions for these concepts are:

*Scholarly practitioners*: graduates who are individuals capable of blending their practical wisdom with their professional skills and knowledge to name, frame, and solve problems of practice; using practical research and applied theories as



tools for change because they understand the importance of equity and social justice; disseminating their work in multiple ways; and resolving problems of practice by collaborating with key stakeholders, including the university, the educational institution, the community, and individuals.

*Signature pedagogy*: the pervasive set of practices used to prepare scholarly practitioners for all aspects of their professional work: “to think, to perform, and to act with integrity” (Shulman, 2005, p. 52).

*Inquiry as practice*: the process of posing significant questions that focus on complex problems of practice.

*Laboratories of practice*: settings where theory and practice inform and enrich each other.

*Problem of practice*: 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.

*Dissertation in practice*: a scholarly endeavor that affects a complex problem of practice.

Redesigning EdD programs utilizing this Framework means rethinking the purpose of the program and the interconnectedness of programmatic components to produce graduates who are scholarly practitioners. Faculty must train students to integrate their professional knowledge with scholarship and inquiry to impact problems in practice and enhance their leadership. Central to this work is rethinking how EdD students are socialized differently than traditional doctoral students or typical professional students. For this, we might look to the Weidman Model.

### ***Weidman Models***

As stated above, the need for rethinking how students in EdD programs are socialized into becoming Scholarly Practitioners is an important piece of becoming a CPED-influenced EdD program. The evolution of the Weidman Model (1989) to graduate and professional education (Weidman et al., 2001) offers an important opportunity to understand the places in which such socialization might occur and as such offer CPED-influenced EdD programs tools for program redesign and improvement. This enhanced model looks at the development of identity with and commitment to professional roles using the core elements of socialization— knowledge acquisition, investment and involvement. In particular Weidman et al. (2001) expand the structures and roles within universities that support the core elements and paint a clear path for understanding what components are necessary to socialize EdD students into their new roles.

***Knowledge Acquisition*** refers to the cognitive and affective knowledge professional students learn in their program that shifts their understanding to the problems and ideologies of their profession. This knowledge also solidifies the students’ understanding of their role in the profession resulting in a new professional identity.

Weidman et al. (2001) explain that *organizational structures* such as “academic and professional departments serve as a frame of reference for newly entering students and lay foundation for socialization” (p. 56). These structures serve as a home base for students during their program. *Program structures*, on the other hand, support socialization through their delivery design and content. “Instructional delivery of curriculum”, note the authors, “most assuredly sets the tone for how students are socialized” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 58).

At the interpersonal level, *faculty roles and supervision* provide students with access to “the closely guarded body of knowledge [that faculty] posses” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 58). In these roles, faculty decide which students “shall be anointed and certified as qualified to engage in professional practice” (p. 59). *Student peers* offer another means of knowledge acquisition depending on the design of the program. Entering with “a group of other students affects socialization different than individually. The cohort influences the learning process, opens support mechanisms and enriches the experience socially and emotionally” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 60).

**Investment** refers to the “time and energy put forth [by the student] in meeting program requirements” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 63). Investment begins with applying to the program and ends with completion of the capstone requirement. Weidman et al. (2001) argue that student investment is enhanced when students experience sponsorship of a professor, advisor or current student. *Organizational structures*, such as program milestones and the celebration of students reaching these goals supports socialization. *Professional standards*, or the sorting and selecting of rituals that allow progression toward a profession from admissions to graduation also provide structures that contribute to socialization. *Faculty and their expectations* and advising of students, suggest Weidman et al. (2001), “play a major role in shaping the professional self-image of a student” (p. 66). The relationship that forms between student and their faculty mentor can ultimately “turn into a partnership when faculty [member] recognizes the student’s intellectual and research abilities” (p. 67). The *student peer culture* also supports a student’s investment in the program. Weidman et al. (2001) note “the impact of peer group members on each other generates a powerful force that nourishes and transforms members” (p. 69).

**Involvement** refers to the opportunities students have to participate in some aspect of the professional role during their preparation. These opportunities (assistantships, clinical experiences, etc.) “teach the student how to think and what to believe” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 70). *Organizational structures* that allow for such opportunities augment student socialization to the profession especially when these opportunities offer more “frequent and varied interactions” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 71) with the professional role. *Program structures* determine the types of opportunities and at what point students experience them. The *faculty role in supervised practice* plays a large role in student involvement as the “close supervision” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 75) affords the student an opportunity to learn from continuous feedback. *Peers* provide less formal structures that give students “social outlets, psychological release and much needed emotional support” (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 82).

Knowledge acquisition, investment and involvement are the core elements of the socialization process that support the students' identity development. Their commitment to this new identity is built through bonding processes with peers and faculty, the sponsorship of a mentor, and internalization of the professional role" (Weidman et al., 2001, p. 83). Commitment is an ongoing process that grows with their participation in the program. Furthermore, as students demonstrate competence in program milestones their commitment increases. Weidman et al. (2001) found across multiple graduate and professional programs that designing a program to foster "commitment versus credentialism" (p. 85) impacts the level of commitment a student will have to their new profession.

### *Applying the Weidman Model to CPED-Influenced EdD's*

As CPED grows and ages, members seek to learn how the CPED-influenced EdD has developed in various university and regional contexts. One area of interest is how the graduates of CPED-influenced EdDs differ from one another. Do they identify as Scholarly Practitioners? Have they committed to this role in their professional practice? Applying the Weidman Model to two CPED data gathering efforts offers insights into how CPED-influenced programs have changed from traditional program models as a means to produce Scholarly Practitioners. Specifically, this section will look at how programmatic changes have supported the development of the core elements of socialization — knowledge acquisition, investment and involvement and how the Scholarly Practitioner identity has been developed and adopted by EdD students and graduates.

In 2014, CPED published data from a four-year US Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) funded study that looked at how 21 of the original CPED member schools of education had changed their EdD as a result of membership in CPED. Findings from the multiple-case study demonstrated that CPED, as an innovation, had impacted schools of education at the institutional, programmatic and individual levels. In 2017, 86 CPED member schools of education were asked to complete an extensive report about the design, implementation and outcomes of their programs. For the present chapter, we reviewed early findings received from CPED programs categorized as "experienced" or "implementing." We sought to understand how applying the CPED Framework to program design changed the expected outcomes for program graduates. Within these two efforts, we learned of ways that programs have changed and become distinctive from traditional preparation to develop students with Scholarly Practitioner identities and who are socialized into understanding their new roles. We also learned what these new roles look like and how students understand and operationalize them. First, we outline changes that demonstrate programmatic changes. Next, we look at program and student understandings of identity and student commitment to this new identity.

## *Program Structures*

Programmatic changes supported the acquisition of new knowledge, student investment in the program and also provided opportunities for students to be active and involved learners.

### **2010–2014 FIPSE Study**

The FIPSE study revealed that CPED had helped the original deans and faculty members understand the relevance of connecting professional practice to doctoral preparation. This understanding manifested into an articulation of a program vision and mission that focused on developing Scholarly Practitioners. Programs were designed with the purpose of becoming more relevant to practice and supportive of adult learners who are working educational professionals. Courses were redesigned to focus on necessary skills and knowledge and honored professional knowledge. Environments were tailored to be more supportive to learning.

In CPED-influenced programs courses and coursework were based on the needs of adult learners, encouraging students to be responsible for their own learning while simultaneously guiding them through a structured set of courses and experiences. Courses were enlightening, practical, and authentic; that is, grounded in the real world needs and experiences of practitioners. In the words of one faculty member, "...it's grounded in professional practice, but at the same time informed by outside perspectives" (Perry et al., 2015). Examples of this could be seen in field-embedded classes, case analyses, and action research.

Programs demonstrated that students learn in laboratories of practice (often their work setting) by doing and applying what they learn in their courses and reporting back through coursework. Additionally, even though some direct instruction and lecture still took place, courses and assignments were designed to scaffold learning. Most learning environments were complemented either with internships or laboratories of practice where students could learn from more knowledgeable others or with embedded fieldwork where students could learn from practice and with peer-to-peer collaboration.

Methods courses, in particular, were central to socializing Scholarly Practitioners. These courses were targeted and useful to student practice—teaching students to consume, use and do research in their daily work settings. Articulating the benefit of methodological knowledge, faculty members from the one institution said they wanted their students to become sound decision-makers and problem-solvers. In fact, early thinking in the CPED consortium suggested programs should develop students into problem-solvers.

To accomplish this goal, instructors provided understandable information in increments or, use a "just in time" approach where materials and skills were offered in progression with the program allowing students to learn as they go. Examples of types of methodological knowledge included gap analysis and cycles of action

research. Moreover, much of these methods courses were closely tied to dissertation work so that students learned skills together, under the guidance of their faculty and over the full period of the program.

Further supporting socialization, courses in CPED-influenced programs were taught by a variety of individuals in varied combinations. At some institutions, only tenure-track faculty members teach courses, whereas at other combinations of faculty and clinical faculty (sometimes graduates of the program) teach and sometimes, practitioners co-teach with faculty. At some institutions, two courses were blended together and co-taught by faculty to provide interdisciplinary understanding. In most of these programs, a practitioner with a terminal degree was asked to sit on the dissertation committee to allow for professional experience to influence and guide the student's study.

## 2017 CPED Report

More recently, we have found that institutions have invested in developing the skills, knowledge and dispositions that improve a Scholarly Practitioner's abilities. These changes support identity development through knowledge acquisition, investment in defining the scholar practitioner and student involvement in the program.

The CPED Framework has strong emphasis on engaging community, working towards social justice and equity in schools, engaging diverse stakeholders and sharing learning across these stakeholders. Programs have responded to these aims for the Scholarly Practitioner by adding programmatic components that will socialize students to enact these skills in practice. For instance, in order for students to better interact with their communities, program changes have included:

- Civic engagement projects that focus on contemporary regional issues in education impacting educational attainment, economic viability, and/or livability in a metropolitan area,
- Shadowing of educational leaders to learn how to appraise problems in context, and
- Evaluating existing and projected needs of ethical leaders in local educational and community settings.

Students are also asked to apply their learning in a variety of different settings, going beyond the comfort of their current practice environment. Some program changes that support this learning have included:

- Field experiences that require guided practice in highly diverse and high need school settings,
- Exploration of current ethical issues influencing leadership decisions,
- Student participation in discussions of problems of practice across a diverse set of understandings and perspectives,
- Faculty with experience in highly diverse and high-need school districts, and
- Field-based performance assessments of students.

These programmatic changes reflect a pedagogy that reinforces “learning by doing” in safe settings that emphasize in-depth dialogue, reflection that relates course readings to these activities and to professional practice. This means learning to communicate through means other than academic and scholarly writing. Some program changes to that end have included:

- Conveying information through dialogue, virtual media, arts-based projects, etc., that is readily understood by multiple audiences.
- Preparing and presenting written work to both academic and practitioner audiences
- Requiring students to shadow educational leaders to learn about school improvement initiatives that make a positive difference in the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities

As the Council of Graduate Schools Taskforce on the Education Doctorate (2006) pointed out, professional doctorates cannot be a replica of the PhD. These data demonstrate how CPED influenced EdD programs have redesigned their structures to produce Scholarly Practitioners. All aspects of a program must be reconsidered if a program is to develop the new identity. For the CPED-influenced EdD, that means reshaping programs that support the merging of inquiry and practice and supporting students as they move from highly skilled practitioners to Scholarly practitioners.

### ***Becoming a Scholarly Practitioner: Identity and Commitment***

We have seen across the data that students who have participated in these programs have come to understand themselves as Scholarly Practitioners and programs have redefined what they want graduate outcomes to be as a result.

#### **2010–2014 FIPSE Study**

In the FIPSE study, data was gathered from students in two ways. First, 83 students from 11 of the 21 institutions participated in focus groups. Second, 225 students across all 21 institutions participated in an open-ended question survey. What was learned from these data was how students and alumni were becoming or had become Scholarly Practitioners as a result of the program changes. Two big themes emerged – (1) students saw their program as having given them tools for understanding and changing their local practice; and (2) student mindsets and thinking about their professional work had changed.

Results indicated that students felt they had gained research and inquiry as tools for arguing to stakeholders and policy makers the need for solving problems and actually changing their practice. Students noted the ability to read data and use it to better understand their practice. Several participants described this as “consuming

research” and one specifically as “making sense in a practice way.” (Perry et al., 2015). Participants noted that this learning came from their program’s ability to connect theory to their current practice as a means to develop these skills and ultimately make methods courses “matter.”

One student described the ways in which learning was done in her program as “action learning” or “transfer of learning to actual application.” This idea of action learning formed both an initial *en vivo* code as well as a broader theme as the data was analyzed. Participants spoke of learning by doing at many points in their programs including individual classroom exercises, longer-term field experiences, and the bringing of learning back to their place of work, trying it out and then reflecting on the experience back in the classroom. Action learning is what Shulman and CPED members would consider a signature pedagogy because it allows students the opportunity to be socialized to the habits of hand, heart and mind in a reflective, safe environment.

Participants perceived the understanding and applying of existing research for practice improvement as a growth in themselves as one student described “moving beyond the practitioner mindset to really understanding research.” Such statements were common across the data, with participants often beginning with “I am able to” as they described a new intellectual mindset. For example, one student commented, “we can prove the case” when discussing how he applied research to build arguments for resources in his school district. “We were challenged to present not as practitioners, but as scholars, because we were defending our point of view,” another student explained, “it’s not just a matter of opinion, but what is your evidence that you want other people to believe in you” (Perry et al., 2015).

Students and alumni also described having the ability and imperative to view problems of practice and potential solutions from multiple perspectives or lenses. “We have learned different ways of looking and appreciating,” one participant commented. Another said, “You almost feel guilty [now] if you don’t use multiple lenses.” These lenses were described as being global in perspective, diverse across groups of people, going beyond practical knowledge to theoretical frameworks and intentionally moving students “out of their comfort zone” to better lead and solve problems.

## 2017 CPED Report

Though data were not collected from students in the CPED report, an understanding of what learning outcomes *experienced* and *implementing* programs expect their students to possess upon graduation lends an understand to the ways in which socialization in CPED-influenced EdD programs are different. Each institution was asked to list the expected outcomes for graduates as they relate to the CPED Framework. Not all of the principles had matching outcomes in the implementing and experienced category. However, looking across all of the outcomes listed, some pertinent themes emerged that demonstrate both programmatic change and a clear need for specialized socialization in CPED-influenced EdD programs.



Much of the language of graduate outcomes centers around, the ability to solve problems of practice and create policy through the application of theory and inquiry. For example, programs expect students will be able to “Understand, evaluate, and apply educational theory and inquiry knowledge” or “who have the skills and mindset to sustain inquiry around professional problems of practice.” In this language is a strong sense of creating change in practice with words such as “meaningful action”, “applying”, “solving”, “investigate potential solutions.” Coupled with the sense of change is engaging others in action. That is, combining leadership skills with inquiry to engage stakeholders in understanding and solving problems in practice.

Leadership is also highlighted in the outcomes but in ways that expect students will develop their leadership abilities through the application of theory and inquiry. For example, one program suggests graduates will be able to articulate, “How theory and research influence the development of personal leadership practice.” Another suggests students will sustain their leadership growth upon graduation by continued application of scholarly skills. Within most of the programs’ stated outcomes, there is a notion that graduates will “transform” practice as educational leaders through the application of their scholarly practitioner skills.

A final theme that stands out is the notion of transformational leadership as a means to serve communities and schools as a matter of social justice. Part of this is understanding themselves as leaders, “how their personal narrative shapes their own approach to social justice” and how they incorporate a social justice mindset to lead complex organizations that serve all. Coursework listed prepares students to investigate some of the ways in which oppression affects and is reproduced by education and schooling, explore the power of education to reform society, and leave the program equipped with the intellectual curiosity and a basic set of tools to challenge oppression in their own institutions.

## Conclusion

Acquiring a new role in graduate programs, as the Weidman, et al. model (2001) suggests, is a distinguishing factor in CPED-influenced programs, one that sets these programs apart from traditional doctoral study in the field of education. Preparing practitioners for their new role as Scholarly Practitioner requires not only a full overhaul of EdD programs, but also a redesign of the purpose and intent of program content. In many respects, helping faculty who have been trained in traditional PhD programs to understand these distinctions requires that they too be socialized into understanding the difference and distinction of the EdD.

CPED is an innovation that requires that more people learn about and understand it in action. As membership grows, the unique nature of this grassroots organization will continue to provide learning about and improvement in their programs. Over time, the more we learn about the impact of the CPED Framework on EdD programs, the more we will learn more about how these programs socialize students to becoming Scholarly Practitioners.



## References

- Anderson, D. G. (1983). Differentiation of the EdD and PhD in education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 55–58.
- Archbald, D. (2008). Research versus problem solving for the education leadership doctoral thesis: Implications for form and function. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 704–739.
- Berliner, D. (2006). Toward a future as rich as our past. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education* (pp. 268–291). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, L. D. (1966). Doctoral graduates in education. In *An inquiry into their motives, aspirations, and perceptions of the program*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.
- Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2009). *Working principles for the professional practice doctorate in education*. (np).
- Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate. (2011). *Design concept definitions*. (np).
- Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). *School: A brief for a professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Colwill, D. A. (2012). *Educating the scholar practitioner in organization development*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Council of Graduate Schools. (2007). *Task force on the professional doctorate*. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- Deering, T. E. (1998). Eliminating the doctor of education degree: It's the right thing to do. *The Educational Forum*, 62, 243–248.
- Denemark, G. (1985). Educating a profession. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(5), 46–51.
- Eells, W. C. (1963). *Degrees in higher education*. Washington, DC: 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: University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner, S. (2009). Conceptualizing success in doctoral education: Perspectives of faculty in seven disciplines. *Review of Higher Education*, 32(3), 383–406.
- Golde, C. M. (2006). Preparing stewards of the discipline. In C. M. Golde & G. E. Walker (Eds.), *Envisioning the future of doctoral education* (pp. 3–23). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Green, H., & Powell, S. (2005). *Doctoral study in contemporary higher education*. Maidenhead, UK: The Society for Research into Higher Education/Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.
- Hochbein, C., & Perry, J. A. (2013). The role of research in the professional doctorate. *Planning and Changing Journal*, 44(3/4), 181.
- Hoffman, R., & Perry, J. A. (2016). The CPED framework: Tools for change. In J. A. Perry (Ed.), *The EdD and scholarly practitioners: The CPED path* (pp. 13–27). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Jarvis, P. (1999). *The practitioner-researcher: Developing theory from practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. New York: The Education Schools Project.
- Osguthorpe, R. T., & Wong, M. J. (1993). The PhD versus the EdD: Time for a decision. *Innovative Higher Education*, 18(1), 47–63.
- Perry, J. A. (2010). *Reclaiming the education doctorate: Three cases of processes and roles in institutional change* (doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park.
- Perry, J. A. (2012). To EdD or not to EdD? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(1), 41–44.
- Perry, J. A. (2013). Developing stewards of practice. In J. A. Perry & D. L. Carlson (Eds.), *In their own words: A journey to the stewardship of the practice in education*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Perry, J. A. (2016). *The new education doctorate: Preparing the transformational leader the EdD and scholarly practitioners: The CPED path* (pp. 1–13). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

- Perry, J. A., & Imig, D. G. (2008). A stewardship of practice in education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(6), 42–49.
- Perry, J. A., Zambo, D., & Wunder, S. (2015). Understanding how schools of education have redesigned the doctorate of education. *Journal of School Public Relations*, 36, 58–85.
- Powell, A. G. (1980). *The uncertain profession*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shulman, L. S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52–59.
- Shulman, L. S., Golde, C. M., Bueschel, A. C., & Garabedian, K. J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25–32.
- Tupling, C. L., & Outhwaite, D. (2017). Developing an identity as an EdD leader: A reflexive narrative account. *Management in Education*, 31(4), 153–158.
- Weidman, J. C. (1989). Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 5, pp. 289–322). New York: Agathon Press.
- Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., & Stein, E. L. (2001). *Socialization of graduate and professional students in higher education: A perilous passage?* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, Vol. 28, No. 3). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED457710.pdf>
- Willis, J. W., Valenti, R., & Inman, D. (2010). *Completing a professional practice dissertation: A guide for doctoral students and faculty*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.