Critical Friends and the Carnegie Foundation Project on the Education Doctorate: A Café Conversation at UCEA

Dr. Valerie Storey (Lynn University)
Dr. Rosemarye Taylor (University of Central Florida)

Abstract: *The café conversation represented in this article is intended to foster mutual engagement-and opportunity for learning-across the institutions involved in the Carnegie Foundation Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED). Participants in the café conversation addressed the following questions: (1) How does your institution ensure that program pedagogy and delivery (laboratories of practice, signature pedagogy, and capstone) remain true to Lee Shulman's vision? Have CPED institutions effectively defined the program's purpose and outcomes, to external stakeholders? (2) What do you see as commonalities and differences in the challenges institutions face? (3) What are the benchmarks by which CPED institutions judge quality and rigor in the Ed.D program? Given all of this, are CPED institutions delivering an innovative scholar practitioner doctorate? Opening and closing comments set the café conversation in historical context, highlight issues raised, and suggest how critical friends can move the project forward.*

Keywords: Café Conversation, Critical Friends; Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED); Program Design and Implementation.

We, the members of CPED, believe:
The professional doctorate in education prepares educators for the application of appropriate and specific practices, the generation of new knowledge, and for the stewardship of the profession.

Charter for Phase II of CPED, 2009

1 Framing the Issues: Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED)

According to the Council of Graduate Schools, in their *Task Force Report of the Professional Doctorate* (2007), "…a professional doctoral degree should represent preparation for the potential transformation of that field of professional

practice, just as the Ph.D. represents preparation for the potential transformation of the basic knowledge in a discipline." (p.6). Such a transformation of the Ed.D. is the focus of CPED (phase 1), a three-year initiative (2007-2010) launched by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) -- with the goal of including and engaging two dozen schools and colleges of education in a national, inter-institutional dialogue aimed at improving the preparation of advanced educational practitioners (Perry & Imig, 2008).

The initiative requires invited members from the Council for Academic Deans of Research Education Institutions (CADREI) to send representatives to CPED convenings to continue efforts to enhance the professional practice of doctorate education. Teams representing a broad cross-section of the faculty at each of the invited education schools convene twice a year to deliberate about the form and function of the professional-practice doctorate (Perry & Imig, 2008). There are 25institutional members of the partnership (*see Table 1*). Participating in the café conversation at UCEA, 2009, were Lynn University, Texas A & M University, University of Central Florida, University of Colorado-Denver, University of Maryland, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and Virginia Commonwealth University.

TABLE 1

CPED Participating Institutions

CPED Participating Institutions		
Arizona State University	University of Colorado-Denver	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
California State University	University of Connecticut	University of Oklahoma
Duquesne University	University of Florida	University of Southern California
Lynn University	University of Houston	University of Vermont
Northern Illinois University	University of Kansas	Virginia Commonwealth University
Rutgers University	University of Kentucky	Virginia Tech University
Pennsylvania State University	University of Louisville	Washington State University
The College of William & Mary	University of Maryland	
University of Central Florida	University of Missouri-Columbia	

(Source: Perry & Imig, 2008)

Participation in the CPED initiative is based on:

- Current college or school reform efforts;
- A demonstrated commitment to the agenda;
- A connection of the pilot or experimental program to other ongoing efforts of the school or college;
- A potential for "showcasing" to relevant parties;
- The administrative support and other resources for documentation, engagement and cooperation;
- Each CPED school assembling a team that includes academics, administrators and graduate students.
-

Commitment to the CPED initiative is based on:

- Envisioning new ways of preparing professional practitioners for schools and colleges;
- Designing new programs that will enable professional practitioners to function effectively;
- Examining recent advances in the learning sciences and human cognition, statistics and technology, leadership and discipline-based knowledge, and alternative pedagogies.

TABLE 2
Required Factors for CPED Invitation

Participation	Commitment
Current college or school reform efforts	Envisioning new ways of preparing professional practitioners for schools and colleges
A demonstrated commitment to the agenda	Designing new programs that will enable professional practitioners to function effectively
A connection of the pilot or experimental program to other ongoing efforts of the school or college	Examining recent advances in the learning sciences and human cognition, statistics and technology, leadership and discipline-based knowledge and alternative pedagogies
A potential for "showcasing" to relevant parties	
Each CPED school assembling a team that includes Academics, administrators, and graduate students	

(www.cpedinitiative.org, 2008)

2. Critical Friends

Critical friendship is a term referring to supportive yet challenging relationships between professionals, and it is increasingly coming to the fore in education (Swaffield, 2007). Within this broad frame, it is being used in a variety of ways to reflect varying contexts. Many of the metaphors surrounding the term critical friends refer to seeing issues with a different perspective, Dean (1992) refers to 'a fresh pair of eyes' (p.25), as do Ainscow and Southworth (1996); Bolman and Deal (1991, 2002) focus on 'reframing with reflection.' Whatever, the specific context, the critical friend is generally a person who assists through questioning, reflection, and independent analysis, cultivating constructive critique. This can create apprehension (for a person or institution) if the critical friend is perceived as a rival or competitor. In addition, 'critical' has only negative connotations for some; whereas, for others additional meanings (such as 'essential' and 'analytical evaluation') highlight the inherent tension within the phrase 'critical friend' (Storey & Hartwick, 2009).

> Costa and Kallick (1993, p.50) describe a critical friend as:

> > . . . a trusted person who asks provocative questions, provides data to be examined through another lens, and offers critiques of a person's work as a friend. A critical friend takes the time to fully understand the context of the work presented and the outcomes that the person or group is working toward. The friend is an advocate for the success of that work.

In addition to trust, inter-dependency (Goodnough, 2003) and reciprocity are also required conditions (Johnson & Johnson, 2002).

3. Critical Friend Groups (CFGs)

CFGs have gained increasing visibility as a promising reform strategy (Bambino, 2003; Dunne, Nave, & Lewis, 2000). CFGs require participants to construct their own learning through a cycle of inquiry, reflection, and action. Advocates of collaborative inquiry argue that true reform depends on members of the profession developing their own systematic and intentional ways of scrutinizing and improving their practices. Embedded within this argument is the proposition that inquiry-driven communities foster collective responsibility and internal accountability (Curry, 2008). Dunne and Honts (1998) reported that CFGs provide powerful professional development experiences. In a similar vein, Bambino (2003) claimed that CFGs at the school level have been the catalyst for changes in the teaching, learning, culture, and climate of learning communities in a variety of schools.

4. The Role of Critical Friends in CPED

In CPED, the role of critical friends is to support and empower each other by demonstrating a positive regard for people and providing an informed critique of processes and practices (Swaffield, 2005). They would also agree with the findings of Swaffield, that the longer the involvement of an institution with a critical friend is, the more beneficial the relationship becomes -- as a greater understanding of specific contextual issues facing the university, priorities, and pressures within the institution develop (Storey & Hartwick, 2009).

Swaffield (2005, p.44), identified five interrelated aspects to describe the work, conduct and characteristics of a critical friend:

1. Role: facilitator, supporter, critic, challenger

2. Behaviors: listens, questions, reflects, feeds back, summarizes

3. Knowledge and experience: the relevant background which the critical friend brings and uses

4. Skills: interpersonal and group work skills, data analysis and interpretation skills

5. Qualities: respect, empathy, genuineness, confidence, enthusiasm

It is pertinent here to point out that the twenty-five institutions committed to CPED received no money for participation. Instead, the project, convenings, and completion of the required homework offered a process for engaging deeply in questions of purpose, as well as encouragement to experiment with our offerings and to document the outcomes. The Carnegie Foundation provided the venue for framing ideas; engagement in critical reflection and deliberation leading to action; and critical friends who provided feedback, support, and encouragement were in service.

5. A CAFÉ CONVERSATION: Methodology

Café conversation is a dialogue process. A method used when a large group is brought together "creating a living network of collaborative dialogue around questions that matter in service of the real work." (www.theworldcafe.com) The methodology is designed for sharing collective knowledge and shaping the future. "The café is built on the assumption that people already have within them the wisdom and creativity to confront even the most difficult challenges. Given the appropriate context and focus, it is possible to access and use this deeper knowledge about what is important" (www.theworldcafe.com). The design of the café experience includes six principles: clarity of purpose; create a hospitable space; explore questions that matter; encourage everyone's contribution; connect diverse perspectives, and listen for insights and share discoveries.

Typically, specific questions begin the dialogue and set the framework for the joint exploration. The focus may be on a single question, or several questions could be developed to support a logical progression of discovery throughout several rounds of dialogue. In many cases, one of the outcomes of the café experience is a discovery and consensus on what are

the most significant questions that underline the situation or issue.

The powerful questioning techniques in the methodology are informed by appreciative inquiry theories and practice (Cooperrider, Sorensen, Whitney, & Yaegar, 2000). Appreciative inquiry contends that the questions we ask and the way we ask them will help focus people's thinking and greatly affect the outcome of the inquiry. Questions that focus on 'the best of,' explore when strategic issues have been at their best and the possibilities of what could be. They also connect the participants with why they care and what innovation is possible.

One potential pitfall noted in posing questions for a large group is ensuring fidelity to reality. What café conversations can do is create a deeper shared meaning of the situation and answer the questions:

• What are the different perspectives on this issue?

• What do we find useful in this situation to move forward?

The conversations framed by these questions create an opportunity to see the collective situation in a variety of ways, and extend individual views as well as building a common picture of what can best be worked on in the situation.

A café conversation at UCEA: Design Principles (World Café Community Foundation)
  1. **Set the Context**
  2. **Create Hospitable Space**
  3. **Explore Questions That Matter**
  4. **Encourage Everyone's Contribution**
  5. **Connect Diverse Perspectives**
  6. **Listen Together and Notice Patters**
  7. **Share Collective Discoveries**

1. **Context**-The café conversation presented in this article is intended to foster the sort of mutual engagement –and opportunity for learning (Moss, 2005) - across higher

education institutions that is often lacking. Taken together, the comments of the participants and the café guests illustrate both the challenges and the strengths of being involved in CPED.

2. **Create Hospitable Space**-The points of view expressed here were shared in a café conversation, hosted by Valerie A. Storey, which occurred at the 2009 annual University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Convention. Participating in the café conversation were Rosemarye Taylor, Myles Bryant, Connie Fulmer, Willis Hawley, Charol Shakeshaft, and Jim Scheurich.

3. **Explore Questions That Matter**-Prior to the café conversation, participants agreed to prepare their individual and institutional responses to four critical questions (*see Table 3*). Before discussing the questions, each participant introduced himself and described the institution's Ed. D. program.

TABLE 3 Critical Questions of the Café Conversation at UCEA

Question

1	a. How does your institution ensure that program pedagogy and delivery (laboratories of practice, signature pedagogy, and capstone experience) remain true to Shulman's vision? b. Have CPED institutions effectively defined the program's outcomes and purpose to external stakeholders?
2	What do you see as commonalities and differences in the challenges institutions face?
3	What are the benchmarks by which you judge quality and rigor in the Ed. D. program?
4	a. What is driving the market of doctoral candidates? b. What are the factors that potential doctoral students consider when choosing an Ed.D. program? c. What are typical characteristics of students applying to an Ed.D? program?

4. **Encourage Everyone's Contribution**-Scholars within the UCEA community have engaged with the Carnegie Foundation's work on redesigning the Ed.D. scholar practitioner, educational leadership programs, as evidenced by articles within the *UCEA Review*, symposia and papers presented at the UCEA Convention, and the changes being made in many UCEA programs (Young, 2006). Participation at biannual CPED convenings enables institutions to develop a shared system of beliefs,

explanations, and values. Participants also craft statements about leadership preparation, based on evidence and professional consensus. Convening assignments ensure that institutional planning is communicated to all CPED institutions, and ensuing conversation occurs in a climate of support and trust. But, as with any reform effort, there are institutional barriers to overcome, and compromises are made.

5. **Connect Diverse Perspectives**-A lot of talking needs to take place (Hall & Hord, 2011) in order to ensure that institutions learn from each other by developing the capacity to anticipate and address challenges before they are encountered. Knowing who is talking to whom and what is being said about the innovation is important (Hall & Hord, 2011), as the more positive the perceptions of the Ed.D. reform initiative, the more likely the chances are of favorable adoption decisions. Frequent communication can reduce the stress, time, and resources spent by program directors as they utilize strategies already developed by CPED colleagues.

6. **Listen Together and Notice Patterns**-Qualitative data from the transcribed UCEA café conversation audio tape has been supplemented with institutional website information on the Ed. D. program, institutional presentations and assignments from CPED convenings, and blog comments posted on the CPED website. Themes were identified for program fidelity, program challenges, program rigor, and program marketing. Regarding program fidelity, this paper suggests that vision and rhetoric expressed at convenings becomes modified as the reality of fiscal efficiency becomes a major priority. Program challenges also relate to program fidelity, as faculty involved in the CPED project endeavor to communicate the philosophy grounding the new Ed.D. to faculty invested in the Ph.D. Educational Leadership program currently being offered at their institution.

6. Applied Methodology

An hour of taped conversation was transcribed. A denaturalized approach to the transcription was applied as

this attempts a verbatim depiction of speech, working for a "full and faithful transcription" (Cameron 1996: 33). The application of grounded theory to data analysis (defined by Charmaz, 2000 as systematic guidelines for collecting and analyzing data to build middle-range theoretical frameworks that explain the collected data) enabled the researchers to discover the participants' main concern and how they continually try to resolve it. Data collection also included review of university program web sites.

Café participants were first asked to introduce themselves and the institution they represented, and then to briefly describe the impact of CPED participation on developing a new or revised Ed.D. program. In Conversation Topic 1, the authors have given a summary of each of the café conversation participant's institution initiative related to CPED. In the following Conversation Topic sections, responses are summarized and not necessarily presented by each institution.

Table 1.1: *Introduction of café participant and description of their institutions, and Ed.D. Program*

	Lynn University	University of Central Florida (UCF)	University of Colorado-Denver	University of Maryland	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Virginia Commonwealth University
Name of Program	Educational Leadership	Executive Ed. D. in Educational Leadership	Leadership for Educational Equity	Policy Development and Organizational Leadership	Educational Leadership	Educational Leadership
First Cohort	Fall, 2009	Fall, 2010	Summer, 2009	Fall, 2007	January, 2009	Fall 2008
Concentrations/ Strands/ Specializations	Teacher Preparation K-12 Leadership in a metropolitan area	Pk-12	Instructional or Executive Leadership	Teaching and Learning Policy Organizational Leadership and Policy	Educational Administration Teaching, Learning, and Teacher Education	Educational Leadership
Program Length	3 years	3 years	3 years	3 years	Complete in less than 4 years	3 years
Foundational Themes/ Principles/ Lenses	Four lenses: Leadership, Accountability, Equity & Diversity, Learning & Instruction.	Learning & Accountability, Serving Students' Social, Emotional, & Educational Needs, Political Governance & Influences, Professional Leadership, Research, Doctoral Field Study	Equity & Access (3 courses); Leadership (3 courses); Learning (1 course) Inquiry (3 courses)	1) Teaching and Learning 2) Policy Development and Implementation 3) Systemic conceptualization and analysis of complex problems 4) Effective communication and collaboration	Integrity, Mentorship, Research project involvement	Three lenses: Learning, Equity, Accountability.
Credit Hours	51 credit hours allows for no transfer of credit	54 credit hours allows for no transfer of credit	69 credit hours	60 credit hours	96 credit hours including research courses, and up to 36 transfer credits	48 credit hours
Program Schedule	Annual Cohort Fall admission 12 students	Annual Cohort Fall admission 28 students	Annual Cohort Fall admission Summer Start 20 students	Annual Cohort Fall admission	Annual Cohort 20-25 students	Annual Cohort Summer entry 20-25 students
Instructional Delivery	Classes meet every Saturday in the fall and spring semesters with a three week summer session.	Classes meet Monday and Thursday evenings. Research in Educational Leadership are mixed mode.	Courses offered on weekends, hybrid (part face-to-face, part online), online, and/or summer intensive format	Courses are taught in various formats, including ten week courses, yearlong seminars, intensive week-end sessions, and some online sessions	Combination of evening seminars, online learning communities, and intensive study in the summers	Combination evening seminars and Saturday seminars.

Lynn University: The Ed.D. scholar practitioner three-year degree program started in fall, 2009, with its first cohort of 11 graduate students. The program consists of 51 credit hours (the final semester in the program (spring) is a 3 credit hour load). Students complete a capstone experience rather than a traditional dissertation. Transfer credits into the program are not accepted. Students can choose from 2 concentrations: Teacher Preparation or K-12 Leadership in a metropolitan area. There are 3 Core Courses — 9 credit hours; 2 specialization courses — 6 credit hours (15 credit hours total); 3 specialization field study courses - 9 credit hours; 4 inquiry methods courses — 12 credit hours; 2 problem-based research seminars — 6 credit hours; 3 capstone experience courses — 9 credit hours. Syllabi for the core classes are grounded by the program's 4 themes: Leadership, Accountability, Equity and Diversity (E & D), and Learning and Instruction (L & I).

An innovative aspect of the admission process is that, upon receipt of all admissions documents, the college faculty invites prospective candidates onto campus to make a presentation on an identified problem or issue of concern in their school or school district. A specific requirement is that, when crafting their presentation, applicants apply one of the four program themes as a critical lens: Leadership; Accountability; Equity and Diversity (E & D); and Learning and Instruction (L & I). Faculty are able to assess the motivation and disposition of the candidate, can see if there is a good fit between research interests of the candidate and faculty, and finally, as the presentation is captured and stored, it provides a baseline assessment against which the final capstone presentation can be compared (Taylor & Storey in press).

University of Central Florida (UCF): The College of Education has a Ph. D. for full-time doctoral students whose goal is to enter the professoriate upon graduation, and a college-wide Ed. D. in which all non-Ph.D. doctoral students other than educational leadership participate. This college-wide Ed.D. was revised in 2007 to reflect the scholar practitioner philosophy, but still maintains the dissertation as the capstone experience.

In the café conversation at UCEA, the representation was from the Educational Leadership Ed. D., which is distinct from the college-wide doctorate. This degree has two strands: higher education and Pk-12. The Pk-12 degree has been redesigned to align with the CPED philosophy and will be implemented in the fall semester of 2010, while the higher education strand will remain as it is for the present time. The current Ed. D. in Pk-12 educational leadership requires 63 credit hours beyond the master's degree, with a maximum transfer of 9 credit hours. If students do not hold educational leadership certification, they are required to obtain it, adding another 39 credit hours, making the program extremely long.

The redesign of the program is now titled the Executive Ed. D. in Educational Leadership. With data on the graduation rate after 4 years, survey feedback from graduates, current students, and executive level leadership in the central Florida school districts, the faculty redesigned the program to align with the CPED. Coursework strands include: Learning and Accountability, Serving Students' Social, Emotional, and Educational Needs, Political Governance and Influences, Professional Leadership, Research, and Doctoral Field Study. It is important to note that only 12 credit hours remain the same as in the current program. Even the research courses have been redesigned, indicating a significant change in the program.

The result is the Executive Ed. D. in Educational Leadership, replaced the Pk-12 Ed.D. in Educational Leadership for all students admitted after January, 2010. Beginning summer semester 2010, students will be admitted fall semester only and will be in a cohort for 9 semesters -- taking 6 credit hours each semester. This scholar practitioner program includes 15 credit hours of client-based field research that replaces the traditional dissertation. The 54 credit hour program allows for no transfer of credit except on a case by case basis of students transitioning from the current to the new program.

To ensure that the Executive Ed. D. reflects the input from and needs of central Florida school districts, faculty hosted advisory and advocacy sessions with district superintendents and executive leaders to review the proposed program and to ask for advocacy. The response is

positive, and district leaders express the belief that the opportunity for them to be clients for research on problems or issues of practice is a win-win opportunity.

University of Colorado-Denver: "Leadership for Educational Equity," is a practice-based, doctoral level program for professional leadership in P-20 or community-based educational contexts. The program's intent is to "prepare leaders within the profession to address complex educational challenges by combining decision-focused analytic and research skills with a broad-based understanding of systems anchored in principles of equity and access to public education," (June, 2010 convening assignment). The program reflects a cohort model of twenty students, with courses offered on weekends, hybrid (part face-to-face, part online), online, and/or summer intensive formats. Ultimately, the course work will encompass 69 credit hours. The program consists of prescribed coursework and a core curriculum, which comprises of Equity and Access (3 courses**);** Leadership (3 courses); Learning (1 course) and Inquiry (3 courses). Students also choose an academic concentration in instructional or executive leadership.

For the culminating portion of the program, students participate in an internship and dissertation proposal coursework, prior to completing their dissertation. The degree can be completed in 3 years.

University of Maryland: Ed.D. students are required to take a minimum of 55 credit hours beyond a master's degree. This includes core courses, 3-6 credit hours in field-based practica, a minimum of 9 credit hours in research and analytical methods, and a minimum of 10 credit hours of doctoral research study or dissertation. After students have completed most of their coursework, a 12-hour comprehensive exam is required. The comprehensive exam may take a variety of forms, such as take-home conceptual essays, literature reviews, research papers, or "in-house" closed book responses. Interestingly, the organizational leadership and policy studies specialization offers program requirements for Maryland State Department of Education

(MSDE) Administrator I certification (principals and administrators) and MSDE superintendent certification.

The capstone experience has core assumptions that reflect the CPED philosophy. Students work in teams of 4 and are required to use proficiencies developed across curriculum, such as systems thinking. They are to focus on a substantial problem or policy that contributes to a solution. Organizational clients should have their interests served. Although the research is collaborative, it allows for individual accountability and assessment -- and is completed within a 12-month period. Throughout the capstone experience, students meet with the faculty assigned to this responsibility. At the culmination of the research, students provide individual reports to the faculty and team reports to the client.

University of Nebraska-Lincoln: The Department of Teaching, Learning, & Teacher Education at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln is designed as an Education Doctorate cohort initiative that examines and values the work of practice. This program is concerned with enabling educators in K-16 and community settings to further the work of learning and be agents of change. Students are required to continually confront, consider and articulate the complex realities and challenges facing schools, colleges and communities today and in the future. Currently, the department is field-testing a selection of "arts of the practical" course offerings as cross-disciplinary and cross-emphasis choices in order to cultivate a culture of collaboration between scholars and practitioners. Each course will be designed to enable educators to concretely consider, negotiate, analyze and articulate the nature of learners, learning, teachers and teaching from multiple perspectives. The cross-disciplinary/cross-emphasis debates and deliberations will reflexively figure into the more focused studies of educational practice in later work. Also underway is planning for a core doctoral seminar experience. It will be designed to provide program continuity, and it will ask participants to be students of the work of learning -- as the scholarship of practice is mapped out, explored, researched and documented.

Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU): After achieving faculty consensus on the development of an Ed.D., the School of Education initiated a task force that included faculty from within the school's varied disciplines, students and local school professionals. A set of assumptions and values were drafted, which are now being used to guide the program's development. In addition, they created a set of five themes that serve as a common core to a doctorate in leadership. This innovative program now serves about 100 students, primarily in cohorts associated with school divisions in the Richmond metropolitan area. This is a three-year professional practice doctorate that begins in the summer and ends in May of the third year. Students examine cases built around enduring questions in the field and examine these questions through three lenses: learning, equity, and accountability. Questions are explored through contrasting evidence from economic, systems, legal, human relations, and political data and perspectives. The program content and assessments correlate to common curriculum elements across perspectives. The first summer experience constitutes 3 credit hours of coursework, followed by 7 semesters (to include 2 summers) of 6 credit hours of coursework. The final semester in the program (spring) is a 3 credit hour load. Learning communities meet both on the VCU campus or onsite in the host district. Rather than separate research courses, the concepts and application are infused into each course taken.

7. Conversation Topic 1

a. *How does your institution ensure that program pedagogy and delivery (laboratories of practice, signature pedagogy, and capstone) remain true to Shulman's vision?*

Table 1.2: Conversation Topic 1
How does your institution ensure that program pedagogy and delivery (laboratories of practice, signature pedagogy, and capstone) remain true to Shulman's vision?

	Lynn University	University of Central Florida (UCF)	University of Colorado-Denver	University of Maryland	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	Virginia Commonwealth University
Laboratories of practice	Research laboratories in the field support formal courses on systematic inquiry, and develop each student's repertoire of analytical skills	A 15 credit hour doctoral client-based field study is the capstone experience which provides the expectation of researching issues identified by a client and being accountable to both the client and UCF faculty for the final product.	Students complete two internships, one with an aspiring peer and one in a complementary context. For each internship students 1) spend a minimum of 80 contact hours in the host context across a semester and 2) complete an individually negotiated product that contributes substantially to the host context. Two inquiry courses lead students through program evaluation studies linked to educational organizations.	Research laboratories that, in concert with formal courses on systematic inquiry, and develop each student's repertoire of analytical skills. Apply learning from the entire curriculum to understanding and evaluating potential solutions to complex, persistent and, seemingly, intractable "macro-problems". Application seminars that engage students in two year-long problem solving through two year-long courses on enduring issues in educational policy	Small cohorts of students (5-6) collaborate to indentify and address important problems in 1 of 3 types of sites. Field sites serve as context for the study of those problems, afford application of theory to practice, and practice to theory, and support research projects focused on problems of practice.	Problems of practice in all areas of the curriculum. Teams of students investigate practical problems issues throughout the program, related to the topics of study. E.g. Policy development, Program evaluation.
Signature pedagogy	Problem Based Instruction (PBI) Problems of practice and issues of the field are the lens through which students examine the four overarching themes that guide and are embedded as foundational skills and competencies in the program. 1. Leadership. 2. Accountability. 3. Equity & Diversity. 4. Learning & Instruction	Throughout coursework students are asked to apply theory and research to their roles and institutions to reframe problems of practice and generate potential solutions. Inquiry to identify solutions based on sound empirical research is emphasized.	Combination of collaborative problem solving, active learning, and uses of technology in the delivery of courses	Engages students in active learning, immerses them in collaborative problem solving that is relevant to their professional responsibilities	Ed.D and Ph.D. are available entirely through distance education	Problem based learning active learning, collaborative learning and teaching
Capstone	Client-based field research replaced the traditional dissertation	Client-based field research replaced the traditional dissertation	Thematic Dissertation – Groups of 5-6 students mentored by a faculty member who study a complex problem of practice, linked to an educational organization. Each student explores the problem from a different lens or approach and completes and individual 'dissertation'. The dissertation is comprised of four elements (products).	Client-based field research replaced the traditional dissertation	Traditional dissertation	Client-based Field research conducted by teams led by faculty director
Coursework	Coursework is built around the 4 themes and the ability to analyze research. Students are exposed to research design and analyses throughout the program. Application of theory to practice underpins instructional delivery throughout the program.	39 hours of coursework includes 9 hours of Research in Educational Leadership.... Courses begin with self-reflection and understanding based on outcome strands intended to prepare students to be successful in a diverse, high accountability environment	All students take courses in three core domains: equity and access, learning leadership, and inquiry. Then, students opt into one of two concentration areas: 1) Instructional Leadership or 2) Executive Leadership. Instructional Leadership focuses on preparing future leaders to assume roles such as serving as mentors, coaches, coordinators, university teachers, etc. The Executive Leadership area focuses on preparing future executives to assume roles such as superintendents, HR Directors, upper-level admin positions, etc.	Coursework follows a path that begins with the development of a solid understanding of research on teaching and learning. Not only is this knowledge the foundation for thinking about educational improvement, it serves as a knowledge base that is essential for leadership and consensus building in and among public and private organizations	Two core courses for Ed.D. An additional core course to be created. Students choose cognate courses from 1 of 4 concentrations	Coursework begins with understanding of self, and organization. Course content based on institutional context. Embedded research.

Each of the participating universities faces the same fundamental task of ensuring that the underlying program pedagogy and delivery remain true to Lee Shulman's vision (*see Table 1.2*). Though the laboratories of practice and signature pedagogies differ, all programs attempt to engage students in active learning and develop necessary problem-solving skills. In terms of the capstone requirement, most of the programs have replaced the traditional dissertation with client-based field research.

As a model of excellent practice, the University of Maryland program is profiled here.

University of Maryland - Program pedagogy engages students in active learning throughout and immerses them in collaborative problem solving that is relevant to their professional responsibilities. Efforts are made to ensure that the curriculum and the pedagogy foster the transfer of what is learned to the improvement of educational policy and practice. Courses are taught in various formats, including ten-week courses, yearlong seminars, intensive week-end sessions, and some online sessions. Coursework follows a path that begins with the development of a solid understanding of research on teaching and learning. Not only is this knowledge the foundation for thinking about educational improvement, it serves as a knowledge base that is essential for leadership and consensus building in and among public and private organizations. This foundation is built upon by introducing courses on policy evaluation and development and organizational improvement. Students also participate in two other types of learning experiences: (1) applications seminars that engage students in two year-long problem solving through two year-long courses on enduring issues in educational policy and (2) research laboratories that, in concert with formal courses on systematic inquiry, develop each student's repertoire of analytical skills. Students in the program work in teams using primary and secondary sources of data and information in their work. The topic for seminars in year one involves the development of a comprehensive strategy for "narrowing the achievement gap." In year two, the seminar will focus on designing systems of governance and administration in the context of

high stakes accountability. The specifics of each seminar will be shaped by current representations of these "mega-challenges."

In the first two years of the program, students are engaged at any given time in one course and an applications seminar. In addition, intensive research laboratories are scheduled twice during the calendar year. The ongoing work of agencies, associations and organizations engaged in policy-inquiry provide learning laboratories for students. Several courses are taught by prominent policy analysts and researchers. In addition to teaching students how to use different ways of knowing; the coursework related to systematic inquiry requires students to examine real-world constraints on inquiry and the application of research to policy development and the improvement of practice.

b. Have CPED institutions effectively defined the program's outcomes and purpose to external stakeholders?

Each institution has handled these issues differently. There are those, like UCF and VCU, which have aligned their redesigned programs with the three concepts including signature pedagogy, the problem of practice, and capstone experience. Other institutions, such as the University of Maryland, are providing the option of the problem of practice or client-based research along with the traditional dissertation. The traditional dissertation is a requirement at some institutions (USC), and there are those, like the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, where the faculty believe in the traditional dissertation and continue with it as a requirement.

8. Conversation Topic 2

a. *What do you see as commonalities and differences in the challenges institutions face?*

Table 1.3: Conversation Topic 2
What do you see as commonalities in the challenges institutions face?

1. Faculty
    a. Falling back into old patterns of Ph.D. experience
    b. Credibility as practitioners

2. Faculty & Stakeholders
    a. Perception of the capstone experience in relation to:
       i. Rigor
       ii. Personal experience of traditional dissertation

3. Relationship with school districts
4. Infusion of research or discrete classes
5. Adoption of problem based instruction
6. Staying true to Shulman's vision

7. Maintaining a commonality of vocabulary
    a. Critical friends
    b. Signature pedagogy
    c. Laboratories of practice

Some of the common challenges faced by participating colleges and universities include: establishing faculty credibility as practitioners, overcoming negative perceptions of the capstone experience, developing relationships with school districts, the infusion of research or discrete classes, the adoption of problem based instruction, staying true to Shulman's vision, and maintaining a commonality of vocabulary *(see Table 1.3).*

One of the major conceptual changes is in the implementation of a capstone experience other than the traditional dissertation. Can a capstone research experience be rigorous and not be a five-chapter dissertation? For some the first step in addressing this challenge was within participants' own program faculties, and then faculties outside of the program within the college. At UCF, one of the colleagues in another program area responded to the idea with a comment, "Then, it must not be a real doctorate." This perception and question has also been raised by scholar practitioners who hold Ed. D.s and who wrote a dissertation.

After some discussion and sharing of the components of the client-based field research, the wary colleagues seem to understand that the new capstone is rigorous, and, in fact, have higher accountability since the audience will be both within the institution and with their employers.

As institutions have redesigned their Ed. D. programs and considered student outcomes, the outcomes for developing knowledge, skill, and application of research have met with varying degrees of resistance (*see Table 1.3*). There are those who have infused learning and applied research methods and statistics throughout the coursework, and those who have discrete courses but have changed the outcomes for the courses. Unlike clinical instructors, research faculty tend to have   minimal experience outside of the university environment, and therefore collaboration and consultation with school district directors of research has assisted in identifying the outcomes for the new practitioner focused research courses.

b. Now that we have had the commonality conversation, what are the differences?

Many of the differences reflect varying leadership styles of the deans or administrators. For example, at UCF, the dean of the College of Education believes that curriculum and programs decisions should be made by faculty; therefore, there are differences among Ed. D. programs within the college.   At other institutions, like Virginia Commonwealth, an administrator has led the program change and implementation with commitment to its success, resulting in consistency across programs.

Participants in the café conversation agreed that institutional commitment combined with

an active partnership with schools and districts any lack of practitioner experience.   Further consideration is in the structure and content of the Ed.D. program itself; Does it use the laboratory of practice — the context of schools and districts for learning? There is an alternative view that takes these two excellent points to another level.   In the

educational leadership program at UCF, search committees prioritize hiring faculty who have a minimum of principal experience with the preference for district-level administrative experience. Such experience serves the faculty well in connecting to schools and districts in a meaningful way and in connecting theory and research to practice.

9. Conversation Topic 3

What are the benchmarks by which you judge quality and rigor in the Ed.D program?

Table 1.4: Conversation Topic 3
What are the benchmarks by which you judge quality and rigor in the Ed.D. program?

	Lynn University	University of Central Florida (UCF)	University of Colorado-Denver	University of Maryland	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	*Virginia Commonwealth University*
Benchmarks	Semester reviews. Annual reviews. Portfolio (LifeText). Complete capstone proposal. The portfolio (LifeText) assessment of learning will serve as a comprehensive exam. Student portfolio work will be judged rigorously in order for the student to move forward into the capstone experience.	Milestone 1 (end of first year), a white paper applying the content, concepts, and skills of the outcomes of the first three semesters. Milestone 2. Oral defense of the client-based field research given to the educational leadership faculty and the client. Acceptance by both the faculty and client is required to continue in the Executive Ed.D. program.	Qualifying exam after year one – serves as a source of formative assessment to students and faculty; results are used by students to create a professional plan to guide their focus/actions across future coursework and in preparation for the comprehensive exam and, a Comprehensive exam after year two (includes oral defense). We are still in the process of defining and setting on our Benchmarks and opportunities for formative feedback.	Several strategies implemented that ensure program quality and rigor. The most unique of which is the dissertation work.	A new rubric for assessing the quality and rigor of comps (qualifying exams) for Ed.D. students has been developed. An introductory course for new Ed.D. (and Ph.D.) students that lays out expectations and outcome criteria for three key milestones along the doctoral journey – (a) developing the Doctoral Program of Studies, (b) writing the field study/dissertation proposal, and (c) the final oral examination has been introduced.	Formative Assessment I. At the end of the first year of study, students will use technology to develop evidence of how they have incorporated what they have learned into their daily work. These "digital stories" will address a specific theme. Students will present their product to faculty teams and will address questions posed by faculty. Faculty and students will review student work and provide feedback. Faculty determination of unsatisfactory completion of Formative Assessment I may result in the student's dismissal from the program. Formative Assessment II. Before enrolling in Capstone Project classes, student teams will complete an evaluation of a program currently in use in their workplaces. Teams will confer with workplace supervisors to develop goals and objectives; will review literature related to the program; will design a method of study; will collect and analyze data; will develop conclusions and recommendations. The final products will include a formal report, an executive summary, and a presentation. Faculty, supervisors and students will review student work and provide feedback. Faculty determination of unsatisfactory completion of Formative Assessment II may result in the student's inability to continue in or dismissal from the program. Students who have successfully completed Formative Assessment II and who have completed IRB training must apply for candidacy.

This question did not have the consensus of needing a formalized measure. At UCF, faculty has the expectation of appropriate student expertise in writing, speaking, and communicating deep knowledge and application of that knowledge in each course. There are two milestones that students must successfully complete to continue in the program. At the end of the first year, students will have Milestone 1, a white paper applying the content, concepts, and skills of the outcomes of the first three semesters to a complex problem of practice. At the end of the second year, students will have an oral defense of the proposed client-based field research given to the educational leadership faculty and the client. Acceptance by both the faculty and client is required to continue in the Executive Ed. D. program. At the University of Maryland, the ongoing work of students —speaking, writing, conceptualizing, synthesizing of learning, and evaluation of research -- provides ample data for evaluating the quality of work and rigor of the program. Several strategies are implemented that ensure program quality and rigor, the most unique of which is the dissertation work. Maryland redefined the "dissertation" in ways that are novel and appropriate to the goals of the program.

In their initial work on their dissertation, students work in a 4-5 person team; develop the ability to work collaboratively, and to approach complex problems in multiple substantive and methodological ways. They are advised by a faculty committee and a primary advisor. Students choose dissertation projects from a list of options that potential clients for the research identify and that reflect student interests. Potential clients for student work include advocacy and professional organizations, government agencies, and school systems. The dissertation project is highly structured with deadlines set not only by faculty but by clients for the research.

Responsibility for data collection is shared. Individuals prepare analytical reports on one or more aspects of the problem on which the team has been working. Student teams present their findings to the organizations that requested the studies to be undertaken. Direct faculty

supervision is the responsibility of a University faculty member and an expert on the content of the research.

10. Conversation Topic 4

Table 1.5: Conversation Topic 4

a. *What is driving the market of doctoral candidates?*
b. *What are the factors that potential doctoral students consider when choosing an Ed.D. program?*
c. *What are typical characteristics of students applying to an Ed.D. program?*

What is driving the market of doctoral candidates?	Desire to move into higher level leadership positions in school districts Enhanced financial rewards Understanding that a master's degree is only initial learning, provides certification, but is not a door opener to promotions and more responsibility.
What are the factors that potential doctoral students consider when choosing an Ed.D. program?	Program availability Full time or part time Match between individual's professional life and time available to take classes Required GRE score Tuition costs Pedagogical philosophy Program delivery Program emphasis on performance, and evidence that the program improves individual effectiveness Involvement in CPED partnership
What are typical characteristics of students applying to an Ed.D. program?	Mid-career professional with varying undergraduate backgrounds (many have master's degrees in areas related to educational leadership). Motivated and focused on getting the work done well and at a high level of quality. Varying writing and technology skills

a. What is driving the market of doctoral candidates?

The desire to move into higher-level leadership positions in school districts and the attraction of enhanced financial rewards are the motivating factors for applicants (*see Table 1.5).* These are leaders in schools, districts, and other organizations who understand that a master's degree is only initial learning which provides them with certification, but it will not necessarily open the door to promotions and more responsibility. However, Hawley (University of Maryland) drew café participants' attention to the fact that as educator's compensations are being changed to emphasize performance, the total number of doctoral students will decline. He believes future doctoral students will pay more attention to finding evidence that such programs will improve their effectiveness.

b. What are the factors that potential doctoral students consider when choosing an Ed.D. program?

These decisions vary by institutions based on policy. In theory, the choice between an Ed.D. and Ph.D. should be motivated by the ultimate career objective of the individual student (Storey & Asadoorian, 2008). Pragmatically, however, the choice for students is less transparent, as they struggle with the demands of their jobs, or indeed decide to leave their jobs and become full-time students as opposed to part-time or weekend students. Program availability, GRE scores, pedagogical philosophy, method of delivery, and, of course, finance are additional issues compounding individual choice.

An analogy that distinguishes the two derives from the discipline of economics, namely the difference between consumers and producers. One may view the Ed.D. program as one that prepares individuals to become consumers of research, such that the training of said program is one that emphasizes critical analysis and direct applicability of research, particularly that which is policy-oriented. In contrast, the Ph.D. in education prepares individuals to not only be consumers of research, but, more importantly, producers of research that drives and expands the discipline,

emphasizing theory, policy, and practice. The choice between these two doctoral education programs is not limited to education, but encompasses additional disciplines -- especially business administration with the choice between the Doctor of Business Administration (D.B.A.) and the Ph.D. in Business Administration. This distinction between consumers and producers, and the respective training and career goals to which each is suited, is similar (Storey & Asadoorian, 2009).

There was general agreement from café participants that at their institutions the Ph. D. is reserved for full-time students. Ninety percent of the educational leadership Ed. D. students work full time in demanding positions and will not give up these positions to become full-time students. Therefore, the only option at UCF for the majority of educational leadership students desiring a doctorate is the Ed. D.

c. What are typical characteristics of students applying to an Ed.D. program?

Students in the newly-implemented Ed.D. programs tend to be mid-career professionals and have varying undergraduate backgrounds. Many have master's degrees in areas related to educational leadership (MBA, MAT, M.Ed. in reading, etc.). They generally are motivated and focused on getting the work done well and at a high level of quality. It is not uncommon for a few to have difficulty with writing or with the statistical analysis, and those individuals are referred to the writing center or statistics lab to strengthen those skills.

11. Recommendations: Continuing the café conversation

For institutions participating in CPED, utilizing the café conversation methodology was a natural progression from convening conversations and further enhanced "a living network of collaborative dialogue around questions that matter in service of the real work" (www.theworldcafe.com). Participants are alerted to the questions before participating in the conversation, and may share prepared notes with university colleagues. This helps ensure fidelity to reality,

unlike a free conversation where rhetoric can at times replace the reality of the situation. As can be seen, one of the outcomes of the café experience is consensus on what are the most significant questions that underline the situation or issue.

In this café conversation, we attempted to have a genuine discussion across CPED institutions about such things as the nature, purpose, program and curriculum design, methodologies, standards of rigor, and relevance of the scholar practitioner educational leadership doctorate. As institutional members of CPED, we endeavor to work collaboratively, taking on the challenging role of "critical friend' in contrast to scholars who "seal themselves within their own rhetoric and within their own parish of authorities," (Bruner, 1990 pp. ix–x) thereby ensuring that we are able to identify, and address issues before they become disruptive to the university. The multiple voices participating in the café conversation suggest that though we have absorbed a common CPED terminology, i.e. signature pedagogy, problem-based instruction, capstone, there are significant differences depending on institutional context and whether the new Ed.D. program is being designed by faculty who taught or continues to teach in an existing Ph.D. program. The vision presented by Lee Shulman is less likely to have become corrupted when the Ed.D. program is newly designed and is not seen as competition for the Ph.D.by both students and faculty. We hope that CPED participants collectively engaged in the field of educational leadership will maintain their role of critical friend, and continue to add their own voices through café conversations about the nature — and future — of the educational leadership, practitioner doctorate.

References

Ainscow, M. & Southworth, G. (1996) School improvement: a study of the roles of leaders and external consultants. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* 7(3), 229–51.

Bambino, D. (2003). Critical friends: Redesigning professional development. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 25–27.

Barth, R. (1997). *The principal learner: A work in progress*. The International Network of Principals' Centers, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1991) *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (2002) *Reframing the Path to School Leadership: A Guide for Teachers and Principals.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Sage

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods in N. Denzin & Yvonne Lincoln (Eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research*. pp. 509– 536. Sage.

CGS (Council of Graduate Schools). (2007).*Task Force Report on the Professional Doctorate.*CGS: Washington, D.C.

Cooperrider, D.L., & Sorensen Jr., P.F., & Whitney, D., & Yaegar, T. (Eds). (2000).
Appreciative Inquiry: Rethinking Human Organization toward a Positive Theory of Change. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing.

Costa, A. and Kallick, B. (1993). "Through the Lens of a Critical Friend." *Educational Leadership 51*(2): 49-51.

Curry, M. W. (2008). Critical Friends Groups: The Possibilities and Limitations Embedded in Teacher Professional Communities Aimed at Instructional Improvement and School Reform. *Teachers College Record* 110 (4), pp. 733–774.

Dunne, F., & Honts, F. (1998). *"That group really makes me think!" Critical friends groups and the development of reflective practitioners*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Diego, CA.

Dunne, F., Nave, B., & Lewis, A. (2000). Critical friends: Teachers helping to improve student learning. *Phi Delta Kappa International Research Bulletin, 28*, 9–12.

Goodnough, K. (2003) Facilitating action research in the context of science education: reflections of a university researcher. *Educational Action Research, 11*(1), 41–63.

National College for School Leadership: Nottingham, UK.

Imig, D. (2008). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 3rd CPED Convening. Stanford: Palo Alto.

Johnson, B. & Johnson, K. (2002) Learning from Warthogs and Oxpeckers: promoting mutualism in school and university research partnerships. *Educational Action Research,* 10(1), 67–82.

Moss, P. A. (2005). Understanding the other/understanding ourselves: Towards a constructive dialogue about "principles" in educational research. *Educational Theory, 55*, 262-283.

Perry, J.A. and Imig, D. (2008). A stewardship of practice in education. *The Magazine of Higher Learning.*

Storey, V.A., & Asadoorian, M. (2008). Quantitative Analysis of Current Issues in Education: Answering the Call Re-Thinking Doctoral Education Programs for the 21st Century:
Consumers versus Producers and the Choice between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. Paper Presented at the UCEA annual convention, October 30 - November 2, 2008 Orlando, FL.

Storey, V. A., & Hartwick, P. (In press).Critical friends: Supporting a small, private university face the challenges of crafting an innovative scholar-practitioner doctorate, In G. Jean-Marie & A. H. Normore (Eds.), *Educational Leadership Preparation Programs: Innovative and Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Ed.D. CA:* Palgrave MacMillan
Swaffield, S. (2005). No sleeping partners: Relationships between head teachers and critical friends. *School Leadership and Management.* 25 (1). 43-57.

What are Café Conversations? & Café Know-how –
   www.theworldcafe.com On the website www.theworldcafe.com

Young, M.D. (2006). The M.Ed., Ed. D., and Ph. D. in Educational
   Leadership. *UCEA Review, 48*(2), 6-9.